

**ACPE Curious Orienteers Community of Practice Survey  
(123 total survey responses)  
Qualitative Categorical Analysis  
Compiled October 22, 2022**

Green: Positive  
Red: Negative  
Yellow: Neutral  
Combination: Mixed

*7. In what ways has centralization (changing from nine ACPE regions to one national organizational structure) impacted the ACPE's essential work and value? Explain as fully as you like. Suggest further changes you would like to see made, if any. 115 responses*

Positive 11  
Negative 66  
Neutral 7  
Mixed 16  
Mixed + 2 (Mixed answers leaning Positive)  
Mixed - 13 (Mixed answers leaning Negative)

[It] has changed connections and affirming relationships
I have greatly appreciated the centralization of ACPE. There were aspects of the regional structure that concerned me from a compliance and fiduciary perspective. Although I know this is not true for everyone, I struggled with the regional community. I'm very comfortable with challenge, but there were lots of aspects of the culture that I did not resonate with possible because of my generational culture or perhaps being from a minority religious background. There are individuals in the "region" who have been amazing mentors but I don't feel great when I think back to regional meetings. I need a strong, collaborative professional organization that can help me as I try to carry on the amazing work of our ACPE retired/retiring leaders. I need an organization that knows how to speak with and demonstrate value of CPE to hospital administrators. It would help me greatly if the elders of this community would ask me what I need as I try to keep this field and my career going for another 30-40 years in this climate with tremendous financial, social and institutional pressures. I know every generation suffers but things are pretty tough out there now and I could use your guidance and wisdom rather than efforts to destabilize an imperfect but better-functioning national organization.
I hate it. I have lost connections and opportunity for career growth offered through the region. I don't see ACPE as essential to what I do anymore.
[Loss:] Networking and leadership development in local region. Feeling connected nationally to people that look like me, but disconnected and isolated locally.
The change has not been rewarding at all. Even before COVID-19 these changes were an overall disappointment to why I became a supervisor (I am still holding on to the "old" name, too) in the first place. Now they seem isolating and not sufficient to support the changes to those of us who had programs to close in health care settings.
I feel like I have less voice, say, influence.
More equitable processes, and a big improvement over the folksy but inefficient ways of the past.

Educators are isolated in our sites; networking very limited; shared projects or ed meetings rare. Educators have little input into strategies, philosophy and objectives of ACPE.
I find it confusing
More unified and efficient association that is clearer about goals and all pulling in the same direction.
In my opinion centralization has been primarily negative. I believe the regional structure could have been revamped to address issues and yet retain the community aspects of the regional model.
Major impact of loss of regions was loss of relational opportunities - both opportunities to network and to share meaningful connections, but also loss of accountability. Centralization is great for efficiency (as in accreditation work) but harmful to relationships and we [are] a relational discipline above all.
1) I thought that it would be financially more efficient. It does not appear that way. 2) The essential work (certification and accreditation) of ACPE seems to fall on a smaller and all volunteer group of people - CEs - whose tasks and time demands are great. 3) As there are no CEs in the office, decisions on the daily operation of all educational matters are made by non-CE folks. 4) There do not appear to be anyone concerned about keeping connected to the CEs in their professional functioning and personal lives (ala the Regional Directors). 5) Overall, there does not appear to be evidence of the "give and take" that epitomized the regions.
I have noticed a lack of connectedness. I no longer have relationships outside my center. I no longer hear reports from what is happening at the national level.
I'm less connected with and invested in the organization.
The essential work has not changed. What has changed is the limited relationships, some of which results from COVID.
The centralization has basically had no impact on my center. The nine regions were often run by an elite of old guard. I found little value in them.
Loss of consistent community
I have become completely out of touch with the association and lost opportunities I once had for leadership development.
[It brought] Uniform[ity to] the work. Become more dependent on the use of digital technologies. Often feels like busy work.
I have struggled since the change to feel a sense of coherence and support in the organization. I felt hesitant when regions were dissipated, and that hesitancy is open dismay and sadness. Communities of practice don't replace the regional support we had, and it is a struggle.
It's made it [ACPE] fairer and just financially with all centers paying the same fees. It's opened up more Cont. Ed. Opportunities. I've made relationships around the country which has enriched my practice.
Feel disconnected from my colleagues. Growing disillusionment with ACPE
Not having a regional Director and members of the region affected me I grieve [towards] the loss of relationships with everyone especially the director who is like the chaplain for CEs. Emotional, Spiritual, social, and Physical support are missing. in addition to deep relationships, you build with one another.
Regional structure fostered more collegiality
Negative impact. Current structure supports administration, alienates educators and was imposed without quality improvement evaluation and safeguards. I advocate a model that has educators in the leadership and provides more local autonomy and decision-making.
Radically shifted our focus from CPE practice to organizational enhancement.
It has streamlined it. Having 9 regions was unwieldy. There were too many differences (e.g., student unit fees).

In many locations (where regions did not form their own CoPs), the result has been a diminishment of community and alienation from the actions of the board (with members experiencing a lack of consultative process).

The main change is it has become MORE Atlanta-centric. It had already gone in that direction. With ALL of the money now in Atlanta, ALL the power resides there.

My persuasion is that previous iterations of dimensions of ACPE being referred to as the OLD certification process, the OLD accreditation process, the OLD governance process, are linguistic methods of moving from a national organization that is made up of pods of people all over the US to an organization who has members scattered all over the US and little or no connectedness. Linguistically being part of the new system separates rather than embracing the rich legacy that is ACPE. The Regions provided MANY connections in close geographical proximity. The CoP system really does not work for cross referencing differences. The CoP process tends to put like-minded with like-minded, similar focus with similar focus, we have lost the richness of diversity to silos of common focuses.

Not enough CPE influence in national office. Who voted to turn ACPE into a not-for-profit organization rather than the professional association it had been. Ending the regions took the heart out of ACPE. How can a non-CPE educator dictate what CPE is. How can a former dissatisfied CPE student run ACPE fairly.

I have a sense of further isolation from peers and the Association. I have worked in the intermountain west for 45 years and the centralization was essential dissolution of my primary contact group, the Pacific Region has led to a sense of being alone (except for four or five CPE professionals that I call my peer group—not a CoP).

I have lost a huge part of my village. I am no longer connected to ACPE except in my town. I wish the pendulum had not swung so far in the opposite direction. Is there not a way to keep the good stuff, which you will see I have acknowledged, and include a way to maintain the relationships in the 'region' or whatever the area would be called?

It has enhanced our work, resources, credibility and focus within and beyond the organization. We are becoming increasingly professional, genuinely interfaith, and less of a good ol' boy Christian fraternal order.

It has made it more difficult to have a sense of community and collegiality. This was of course further exacerbated by the pandemic.

I mourn the loss of the ACPE regions and all professional relationships that these offered.

1. I have experienced a negative impact of not having a region after moving to a new job in a different state and having a hard time meeting and building relationships with CPE colleagues. Previously, I would have attended regional and sub-regional meetings and made those connections. 2. I have experienced a negative impact of having all accreditation, certification and professional ethics activities move to only happening on a national level. Previously, I participated in all those activities by rotating through regional level committees while having them only done on a national level makes participation in a variety of these activities more difficult. 3. I have experienced a positive impact through the creation of Community of Practice groups as a way of connecting with ACPE colleagues through a common shared interest or geographical location. The CoP experience has been more structured and means I have ability to go deeper in areas of shared interest. However, I have less opportunities to form new relationships and expand my professional community than I did with the regional structure.

We have lost relationship with one another without the regions and regional work. We have lost touch with the leadership, and they have lost touch with us. It seems like decisions are made without member input. I miss meetings where we could give input and be more directly involved in the decision making.

Centralization has had a positive impact on administrative functioning. The ACPE office seems more familiar with administrative operations and I have experienced the office as being more responsive. A downside for me has been the loss of collegiality, familiarity and identity that I associated with regional functioning. I found my regional connection important to my inspiration and motivation, as well as closer contact with best practices.

[Loss:] Connection and community changes. I miss the regional meetings, and I am grateful for the COP's I belong too. I see a gap in leadership support without having a CE on the national office staff, and I would love to see a few positions created to help bridge this gap.

It has improved efficiency and saved a lot of money that would have been spent on regional meetings. It was a risky feeling for me to run for office on a national ballot, and I was surprised to be elected, but it looks to me that the national ballot process has opened up levels of leadership for Educators to access opportunity earlier in their careers and I see that as a good thing. It has taken leadership out of the hands of Regional Directors, who tended to be older white males which, though not intended, limited perspectives. I hear more complaints from older white males who feel disconnected from newer, younger leaders who have emerged without "apprenticing up" through regional systems (often patriarchal). I have maintained relationships and developed new ones through Zoom meetings. I miss face-to-face, but still find value in virtual meetings, presentations, etc. The current trends have forced me to learn to use Zoom and Microsoft Teams to conduct ACPE business and to teach. I was resistant to these innovations, but have learned to use them effectively, because I had to do so.

Our changes were unfortunately timed and coincided with travel/safety restrictions that are due to Covid-19 dangers. I think some Educators blame ACPE leaders and staff for isolation and lack of community because they cannot distinguish between Covid isolation and missing regional fellowships. I am a part of three Communities of Practice that have only met virtually for the last 2.5 years. I miss being face to face. All three of these groups used to meet from one to three times annually. I recognize this as a consequence of Covid health/travel restrictions and do not blame ACPE.

I look forward to resuming face-to-face meetings and relationships, first in a November Certification meeting in 2022, and then in at least one CoP in March, and hopefully with our ACPE annual meeting in May 2023. I think some of the discontent that I hear from some Educators will be diminished as we again have opportunity to be together in-person and more people feel connected and valued for their input.

The changes have mostly occurred as I entered the "semi-retirement" part of my professional life, so it has been difficult to know how much impact was created by structural changes and how much by personal priorities (e.g., participation in COPs.) I definitely have missed the expanded collegiality of participation in two regional meetings per year, including certification committee work. I'm not aware of being intentionally shut out of anything but neither have I felt like my past work was either recognized or appreciated. I have heard the words "we value the input of our older generations" but have not experienced any actual interest in what that might be. My assessment is that with the loss of regional and subsidized national gatherings (by structure and by COVID) many of us have missed the community (particularly the informal relational aspects) and the support but just not felt it was worth the energy to swim against the tidal currents of change.

For me, we have lost much of the connectivity that has contributed greatly to our work and ministry. Annual and semi-annual gatherings don't occur as frequently. There aren't committees to work on with people in your own region, which I believe makes it more difficult to serve on national committees; it's harder to become known across the nation. Elections become more of a popularity contest. Along with that, the loss of our regional director has been the biggest loss - he was the cog that kept us all connected. He knew what was going on for most of the people in our region and notified us when a CE had lost a loved one, were leaving the region or had other significant life events. He kept us informed of new people so that we could welcome them. And he was a significant part of planning events - rather than leaving it for CEs, who already have enough on their plates. Losing all of this connectivity has resulted in more feelings of isolation, less creativity in CPE programming and made my work less fun. I understand that CoPs were created to address some of this; and it's helped some. But even those groups put more responsibility on CEs to plan and facilitate; does anyone really have a lot of time to do that? And the three positions of area "coordinators" were eliminated soon after they were established - something that I thought was a big mistake. Being able to talk to a CE about CPE education and or difficulties in the clinic is important. Overall, my sense is that we've become less of an association and more like a business. I wish there were good ways to be both.

I like the CoP's for personal growth and connection. I felt minimally connected to my region. I realize I am probably a minority in this respect. The region was extremely necessary for helping educators and

centers navigate problems including accreditation or questions about starting/expanding CPE programs. The national office is not able to coordinate all of this!

Having sat on the Board as one of two Reginal Reps, I know that there has been a significant economic advantage with less people. The loss of community has been huge prior to Covid and on exaggerated by Covid and zoom meetings. Thank God for zoom; it is better than nothing. Zoom has not begun to bridge the loss of community via networking. It is very cumbersome to request money so far in advance and then to be denied i disheartening and maddening. I believe the NCR had one of if not the highest amount of assets that got pooled to the central office; this is not reflected in the amount we get for regional events.

I don't understand who decides what is a worthy project/educational event or who to appeal to when things are not approved. It feels like a very closed non transparent process.

The on-line manuals are impossible for me to navigate; I would like to be able to have a hard copy downloaded of everything on the manuals, including the hyperlinks included within documents. I asked if that was possible and was told it was not so I don't keep current anymore and am forced to rely on my more tech savvy colleagues; its humiliating and demoralizing. I can hear it now, "sink or swim already! It is also hard to discern what is actually DOE mandates and the mandates that come from ACPE; many of them go against my theory, ethics and practice. I'll limp along for another 18 months or so until I retire.

So much isolation and lack of collegiality. People only associating with their preferred folks rather than working together with colleagues w different perspectives, a loss can of casual social connections which create community. Plus referring so much to a National office which seems either disdainful at some times or remote at other times. It has saddened us. There were hierarchies that mentored folks too. That was a surprise but true.

I miss being part of a region and seeing my colleagues at set intervals. It was easier to feel a sense of belonging.

I am retired. It has impacted me personally in that I am no longer able to reach out to former colleagues and friends. Our gatherings and even e-mail and phone number lists have disappeared. My life long professional relationships have become inaccessible. I even learn if deaths and funeral services if colleagues only through happenstance reading online newspapers.

Loss of resources of creative ideas, peer consultation, collegiality, clear communications. COP's do not replace regional resources or relationships. [there were] Genuine ways of connecting which geography provided.

In my opinion it has negatively impacted the essential work of a CPE. The regions for the place for collegiality, shared learning, regional conferences and support of people going through training. Without my region, I never would've made it through my certification process. The people I know there I have known for many many years and our dear dear colleagues. I would like to go back to the regions, we need that kind of support in this work without it we will not know one another

I believe centralization was a necessary challenge for standardization across the association. I believe a double whammy of COPs being developed, resourced, and meeting regularly to fill the void of some of the relational / educational work that was done regionally has been slow to catch on partly due to Covid limitations and partly due to lack of buy-in and understanding of the COP concept along with an inability to meet together in person for annual conference, accreditation visits, and other events (again due to Covid) has severely limited the development of the new structure and ethos. Changes, especially significant systemic ones, take time and replication / persistence to take hold and for norms and patterns to materialize along with allowing for troubleshooting and progressive changes. We just haven't had enough real-world interactions with much of the new system to know how it will be and what changes are needed to know what the true impact to the association's essential work and value might be. Trying to build a plane while flying it is hard enough - having to make an emergency crash landing during a hurricane (of a global pandemic) when all the parts aren't even in place yet makes it damn near impossible to test the viability of the new plane.

We have moved from a Congregational polity to a Roman Catholic polity. The work I do with students is the only remnant of true CPE that exists for me now. I try to stay connected to the spirit of CPE through

and [with] the CoP's, but topics of conceptual learning are not CPE. In CoP's, many conversations are around understanding and conforming to changes we had no voice in creating. Whose brainchild was this competency-based learning? Who had input into the portfolio for accreditation? I didn't. None of my closest educator friends did. I feel like I've lost my cherished community and ACPE has lost its soul. Every now and then, there is a sharing that stimulates a moment of true process learning through experience/reflection learning; but for the most part I experience a lack of congruence and disconnect between what we claim to be as an organization and how we function.

[There has been] Disconnection between colleagues. And at the same, connection with colleagues across the organization. We have to rely on virtual gatherings for connection. Rather - we are dependent on it. There are strengths and limits to this dependency.

I am hoping the centralization means more help for resourcing from the National office than I had under regions. So far, I have experienced this some with the webinars, but I feel a loss of community and collegial relationships under the centralization. And I have not experienced much direct support from the national office. I usually get the help I need, but it takes 2-4 contacts sometimes to accomplish that.

We have lost our way.

I sense a diminished feeling of community. I believe COVID has added to this feeling. Yet, I do realize that in the years past there was a feeling of a more robust community experienced through regional meetings etc.

I think that the centralization has made possible certain changes that needed to happen -- there is no way we could have moved with so many regions pulling in so many directions. However, the loss of region seems to have really curtailed the pipeline of ACPE members doing certain work in the organization such as accreditation. Further, and perhaps most important, I think there has been a very significant reduction in the opportunity to network and form supportive and collegial relationships. I feel less connected with the organization -- I don't feel that I have a sense of where things are going.

[There has been] Loss of community; loss of a spiritual care provided/wise administrative guide in our Regional Director; loss of networking opportunities among colleagues who wouldn't necessarily be part of communities of practice I would join.

The work of ACPE still remains the same, spiritual care education and leadership of the field of spiritual care. Before the change I was a Level 1/2 student on the cusp of the certification process so I'm not sure if I have the clearest view of how our essential work has changed since centralization. But I can say that the changes negatively affected the Educators I worked with, all the changes really destabilized the spaces they used to process in and therefore they had less resources to cope with the massive transitions they were experiencing in ACPE. I still benefitted from CPE in ways I believe many people do but sometimes I felt like I was "managing my managers" for lack of a better way of putting it.

Centralization had a massive effect on my certification process, I entered the process through a readiness committee knowing that I would be in the new process. There were times no one knew what was next for me in the certification process, but I learned to take charge of my own learning. There was a time I had to go back to new competency grid before I could move forward (when I was told I'd never have to do that). There were times no one knew who I should speak to in order to meet a committee, or how to form one and that really disheartened me. But I have to say CoPs saved my certification process, if I had not been allowed to join a new CoP (in a region not my own) I would have dropped out. I found Educators and other students who I really connected with and could seek vulnerable consultation with and so I can't speak more highly of CoPs, so much so that I've excitedly joined the Professional Wellbeing Committee. CoPs really excite me and mine really excited me in the certification process and now has been extremely supportive in my upcoming Accreditation Site Review.

I also found the competencies to be incredibly helpful in my process to guide my learning goals but I'm not sure I would have felt that way if I had not been in the DMin program at Union Theological Seminary with Jeffery Silberman. He crafted a curriculum that gave me all I needed to be a successful Educator and helped me understand the competencies in a way I'm not sure a CEC in a CoP would get. Overall, the core curriculum could use the insight from that program's curriculum because I found it to be generally useless compared to what Jeffery created at Union. As I journey toward becoming National Faculty, I plan to implement Union's curriculum into Ochsner's CEC training program.

I find the centralization of Accreditation extremely confusing but I also really enjoy working with the Commission Reviewer who I find to be incredibly helpful and communicative. I don't know how he does all he does to communicate with those in his charge and run a center but I'm grateful he finds a way. In my previous center I didn't find this really to be the case with the Reviewer but that may just be a personality difference. As I navigate my upcoming site review, I haven't found anyone to be particularly confident in navigating this process. I think we could use more specific education and examples about the portfolio process which I've found Marc Medwed to be responsive to my feedback as a portfolio reviewer.

Loss of collegiality, peership and gatherings which were life sustaining. Our region also developed leaders which served ACPE very well. Commissions were balanced with representatives from all regions rather than hand selected to support the desires of the national office and the board. Much more inclusive approach than what currently exists.

The structure of ACPE is more hierarchal and thus the system of accountability is diminished. The new structure offers little room for dialogue; communication mainly flows from top down. Finally, I have yet to see any research about the impact of the revised structure on targeted groups (i.e., people of color, women, non-Christians etc.) For me, if their experience was improved, then the changes were worth it.

I think the decision to eliminate ACPE Regions was a horrible mistake. Our Regional Director was our go to person. Someone you could always contact with whatever you needed help with. And from a more personal perspective, when my 34 yo son died in 2011, Jasper Keith was at my home, at my hospital talking to our spiritual care staff about ways they could help the program in my absence and talking about how they could care for me. -- presently I can't even remember the last time I was able to call the ACPE number and get a live person on the phone.

Seems to be an attempt at creating more constancy and congruency between programs. It also seems to have provided stronger financial stability as a whole which follows the contemporary corporate model that seeks to stabilize the financial instability in the current economy. This attempt at stability and consistency seems to be at expense of mutual support, communal creativity, and a shared and collaborative vision. I also am greatly concerned at the significantly increased administrative workload of the educator to maintain Accreditation and Certification.

The training & ACPE infrastructure/Atlanta now seems to focus more on the ACPE policies & procedures & its presence as an entity than on the actual training of students.

Also, there is little opportunity for collegiality & contact between we Educators. The Regions provided much more opportunity for fostering/maintaining relationships.

Finally, the "Portfolio" process & its relationship to Accreditation is a royal "pain in the butt". Before the "centralization", we only had to focus on/worry about external Standards evaluation every 5/10 years. We developed them initially, reviewed them & evaluated yearly any administrative or programmatic changes on that basis. Now the Portfolio process seems designed to supposedly require updating/checking on a daily & constant basis. The result is that it's possible & sometimes necessary to spend more time on the "Portfolio" than on our student's education & training.

Constant evaluation of students in ACPE training is necessary, expected & useful; but constant Standards evaluation is a grind & takes too much of the Educator's time, focus & energy away from the students--which, if I recall correctly is why the organization exists & the primary reason most of us got involved in CPE in the first place.

I previously felt connected to the educators from my region, and pre-pandemic, appreciated conferences or gatherings where I could develop relationships and learn from others in person. I feel disconnected from my region. I have tried to join Communities of Practice to fill in this gap but it has not had the same effect or impact.

It sucks. It is difficult to know who is near me and creates obstacles for creating an educational community

I have felt a loss of community. The regions were how I felt connected deeply to colleagues -- especially through our regional meetings. The North Central Region was a very vibrant region with a once-a-year

fall gathering and, in the winter/spring, a SES Consortium meeting that was very engaging, reflective, and collegial. It has been hard to keep connections, especially with colleagues spread out far geographically. Also, our regional director functioned in many ways as a chaplain to CE's. The only time I hear from the national office is when they want something or if they think I haven't done my peer review . . . it doesn't feel relational. I feel less connected to ACPE since the change and I know I would feel even more disconnected if I was a solo supervisor in a center -- I'm grateful to be in a center with multiple supervisors.

I see the essential work of ACPE as setting standards for clinical pastoral education, accrediting centers that meet those standards, certifying educators who are authorized to supervise students doing clinical ministry and adjudicating professional ethics complaints as well as supporting the well-being of its members.

I think ACPE's essential value is its commitment to relational-based education that results in chaplains and pastoral care givers who minister out of authenticity, self-awareness and competency for crisis-based ministry in diverse settings.

I believe ACPE was held together by like-minded professional educators who shared in this work in a covenantal, relational-based process of education that was characterized by mutuality, action-reflection methods of learning, collegiality, and community.

In my experience the regions held this trust in partnership with national. The Regions functioned as the sinew that connected local centers with the national office. The RDs, regional councils and committee chairs managed, nuanced, brokered and negotiated that connection in representative and advocacy-based ways. I belonged to the South Central Region before I belonged to ACPE. The region was my community. I was certified in a community of educators who knew me, challenged me, nurtured me, taught me, became vulnerable with me, and believed in me. I was not the brightest star in the process but my peers saw my potential to be a CPE Educator amid my flaws and shortcomings.

Now there is nothing and no one in between executive leadership and centers. The Board, it appears to me, is increasingly sidelined and symbolic. Perhaps this is the way of organizations a la Max Weber i.e., the charismatic becomes bureaucratic. Well, that may be the case but I don't like it and I feel alienated from the organization. Right now, ACPE does not feel like a movement. It feels more like a machine. (Of course, I could be projecting my unconscious material on ACPE in my answers. No doubt I am to some extent, but much of what I am saying is hopefully factual and based on accurate observation and thoughtful reflection on the question that is posed above.)

We have become top-down, overly sensitive to the Department of Education and its accreditation requirements. Answering to the federal government might make some people feel that ACPE is more legitimate or somehow more accountable to educational standards, but I feel that becoming dependent on the DOE and submitting to its dictates and whims cedes our autonomy and creativity as an organization. As a conservative I believe in local control and relational-based, discernment-based decision-making. Answering to the federal government is what I call "feeding the beast" because the "beast" (I am not talking in some wild eschatological nonsensical way) it demands to be fed to justify its existence. How has bowing down to the DOE improved the quality of education we offer and the quality of the pastoral care provided by our students? I have not seen evidence one way or the other.

The only meaningful connections I have with ACPE right now are my membership in the Central States Consortium CoP (a legacy CoP with ties to the South Central Region) and the volunteer work I do with Accreditation as a portfolio reviewer under the leadership and care provided by Silvia Tiznado. The Central States CoP meets for fellowship and for connection on a regular basis and once a year for an education event. Silvia has started monthly Zoom meetings for portfolio reviewers. She has created a forum to do the work in a way that shares information and provides support to volunteer reviewers.

I no longer feel connected to, challenged by, related to peers outside of my own CoPs. There is an echo chamber effect of small, like-minded groups meeting with no spaces for the whole to address challenges and learn together. I grieve the loss of community.

On positive side, I do think financial stability has increased and the ACPE public relations/ marketing sort of needs are being well met. I like the emphasis on cultural diversity and anti-racism. On the negative side, the loss of regional connection and history is deeply, deeply felt. What is more, the collegiality so important to ACPE has been diluted. I think the COPs are a real and substantial contribution to our culture and practice, but the loss of regional governance has made our organization more top-down, less democratic, less CPE.

Transformation begins in the local community, one that no longer seems to be important to ACPE. There is a disconnect between the national organization of ACPE and ACPE centers. ACPE staff more and more do not answer phones or reply to emails, and complaints about this go unanswered. When we were in regions, we had places to go to get support and answers without having to reach out to the national office. In addition, the relationships that are such a part of the work of CPE are lost when you move to a national model rather than regional. Did the regional model need work? Yes, it did. Some regions were working better than others. Eliminating regions, however, was not the answer. And eliminating the positions that were put into place as connectors to the national office, in place of regional folk, only further alienated the centers from the national office.

I do think the elimination of the regions makes it challenging to network within the area that my region was. However, I also feel that some of the clique-ness of the regions has dissipated, and I have gotten to know people in areas besides my own.

The centralization has hindered open communications with leadership, building of collegial relationships, opportunity to participate in the community of ideas. I experience current ACPE structures as something more akin to being a part of a governmental agency, without opportunity to express opposing views, or have local representation.

Much less collegiality - I miss interacting with colleagues from neighboring states. I know we can't go back due to the IRS problems with the previous structure. I'd value some kind of ACPE supported regional gatherings. The COPs have worked well in two instances that I'm a part of.

I think it has made it much better with more consistent messaging, objectivity in certification and accreditation, and gives one the opportunity to get to know CE's from across the country. I feel that when we meet now at regional meetings organized through a cop, the meetings are much more congenial, inclusive, and thoughtfully organized. I like the fact that they are optional. Before with regional leadership, certification committees, annual meetings, and accreditation committees, I experienced them as not hospitable, very cliquish and gossipy. It also felt competitive and hierarchical. Those who were trained in certain consortiums always gravitated to be with, and seemed to agree with each other. I feel that the CE's who miss the old way miss the companionship with their friends but don't realize that what they miss is what made it uncomfortable for others particularly new members. I used to dread going to the regional meetings in the old structure. I was relieved when it changed.

I am among the last new CE's in the old process and don't have enough long term history to fully appreciate any impact of changes. I must confess that I am royally annoyed that those who were certified as educators under the old process were ineligible to automatically be considered National Faculty (after a cutoff date - that I missed by only a few months). It feels a bit like bait and switch. My new work responsibilities have precluded my ability to pursue National Faculty status and I am annoyed by that.

I have experienced both positive and negative effects. The most positive effect has been a more standardized educational and logistical way of operating across the organization. The most negative effect, even with has been the lack of forming deep relationships in my local area. That has been somewhat offset by my choice of the CoPs I have joined and a local monthly breakfast meeting we have set up in our area. What is still missing is having someone like a local "regional director" who is "in the know" about what is happening in ACPE and with the commissions and can act as a translator, mediator, and advocate to and from the local area and national.

Centralization has left me without a community. I feel alone and unsupported as an educator. When regions were in place, I felt seen, valued and had a sense of what was happening regionally and somewhat organizationally. National ACPE staff were easier to contact. I felt proud to be a member of ACPE - this is less so today. The communities of practice (the ones I have experienced) have not met regularly and CoP leaders appear tired and overextended. I served for 3 years as chair of my regional conference planning committee. This format was more functional than CoPs have been.

For the past few months I have attempted to seek other CoP options. The website link seems to have disappeared and my emails requesting assistance have gone unanswered.

Reevaluating the centralization structure in light of how educator relationships are formed and maintained and best practices for educator education is a must. How can the vital aspects of regions be created while the benefits of centralization be maintained.

It has virtually destroyed periodic collegiality. I do not like it.

I am one who is open to changes, yet I see few advantages. Most of the changes have made the work even more complicated and we feel removed from the organization. The sense of connection is drastically different and the ACPE national office seems to focus more on perpetuating itself than offering us support. The student unit fees are outrageous and it's unsustainable for most of us. Many centers are discussing sunsetting their programs due to the hassles with little support. The work the ACPE creates for centers and Educators is arduous and almost inhuman within organizations that are small and struggling as it is.

Centralization may have strengthened the organization financially, but it has alienated the member and distanced them from the organization. The regional meetings and activities are lost and with it the sense of belonging and professional mutual support.

It leaves me lonely, less well-supported and less well-educated. Our regional gatherings were, as Bob Persenaire said for himself, my church. My two monthly Communities of Practice (one local for southwest Michigan and northern Indiana and Ohio, and one about using the Enneagram) are like small group Bible studies or the choir or some other sub-group of our whole congregation. I enjoy them and get a lot out of them, but their meetings do not replace the level of connection, support and education I received from our twice-yearly regional gatherings. Furthermore, when we had a regional director, we knew who to talk to about problems with our center, including the institution in which our center was housed. The regional director could talk to our institution's administrators with authority about a national perspective on whatever the issue was affecting us. If we had concerns about another center in our region, about the Educator or anything else, the regional director was a great person to go to for advice, guidance, perspective. The regional director knew the history of our region, and brought a lot of wisdom and perspective. I recommend we return to regions with regional directors. OH, I guess I should add some of the benefits of centralization: I think the standardization of the curricula for interns, residents and CECs is probably a net benefit in the way it has been approached (still allowing each Educator to use the materials or not as the Educator's theories dictate for any particular student group or setting). I think the standardization of accreditation philosophy and practices is going to turn out to be a net benefit, using a regularly updated portfolio online. That's a pain for Educators who aren't computer savvy, but long term I expect it will feel like less work with more benefit for the quality of education. I heard one reason the regions were obliterated was because each had its own financial structure, some quite messy, and I suppose the centralization of finances might be a net benefit. I also believe in the net benefit of a merger between APC and ACPE, and I imagine the centralization makes that merger more realistic.

Centralization has negatively impacted ACPE's essential work and value on multiple levels. One concrete example related to starting a CPE program with a satellite agreement across "regions" in the aftermath of their disappearance. The ambiguity surrounding this transition, plus the ambiguity of who remained responsible for what, left our application languishing for well over a year.

Beyond this, with centralization, supervisory training now has "one size fits all" even as diversity is espoused. Training is now heavily agenda driven, with the national office directing that agenda alone. None of these changes bode well for continued clinical training.

Work has become more isolated. It is difficult to connect with peers, especially with those of us who do not have CEC training. Lack of opportunities to take on leadership positions. The CoPs are not connected to the Board or each other. Some of our CoPs are more educational. Some more subregional or regional. There is little money for doing educational events together, such as SOS. I know very few of the newly certified folks--how would I meet them? I would like us to find ways to connect with some geography so that we can meet in person. Have more town halls. Reconfigure the Professional wellbeing committee so

<p>it can support wellbeing of individuals who encounter distressing events. Reconfigure the leadership committee that is very disconnected from the larger body and seeks nominations from the chairs of committees--that does not bring in "unknown" people.</p> <p>Reconfigure the Ethics Commission so that it is more about professional behavior and ethics and less legal. Making a complaint takes over a year, and sometimes longer, how does that assist any student or educator?</p>
<p>I'm not sure because I wasn't present during that time.</p>
<p>It has limited the amount of community. However, being a part of the ECCOP has maintained this important connection. I'm not sure this is true for every region</p>
<p>The change has isolated me from my peers and it has left me without anyone to share .</p>
<p>I like the weekly newsletter and feel more connected to the overall effort of the ACPE and more importantly to my colleagues across the country.</p>
<p>It has had a negative impact in the way that the professional staff in the national office (none of whom are ACPE Educators) make decisions for us. I feel that communication has suffered, and there is a lack of transparency.</p>
<p>I believe the national structure is helping us navigate broad changes in healthcare and puts us in a better position to be on a national stage. We also lost the small, regional, relational aspect of ACPE was that very important to our own well-being as well as for information-delivery. Amy Greene and others in leadership have said many times, "We had to get rid of regions" due to the financial regulations to be an Association. In my mind, that is not true--yes, we had to do away with the financial aspect of being regions; it was not equitable nor legal. However, we did not have to "get rid of" the other aspects of regions--a communication hub, a caring community, an RD who was easily available for consultation, etc. The changes I would like to see made are adding some type of regional structure--not 9 necessarily but maybe 4 or 5--who have an RD or similar role that is small enough to know everyone and be available for consultation. I did *NOT* find the National directors or whatever they were to be helpful or accessible. The value has decreased because I have to go to the national office for every little question and the only way I receive a timely response (literally, the ONLY WAY) is if I copy Marc Medwed. All that said, I do think it is wise to move toward a more national structure if we plan to carry into the future. I also think the national structure has helped to mitigate (but not eliminate) disparities that exist(ed) for under-represented and historically excluded groups of people.</p>
<p>We have lost all connection that we had with regions. We no longer have any chance at collegial relationships except if we make the effort on our own to meet with colleagues</p>
<p>[It is] Cost effective, regional meetings were nice, but because of Covid, not practical</p>
<p>It has severely diminished the sense of community support and challenge. Regional meetings used to be a regular highlight throughout the year. Now, I have little desire to attend regional events or national events as I feel like the connection has been lost. The loss of our regional director has been huge. My job and the jobs and programs at some sites have been damaged or lost because there was no organizational support person to help process changes and challenges.</p>
<p>A more common understanding of and application of Accreditation Standards and the Certification process.</p>
<p>We are more in our own bubbles, as we are choosing who we connect with based on shared interests. When it was regionally, there was much more connection with the other. It would be helpful if there were COPS that were also regional.</p>
<p>Greater clarity of structure. Improved management of systems. Greater objectivity in assessment of business/service/educational environment. More engagement with allied developments in the field. More competent business and personnel management. Less relational connectivity. Diminished sense of connection/engagement with leadership. (Some of these developments have other, confounding influences, such as Covid-19 and the evolution of outfits like Chaplaincy Innovation Lab, etc.)</p>
<p>Lack of relational and collegueship. Too much top-down mentality.</p>

It has diminished and made process of certifying educators, largely due to a much more onerous process through the ACPE organization, rather than a grass roots, networking approach more challenging.

Local and regional commitment almost nothing. Distance from the leadership feels greater.

-Shifted the relational nature of the organization, the community of ACPE has been diminished  
-Rely more on national office and national direction for regional or more communal needs and requests, which has contributed to the diminished communal engagement  
-Less investment in the members of ACPE; less development and growth of members into leadership  
-Has brought some strengths to streamline process or direction of organization; vision seems more direct and clear and can take action without as much burden (whether one agrees with the direction or not does not make this less valuable); the business components of the work have benefited from these structures (budgeting, advocacy, etc.)  
-A lot of the good work done throughout the country can be accessed and participated in more easily due to a more national/centralized structure.

Maybe made it easier but there is a concern having everything fall under one organization which could give the too much power.

I miss the ritual and community the smaller groups of regions provided through an organized structure. I have appreciated some of the resources and collaboration that have come out of the centralization of ACPE, but I feel less connected to my community. I participate in a community of practice, but the meetings do not provide the same kind of relationality that was organically part of regional meetings.

It has removed some of the polarization but also created more of a collective identity

There are far fewer opportunities for serving in the organization or having one's voice heard. Much of what happens, including the elections process, has less transparency now. For example, when we were invited to run for the transitional board (before merger talks ended), we had to state that we supported fully the terms of the merger, even though no clear framework had been established yet. Before legal advisors weighed in about the necessity of having a provisional structure presented to the membership, I was among several who had raised questions about the process and lack of clarity about what a yes vote would mean in concrete terms, but our questions were dismissed as distrustful and divisive.

I would like greater transparency and more opportunity for members to articulate our views in meaningful and official ways (e.g., the newsletter), allowing a range of perspectives. I would like clear, accurate, and timely communication. After our last membership meeting, ACPE sent out Q&A from the chat, including a promise that an official membership survey would go out in May or June, but it's August and I've seen no official survey, only harsh critique from the Board about this unofficial one.

Centralization has been a massive change affecting many areas, some of them helpful and most of them destructive of the essential work and life of the clinical ministry movement. Certification has been weakened, accreditation complexified, the board of directors made inaccessible, and functional regions obliterated, leaving educators even more overworked and isolated from one another. Our educators have been formed, and confirmed in community as a uniquely collaborative and frequently interpersonally challenged profession that top leadership does not seem to understand.

It has left me feeling much less connected to ACPE

My belief is that the centralization has diminished the value of ACPE and made my participation in the organization less satisfying. Despite serving in national leadership, I feel less connected to ACPE since the centralization. Honestly, I feel like someone one(s) are making decisions somewhere and just handing those decisions down. For example, the recent announcement in a Monday Morning memo that the national office was going to a virtual address seemed to come out of nowhere...and I try to keep plugged in and informed as a national leader. That is one specific and recent example of so many experiences over the past several years. Also, at a time when most centers are being required to have in person 6 year visits and encouraged to have 3 year consultation visits, ACPE announces that the national office is going virtual. That seems like mixed messaging. I also feel that the national office, after centralization, is less aware of and connected to the reality and challenges educators face in their own centers. Most full time educators that I know are exhausted and stressed out. I also experience ACPE as

fairly reactionary and making decisions based on trying to distinguish themselves from other accrediting and certifying bodies. Why, for example, do we try and fit ourselves into the mold of the US Department of Education? In my opinion, as an organization, we are doing way more for them than they are doing for us. It feels like we are saying to our members, we need them to be legitimate...see...we have this document! I also experience a dynamic where centers and educators have to listen to and be in relationship to ACPE...but ACPE doesn't have to listen to or be in relationship with educators and centers. The Communities of Practice are very cool...a great idea...but I don't have time to attend more than one...and I sometimes find it hard to attend that one meeting. Additionally, billing by ACPE remains a mystery for student units. Center fees are understandable, other than paying to have the organization dictate how I do things.

I have lost 1) a sense of recreational community, 2) an accessible educational resource, 3) a support group that cares, 4) a sense of diversity connected via uniformity, 5) a regional identity, 6) a professional organization of which I am proud to be a part. In addition, we have lost an infrastructure that gave form and shape to the organization and a means of maintaining it, with everyone who wanted a buy-in could have easy access to it. We have lost the "not-for-profit" mentality of being a service organization to being a "for-profit" institution whose bottom line is no longer solely service but is as much, if not more, about money as it is about service. The organizations programmatic process could have transitioned to a more centralized process without changing its structural form of regionalization.

Please keep in mind that I am at the age of personal transitions as well as professional transitions although I am still actively facilitating CPE groups. I retired from full-time permanent Certified Educator work and transitioned to part-time on-line CE work in 2017 just as ACPE was in the midst of its transition.

It has made things easier administratively for national ACPE. It has greatly decreased community and relationships and community and connection. It has decreased leadership and peership opportunities. It has been a great negative.

Hard to determine whether it was centralization or the pandemic, but I feel completely isolated. Before I gathered with the regional educators yearly. Now I am a part of a number of communities of practice, but have never met many of these people in person.

For us in the Eastern Region there was a loss of a sense of community. The centralization has made it all feel more anonymous and distant to me. More remote.

The loss of regions led to loss of connectedness and collegiality.

I am more supported in my volunteer role as a peer portfolio reviewer for Accreditation. Portfolio reviews are more transparent and less murky. I was an SES when our Center had a 10-year-review, and that process was so stressful because we did not have the Portfolios online yet. I like that the peer portfolio review process fosters collaboration and sharing of best practices.

1. Negatively impacted Community: The regular Regional Meetings and working together on established Regional Committees offered a natural network for Educators/Supervisors to meet, support, learn together, and critique one another. This process developed collegiality and friendships. The Pacific and South-Central Regions paid for Educators/Supervisors and those in the process to become Educators/Supervisors to attend the Regional Meetings. In the SCR, we instituted this covering-of-the-cost of attending Regional meetings, after seeing the positive benefits in the Pacific Region, which had been doing this for its members. The SCR meeting participation increased in involvement and commitment to the SCR and the ACPE, to one another, to personal education and to the quality of our CPE programs. In doing so, the SCR became a working community and deep friendships and collegiality developed and were sustained. Members sought involvement.

2. Negatively impacted Leadership Development: The grassroots involvement of having Regions and doing important parts of the work-of-the-ACPE created opportunities to learn about the ACPE, to develop leaders, and for other members to know the abilities of one another. Often, as Educators/Supervisors attained Associate status, the Associate would be voted onto a committee, e.g., Accreditation, and learn about the Accreditation process for their institutions and the ACPE, furthering their development. Established members would get to know them, mentor them, learn from them, as the new Associate learned about ACPE. That person would then serve on other committees and learn, grow, and develop, while also becoming known. Many were eventually voted onto Commissions and contributed to the

ACPE, from the basis of serving and learning at the grassroots level of the Regions.

3. Negatively impacted participation in and ownership of the ACPE and its leadership: Members often feel that "leadership" including the Board, makes decisions without transparency or including memberships perspectives or desires. This has left many choosing to not be involved, especially with the many requirements of their home institutions and what is required to run their programs and departments.

I feel disconnected and removed from the Association as a whole. The decisions made at national, which is virtual, seem arbitrary, centralized, and without much input from the larger membership. Where is the voice from members? How are we able to speak into the life of the organization?

*13. How does the changed format, style, and conveyed ethos of the ACPE Newsletter serve you as an educator? How could it be further improved? 108 responses*

Positive	39	
Negative	34	
Neutral	19	
Mixed	10	
Mixed +	1	(Mixed answers leaning Positive)
Mixed -	5	(Mixed answers leaning Negative)

More ongoing transparency and consultation might be good

Sometimes the lede gets buried. I'd rather straightforward info in the newsletter and not have to click for the important info. In my opinion, inspirational reflections should not be mixed with compliance and organizational info. Otherwise, I appreciate the format and like that it touches upon various commissions and national resources.

not sure

It is just about as useful as it was prior to the change.

I like it.

It seems to be working well from my perspective. No suggestions.

Minimal communication, sometimes feels like spoon-feeding

If ACPE could allow those emails to go to our whole team, that would be actually useful and helpful.

Enjoy it.

A bit too much fluff in the newsletter and not enough content. it doesn't really touch upon the complex nature of the clinical work we do. So while a peer reviewed journal might be a better place for that, still, I'd like to see something with more substance in the newsletter.

The newsletter seems like an advertisement in favor of everything that the national office is doing as opposed to a discussion of many real issues facing ACPE, except for the diversity presentations which dominate much of the newsletter.

I like the newsletter. It also feels somewhat burdensome, as everything has the same level of importance, and it is sometimes difficult to know where to focus my limited attention.

I find the newsletter helpful, informative.

I appreciate short frequent newsletters.

Prior to the weekly newsletter, I had no idea what was happening in ACPE.
Not sure
It's quite good. There is a rich variety of topics. But I view it as an outsider—I don't feel at all connected to the association.
Confusing format. It seems more like an announcement bulletin and not a newsletter.
I appreciate the regular, consistent, weekly communication. Did not have this in the region.
It was informative yet there is a disconnect with leaders.
More about communities of practice and innovative programs.
It lacks humanity. Could be improved by reflecting more of what we do - clinical and congregational work with students.
No real change - never allowed open discussion of controversial topics or negative criticism of ACPE life and CPE practice
The newsletter is informative. My major concern about the ACPE (which is often reflected in the Newsletter) is the left leaning political bias (sometimes referred to as woke politics) that is apparent, and which hasn't been reflected on. It seems taboo to question or challenge the left leaning ethos of the ACPE, which is unhealthy.
The newsletter is ok, just hard to manage on a cell phone.
ACPE newsletter is essential no matter which system of governance is in place.
Needs more attention to the educators especially those who die.
I hardly read it unless there is an Accreditation or Certification issue or change. I find it pointed towards racial, social, and political (by inference) justice issues that are relatively dissimilar to those I face in my educational ministry.
I miss the neighborhood feeling of knowing what's happening in my 'region.' I enjoyed an area perspective of who was doing what and how people were doing.
It is consistent, relevant, and inclusive. It is a central part of my access to the goings on and resources of ACPE.
I often read this, but seldom feel like I have been informed about changes and new developments within the organization - or at least the depth of what these changes mean to me and/or my center.
I like the newsletter format. I can quickly skim the headings for articles I want to read fully. It comes to my work email and I can read without multiple clicks or having to open additional pages or documents.
I appreciate This Week @ ACPE. I feel it keeps me in touch with what is happening on the national/administrative level of ACPE. I think it conveys information well. I especially enjoy personal testimonies of various kinds, and for me it could be improved by including more of these.
I would love to see a quarterly printed edition with all major changes and highlights mailed to membership.
My understanding is that the majority of Educators do not read the ACPE News. Sad. I read it every week and still did so when I was a Program Director full-time before semi-retirement in August 2021. I have found links and invitations in it to presentations that I have used in my student programs. I have alerted emerging Educators to jobs I thought they might find interesting advertised in it, I have alerted Summer Interns and Extended students to Residency opportunities I have seen posted there, and I think the effort to explain monthly Ethics standards is admirable and progressive.
Limited response here. Seems informative about what top end leadership is doing. A couple of good poems that made inspiring reading. Improvement? Not sure--maybe dealing with conflict/controversy in less subtle, more straightforward ways.

I read it primarily to see what I should or shouldn't be doing - like it comes down from "on high." Again - it seems more business-like.
In terms of ethos, I'd like to see more transparency that ACPE talks diversity but does not necessarily rise to the level of the talk
No change.
It is confusing. Sometimes inspirational. Sometimes informational. Sometimes essential. Hard to know....
Sharepoint is a HUGE pain to both get onto and navigate.
I find most of the newsletter to be irrelevant to me, and, as far as I can discern, to local centers. It seems largely propaganda for the national office and personnel.
Feels more like a business newsletter, would appreciate seeing more about people I recognize. As an elder, my needs are different. The shift from a clinical relational experiential model to a business model has lost its soul and ability to be trustworthy in the current context of our world. How are we any different than any other healthcare business?
I find it quite an inspiring, often miss it as it populates in my email, and experience it is awkward having to follow links. I would prefer more personal sharing and connection about our direct work rather than all focused on national issues of leadership
I appreciate the layout and headings making it easy to find information from / about commission work, manual changes, deadlines, etc. However, the content starts getting very repetitive with little changes to some of the postings. I tend to just skim them lately as it seems that there is very little new information. Perhaps only post sections from commissioners when there is a change or something new on which to report and not post something more than 2 newsletters in a row.
It doesn't serve me at all. The amount of time it takes to read it is not worth what I take away. I usually feel patronized by leaders speaking information I have not had input into in a coaching tone that fuels my grief: Authentic process conversations and consensus decision making are gone.
It serves me to see upcoming deadlines and news. I do read it each week.
It is repeatedly caught in my organization's filters, and I often don't see it. When I do, it seems to have some helpful information and other parts I don't read/are not of interest to me. I miss the communications about PEOPLE that we used to get from the regional director.
I just read it for any news.
The newsletter is an upbeat affair with no room for various viewpoints.
I don't find the newsletter to be particularly helpful, except for when I scroll all the way down to the educational opportunities and when looking for a position as an educator the open positions. But that's all find useful in newsletters in general. BUT when I was a CEC I read those newsletters like they were a sacred text! I didn't find them accessible, but I would comb them diligently to make sure I wasn't missing the latest and "greatest" change.
Could be more representative of the educational method and support our students in their learning/growth. It appears to be driven by announcements and perspectives of very few persons vetted by board and national office.
I like the idea of the weekly online newsletter. But the weekly newsletter his not used by ACPE leadership to help us understand decisions that are being made.
I've noticed frequent substantial changes even revisions of standards and manual that occur with no discussion and/or minimal communication and then educators are expected to be responsible for the changes. The organization had this problem years ago and addressed this by having specific times when changes would be made. Seems we are back to earlier processes.
Newsletter information is necessary & useful. I have no suggestions for improvement.

I don't have much to comment on here. I scan it every week to see if there are updates. I am not sure I need to receive a newsletter on a weekly basis since several items do not change from week to week.

It's ok

I have appreciated the ACPE Newsletter to know what is going on nationally, but it feels far away and "out there." It seems that the same voices are constantly being heard from and I don't know of a single time I've heard from a colleague in my former region. Not sure the process to have something included in the newsletter and unsure of the criteria for something to get published. Again, our regional newsletter focused on issues nearer to the ground and was more relevant.

We live in a digital age. I have no problems with the change from a printed newsletter to a digital newsletter.

No comment

i feel disconnected, disenfranchised, less trusting.

The newsletter introduces me to people I do not know, and also is a helpful reminder of committees at work. This is a positive. However, I have no idea what is happening at other centers in my own state, or across the state line, when I use to have regular connections with them.

For the most part I like the newsletter. I wish people would read it.

I don't read it often

It is akin to the weekly business update I receive from the healthcare system where I work.

I like the weekly news. Feel much better informed about the wider association.

I wish it would be emailed to me. I don't get on the SharePoint very often.

I think some of the important points raised in a particular newsletter should also be emailed separately because separate emails are often easier to read than entire emails, and the subjects searchable.

I find it informative. I like that I can start each work week with an opportunity to keep ACPE in the forefront of my professional agenda.

In general, I like the information that is shared weekly. My institution blocks any SharePoint other than their own on the same platform. If I could open the newsletter sections via something like a word doc and not have to log out of my institution's platform and log into a different platform, that would help. I wonder if, at least periodically, we might be able to have a section devoted to "best practices" or "Creative ideas" or "tips" for CECs and CEs?

Weekly news conveys important information I need to effectively run my program

My overall disappointment with ACPE since centralization effects how I read the newsletter. I peruse it, but rarely read it.

Feel like it a further instrument in distancing us from ACPE Staff.

The communications [are] lacking. No one in our center has time to comb through a newsletter every morning. There are no clear communications that are easy to access. I apologize, I just don't think you're serving us well.

No comment.

I don't generally like it, but I don't know why. Thanks for asking, I'll have to think about it. I never saw an earlier newsletter to compare it to, that I recall. I think your phrase "conveyed ethos" strikes a chord: the ethos is a communique from headquarters giving us our marching orders while trying to encourage us to keep our chins up and have a good attitude. It sometimes does encourage me and inspire me, but just as often it is communicating a new burden.

In responding to question 12 and this one, with the direction that ACPE is choosing to move forward in, my healthiest approach in terms of well-being is to keep my distance. What I trained to do in CPE

<p>supervisory relationships bears little resemblance to what is being espoused and driven through agenda at the present time.</p>
<p>Some articles are too long. Some things are only posted once and if I miss a week, I can miss something important. It cannot be our only way of communicating.</p>
<p>I'm not aware the change.</p>
<p>It would be much easier if it didn't send you to SharePoint. A newsletter with all the information in the link would be easier to manage when at the hospital.</p>
<p>I feel as if information is not shared but it is more of directives.</p>
<p>It's easier to keep up to date with changes and expectations for accreditation.</p>
<p>In some ways, I feel like it has become a propaganda tool for ACPE rather than an exchange of information and important concerns.</p>
<p>The newsletter seems to only share the "party line"--I occasionally experience being "admonished" by the contributors to "get in line" with whatever the new thing is. I am disgusted that they specially called out a particular CoP in one article--so inappropriate, whether I agree with the work of that CoP or not. It seems like the only ACPE Educators who write "articles" for it are those who 100% agree with everything the national organization is doing. I am also in complete shock and disgust that they "announced" with no warning or discussion that their office (and when I say "their" I mean the national office staff because it clearly is not "our" office anymore) was going virtual. The members had no say in this?</p>
<p>The Newsletter is just noise in an already overcrowded inbox</p>
<p>Perhaps a bi-weekly or monthly format would be more efficient and substantive.</p>
<p>I find it necessary but not necessarily helpful as it has to cover so many topics.</p>
<p>I look to it for the latest updates in Standards, announcement of Resource Rooms and other professional development opportunities, and Milestones.</p>
<p>Love it! Quite helpful and informative. It would be helpful for each ACPE committee and the board to include a monthly or weekly segment of what's new to keep us aware of what they are working on.</p>
<p>Weekly publication is an improvement. Information from Accreditation seems timely and substantive.</p>
<p>It is so easy to miss something important! Case in point, the new ACPE address buried deep in the last newsletter, and yet it is vital for all CPE Center materials to have the correct address.</p>
<p>No response</p>
<p>I appreciate being informed of what is taking place; I feel often i am getting the propaganda of the national agendas and little "engagement" or dialogue. So, I do not experience the newsletter as a way for our membership to be in conversation with diverse voices. I am not speaking of demographics of identity either. Trust the membership to hear thoughts, reflections and opinions that aren't selling the company line. We have no format for that anymore.</p>
<p>I like it.</p>
<p>I appreciate the weekly updates and hearing different members' voices</p>
<p>Created awareness for all issues and easier to navigate</p>
<p>I think it's well-written and helpful, but only select voices are allowed to be represented in the newsletter and it's very one-sided. Often, the information provided about leadership actions is vague, defensive, self-protective, and critical of any questions or dissent.</p>
<p>It has "rosified" news, focusing only on PR, with no opportunity to openly dialogue about anything. We need a forum for that.</p>

I'm now fully retired, so it's not a big issue, but hard to know what other programs, centers are doing (best practices, etc.).

When I have time to read it, I find some of it useful. With the specific example of the announcement of the virtual office shared above, the memo/newsletter sometimes seems like a place where decisions from on high are announced.

In its current format it leads with the head but leaves out the heart. As a thinking and feeling people, the front page of the newsletter must reach all people to be effective. It would be helpful to have information about what the various CoPs are doing, innovatively and relationally. With an area as large as ACPE, maybe having news from CoPs each week would help.

It is fine. I would like to see more educator resources and stories

I read the newsletter every week. I love hearing from Trace, other leaders, and my colleagues. It feels like a small connection - a bridge - from my lonely little island (my solo educator CPE program) to my community.

Related to question 12 -- both positive and negative. Newsletter is helpful.

I appreciate getting Newsletter, find myself less interested in PR

I do miss the regional meetings and the communication through the regional director and various committee and commission representatives during the regional meetings. In those settings I am forced to listen. If I miss something, someone else is there to inform me. I may miss some important communication through the newsletter because there are so much information in the mailbox that I need to read.

I often don't read it.

Poorly. We need more communication from ACPE head office and via email for important changes that affect us, not just passed out through a newsletter. Multiple and numerous different ways of communicating the information will be better.

17. Certification committee/commission members: How many years (if any) have you served on the ACPE Certification Commission or regional certification committee in the old and/or new certification process, or both. Designate years and identify what is improved or works better. Identify what you see was lost and/or gained in the certification process changes. Explain as fully as you like. Skip if not relevant. 52 responses

Positive	4	
Negative	10	
Neutral	27	
Mixed	10	
Mixed +	0	(Mixed answers leaning Positive)
Mixed -	1	(Mixed answers leaning Negative)

Major loss is in-person due to covid and no meetings. Best [aspect] has been less "old boys" systems and more collegiality.
N/A
8 years. The current process is very relational and student centered. It takes away the shame of failing a committee in the former process where committee appearances had little to do with supervisory competence
None
N/a
5 years--Committees in old process [helped] clearing out the dregs. New process is not as engaging but is far healthier for the CEC's.
While I am not presently working with a CEC, I was for the first few years of the new system. I found it in some ways vague and confusing. More problematic for me was the extremely large number of competencies that were required. It seems overwhelming as a task to demonstrate and not necessarily the best way to assess one's mettle as an educator.
I served on the regional committees for probably 20 years - between 1993 and 2015. Periodically I was asked to serve on national committees,
None.
I have served both regional and national certification. The new process is less abusive and less subjective. Old committees were essentially a challenge of who you knew in ACPE and if you could be non-anxious while you were verbally abused by your elders. I see nothing lost. Trying to get a candidate a fair hearing in committees was a constant battle. It is better having clear competencies on which students need to demonstrate their work.
15
9
Not enough meeting with the other CEs when appearing; and the go signal to appear depends on the mentor. A big work for the mentor.
About 50 years - originally in the C & A committee, then regional committee in five regions and chair for regional committee and member of the national commission. The new process is less focused on interpersonal and more academic in approach. Eliminating regions eliminated a significant socialization

opportunity and certification committees were closer to the kind of open, interactive process that makes up CPE.

ACPE Certification Commission - 7 years. 8 years regional (committee member and chair)

In the PREVIOUS Certification process it was supportive of Regional nurturing of Candidates and their supervisors. Under the current process unless you are supervising a CEC the local CE's are not kept abreast of what is happening in the whole certification process.

Dynamically it seems certification is now done as an activity of ACPE - ATLANTA. The CURRENT certification process is a transaction between ACPE - ATLANTA and the local individual and center. A process that was intended to be more streamlined and "shorter" is now multi layered, complex, and drawn out.

I served on regional /national C Coms for 15 years and was regional chair for 5 years.

4 yrs. The process is more predictable, professional, anti-bias/subjective, developmental, collaborative.

13 yrs.- I want to stay involved so that I can feel more informed about these matters and to keep my center in compliance with the latest processes and procedures. I do not often feel like I would have the necessary wherewithal for these matters without this added involvement.

I have no idea about the new process, and don't see any more people getting certified more quickly.

4 years on Certification in the SW Region, then used at every meeting as an Adjunct member for 6 more years. 10 years on Certification in Mid-Atlantic, including 7 years as the Co-Chair. I am in my 4th year as an elected Certification Commissioner with one more year to go (5 years in the new system by 2023). I have been in ACPE since it changed from the Acting/CPE Supervisor model that overlapped in the 80s with my process of Associate/CPE Supervisor and have seen at least two other changes of the process in the years between.

Not sure if this is being asked of past as well as present committee/commission members. As a past member on the regional level it has changed dramatically. Regional certification work, in my view, increased members involvement with and advocacy for candidates. (I served on committees in two different regions from the mid 90s through the demise of the regions.) Further the sense of community among committee members was significant.

I served on the East Central regional committee and the Commission for a total of about 11 years. I then served on the North Central regional committee and the Commission for about 3 years. All of those years were during the old certification process. The biggest gift of the new process as I see it is the Theory Integration Mentor; I believe it helps students to have someone to consult with about paperwork other than just their CE. And that person is then in the student's corner when their papers are approved. Much smoother! I am less impressed with the remainder of the new process. It appears to be taking students EVEN longer than the old process did - which isn't a good thing. The grids demand a lot from students - time and energy. Passing committee is sort of anti-climactic, since the student knows going into the interview that they will pass. Certainly, some of the anxiety and frustration has been eliminated; I'm not yet sure if that is good or bad. People who have successfully gone through the new process may have very different opinions; I'd love to hear them.

Approximately 15 years on regional certification and National Faculty. I occasionally was invited to serve on national committees but never elected to serve on ACPE Certification Commission. I'm currently considered National Faculty in the new system.

Both systems are definitely flawed. In the old system, too much responsibility given to the Commission to determine competencies without adequate relationship to evaluate in context. The new system has a better process but Phase 1 & Phase II grids are problematic; they are heavily determined by written abilities and we have lost some of the integrative strengths of the old process. I fear we will turn out more "surgeon like/task oriented" CE's than ones with good relational process skills.

I think I was on regional certification for ten years and National for nine. My sense is that each committee acts as a commission would have. Much more random.

I served as regional chair for two terms, and in national commission in the 1980-1990s. I appreciated the presence of diverse backgrounds and personalities and the way we respected each other. I appreciated the ability to both confront and support candidates. I believe we did good work. I believe the value was largely because of personal investment and vulnerability of commission members to the process. As we came to rely more on external tests and written academic materials, we began to lose this. The genius of the certification process was the openness of both the commission members and the candidates. I think this has been lost, to our detriment of the certification process and the quality of those we certify.

Mid Atlantic Certification Committee in late nineties. Preferred Accreditation and served in two regions.

I served in certification for 9 years in the north central region. During the structural changes and afterwards, I have not once been consulted or invited to participate in the new certification process. I'm currently working with a CEC and am baffled by the skill, task, demonstrating competence through writing emphasized throughout. Where is the interpersonal, experience/reflection, authenticity emphasizes so essential to adult transformational learning. It is so painful to work within a national model of certification that is so disconnected from the work I'm doing and the learning I'm trying to facilitate with our CEC.

6 years: meeting committee used to require integration that I am not currently seeing in the new process. Taking even more time for CE certification. Difficult for centers to commit more time up front before candidates are able to work with students. Cost prohibitive for centers.

I served 3 years on the Regional Certification Committee

NA

N/A

I have no clue about the new certification process.

Five years in the early 2000s. Too much to type here. . . but big ones include that the process is now more fastidious/onerous than engaging. The educational theory behind the changes seems to favor transactional learning rather than transformational learning.

N/a

I am not sure. Presently I am the Certification Chair and in this go round I have been on certification for over five years. I have served in the former process and the current process, nationally and regionally. I like the fact that everyone gets to know people across the organization not just a select few. I like that having to start all over from scratch when someone is not granted has gone away. In the current process, there are opportunities to review material before getting to an assessment point. I like that some of the pettiness around not liking a CECs educator has seemed to dissipate. The CEC is looked at for his/her own work. I could go on. I think there are some kinks that need to be worked out in the current process but that's what happens when a group is doing something new.

I was on our regional certification committee for 7 years between 2008-2015. I think the new process does a better job of accompany a student through the process but the competency structure seems arduous and has done the opposite of its intent which was to speed up the process.

N/A

NA

I am on the commission but inactive

NA

NA

I have served on certification committees in old process, as well as on accreditation reviews under the old system. I also served on the only regional strategic planning committee that functioned in ACPE, and found the work we undertook to be very gratifying. My main critique is that I have witnessed persons of diverse backgrounds navigating the certification process through diverse contexts and pathways. Now that

<p>outcomes and competencies have been expressed in terms of agenda, supervisory relationships are being lost in the midst of fulfilling the outcomes that are the same for all, with a centralized and agenda-driven certification process. I have not dealt with the portfolio process now in place for accreditation, but have witnessed much anxiety being experienced by present "educators" (another agenda driven change) about any ways their portfolios may differ from "expectations" read only as compliance. Any deviation is treated with suspicion, not openness to creativity, in terms of how these portfolios will be treated.</p>
<p>9 years. Now I am not involved. There is no entry point for those of us who do not have CEC at our centers. Seems very insular. It was important to have SOS and other opportunities to meet folks who do not know the CEC so well. Just like chaplaincy and running groups, most everyone is a stranger. How are the new folks learning to navigate what is difficult? To navigate with strangers and their differences.</p>
<p>3 years</p>
<p>Last 7 or 8 years. Newly minted CEs come out of the process much stronger in theory than they used to. Access to virtual peer groups supports minority students and students in geographically isolated centers. More CEs are involved in a typical student's process, building in a stronger relational matrix amongst educators in the organizations. The competencies set the bar higher than the previous certification process did, more adequately preparing students for the actual work (particularly in the realm of organizational competencies). The new process has more safeguards against forcing a student's theories to be expressed in Christian language. Those are all pluses. Minuses: scheduling of the nodal interviews is sometimes really difficult with students having to wait a long time to meet an interview team, educators' resistance to using the competencies forms means many students do not get the feedback on their work they deserve. Still problems from previous to current process: students are still vulnerable to educators who do not respond quickly (especially in Theory Mentorship), students are still vulnerable to educators who do not keep up to date with the certification process, assessment of students is still uneven.</p>
<p>N/A</p>
<p>None</p>
<p>3</p>
<p>Twenty years in the old process. What was gained is a focus on concrete outcomes. What was lost was dynamic demonstration of competencies with a group of peer educators with authorization to practice at stake, and efficiency with way too many outcomes.</p>
<p>N/A I have not served yet on Certification. I hope to one day.</p>
<p>Six years in the old system</p>
<p>Served over 20 years both regionally and nationally. Gained - a more flexible schedule and individual mentors and theory writer support, and overall, a more supportive relational process. Lost - the number and variety of people who served regionally and nationally to support the process - very few opportunities to serve.</p>
<p>10 plus years in Regional Certification Committees. Lost: Broader connection with the Candidates as they go through Certification. Gain: CoP's for Certification have become strong...including the San Francisco group, the Sacramento group, &amp; the Cascadia group.</p>

18. Supervisory CPE educators: About how many years (if any) have you been involved in supervising CECs (certified educator candidates) as primary educator or in a training group? Assess the differences between the old and the new processes, as you see them, as fully as you like. Skip if not relevant. 71 responses

Positive	13	
Negative	19	
Neutral	29	
Mixed	8	
Mixed +	1	(Mixed answers leaning Positive)
Mixed -	1	(Mixed answers leaning Negative)

Supervised CECs in old systems-chose not to get over involved in new system
7 years - I've mostly been involved in theory integration reviews and I think the process is fostering greater support for cultural, ethnic, racial and religious diversity. I am not aware of any downsides at this point.
Six years. I don't mind the "new" process, but it does mean ALOT more time from both the training educator and the CEC. I have a hard time finding enough time to do it well. I worry we will run out of educators.
4 yrs., see answer above. I much prefer the current process
N/a
8 years
4 yrs.- Easier in new process
Same answer as above. Over my career, I worked with about a half dozen CECs (SEs and others). Quite simply in the old process, there was a broader range of people (mostly regional) who interacted with candidates as they moved through certification. They were observed in local consortia and in regional certification meetings as they matured in the process. They received feedback from a variety of people. That was lost and was important to allow candidates to live into their authority.
About 20 years. I find the new process helps my CECs move forward quicker. Having a number of persons help guide the CEC and my team is an improvement. The competency grid is a great help.
11 years, 2 SEs 2 CEC. The old process was essentially an interpersonal challenge. Could a SE show up while being grilled and often harassed by the committee. The rare good committee provided some helpful insights, but would leave out swaths of needed educational competence (almost no SE came through ready to participate in accreditation of a center; most passed if they could be good facilitating the committee). The new process involved a larger group of persons from around the country. It involves looking at what an educator actually has to do competently (rather than if one is able to be respectful and unflapped by abuse in a high-stakes committee), and assessing a CEC's abilities to meet those competency areas.
20 yrs.
2 years. Old process dive[d] in deeper in[to] the personhood of the CEC. New process just writes what evidence it was demonstrated. Lack of quality of Education in the new process.
10+.years. Old process was not perfect but it resulted in better quality of educators.

About 30 years. The local community nature of the old system typically involved SESs in longer term relationships integrating both practice reflection and theory development. This strengthened collegiality and interdependence.

5 years. The new process is more collegial and transparent which is a positive development. The downside is that it takes longer to complete. That is a major problem since we have more CEs retiring than new ones being certified. The shortage is already upon us and we need to put more focus and resource into solving that problem.

20 - 25 years involved in supervising as primary and in a training group.  
PLEASE RE-READ #17.

15 years

Not since the new process began.

6 yrs. My CECs are now surrounded by specialists in supervisory training and have expanded resources for guidance and formation. The quality of the overall process and outcomes has increased.

The main benefit of the new process I see is that the CECs progression through the process is determined by the CECs own work and the assessment of the primary CE and the representatives from the National Certification. Previously, too much power was in the hands of certification committees and a CECs ability to successfully meet and 'perform' for that committee who did not have an ongoing relationship with the CEC and lacked first hand ability to assess the competence of the CEC. The old 'hot seat' committees were often emotionally triggering to CECs who had previously experiences of trauma related to bias, racism, homophobia, gender bias, etc. The new process had difficulties in the first few years with working out of the 'phases' but seems to be better now. An ongoing critique of the ACPE certification process, both old and new, is that it takes many people too long to get certified. We have a growing shortage of CEs and we don't seem to be able to design a certification process that most people can get through in a reasonable amount of time. Many talented people leave or don't enter in the first place. We may be causing our own decline as the primary spiritual care education organization as a result.

Was involved in the Dallas Training Group back in 2008/09 supervising a CEC and another time earlier. Supervised two SITs back in the late 1990s in Birmingham, and participated in the Borderline Group (TN, GA, AL) for them and others 3 or 4 years.

Participated in a Mid-Atlantic Regional program for CECs from about 2014 to now (by Zoom) that meets twice a year to hear theory presentations by Educators and to offer CECs a chance to present work before peers and Educators from VA, MD/DC, and NC. Convened that group for three years. Have read papers and consulted with SITs/CECs over the years.

Remember I have seen the process change 4 times. It is much better for the Training Educator and CEC to have access because of technology (Zoom, etc.) to Supervisory Peers groups without geographical boundaries limiting them. (Example: One Denver CEC and CE joining a peer group in Richmond, VA.) It was better after I was Certified to have SITs know who their theory reading team was - I never knew. It is a better process today to have Educators trained in how to be a Theory Mentor and for there to be a relationship between a CEC and their Theory Mentor until their papers are ready for an Integration Interview, instead of assuming that any Educator hired by a Center with CEC training accreditation would be adequate for that role. It is better to have a CEC coached toward competence by a team of a Training Educator, a Theory Mentor, a Peer Group (or two), a Certification Commissioner, and at different points, National Faculty members, and a Second Commissioner who has not been a part of the CECs process. Known relationships in this guided system are producing confident, capable Educators with less abusive behaviors by Educators who used to server on Committees in the last two process models. I have served on at least seven Phase 2 integration Interviews with another coming up in late September and I am proud of the Educators this system is producing. Not perfect, but good enough.

Only did so under the old process and with a limited number of students. Can't really comment on the new process except to say it doesn't appear to have greatly increased the successful navigation or time commitment of the certification process.

I have been a training supervisor for at least 25 years. My responses in #17 address much of this. I think the other GOOD thing about the new process is that it doesn't feel as "gamey."

You either have the evidence or you don't; it isn't as focused on how you meet committees or on rogue supervisors on committees who have a bone to pick with the candidate. (My own certification process was smooth and I didn't feel like I was picked on or misunderstood - FYI.)

18 years. See above and...There is more time devoted to reflecting on how to complete and complete the grids than reflecting on and understanding their learning needs/issues as a developing CEC. CPE training at all levels is getting more skill and external evidence-based and less personal/professional integration.

We have lost a good bit of accountability for personal/professional integration in the new process that I hope we move to correct.

I supervised SESs really only until they became CECs. Cannot comment.

I primarily supervised beginning students in CPE during my 40 years of practice, in the "old process", most of these persons preparing for parish ministry and ordination. I supervised no more than 10 persons in the supervisory track.

Since 2005, occasionally through full and part time employment. Concerned about how current candidates will learn the "art of supervision" as an educator. Less clear what is "basic" level knowledge and skills needed, how to integrate new ways of providing spiritual care, how to "market" the discipline.

The old process is too subjective in meeting the committee for social in my opinion, especially after all the work that entails getting to that point and being denied by five people you do not know. However, the new process is incredibly cumbersome and I find hard to understand, demand so much of the student and educator

I've been involved with supervisory training and CEC training on and off for about 20 years. I jumped ahead and answered this in the above question. This competency based process is slick and I have great suspicion that it will not serve us well by producing slick supervisors. Where is the grit? Where is the community of peers and educators that continuously call us to be real and authentic. I had one student preparing his portfolio, who presented his verbatim to a group of peers and educators and then changed the conversation with the patient and the analysis of the verbatim. This fake verbatim, he then used in his portfolio to present to his online committee of three people, two of whom had never met him, and was granted candidacy. I was only a consultant for him because at that time the student was not considered an official student yet. I had no voice in his materials or his committee. I left that health care system, but understand he ended up soaring through the process quickly, while his peer group continued to challenge his lack of emotional availability and lack of authenticity. The student I'm working with now is also not yet an official student with ACPE, so while she puts her material together for her portfolio, I'm not only learning a new process, but am struggling to figure out why certification things have changed in the direction they have. We certainly did not use experience/reflection learning to make these changes. This is a huge disconnect. After watching required videos on competency based learning, our new student commented "this does not seem like CPE to me."

4 years. Harder to capture the relational component of learning for CEC. The old process had the 2-page summaries which were in many ways, the culmination of the relational dynamic between CEC/SES and student. If there is a way to bring that ideology more into the present certification, I think the current process would be ideal. I like the current process. The CEC is required to engage many educators which is helpful. The CEC can potentially get through the process quickly - which is helpful.

10 years. Just starting experience with new process, so can't really speak to it. Trying to learn it.

15 yrs. The focus on competencies ignores the in-depth soul-making supervision requires.

I have not supervised anyone in the new process

About 20 years. I like the new process because the bar for clinical competence is much higher than in the old process. The competencies are quite interpersonal so those who say the soul of CPE is lost because we have competencies have not read the competencies. The loss is having the CEC meet with

a committee who doesn't know her/him/them to see how they are able to navigate describing their practice and relating with colleagues unknown to the CEC.
9 years. Meeting committees regularly was a checks and balances on people lingering on when they should be leaving the educational process. It also provided clarity and focus for the work that needs to be attended to.
0
I supervised CEC's for 2 years directly, and continue to work with CEC though my COP - ACOP
5 yrs. My evaluation is more complicated to explain than would fit this format.
I have not supervised a CEC, but was a CEC who started in the old process and switched to the new one. This was a painful, negative experience. There were many steps that needed fleshing out further before it went "live", and it took a great deal of time to receive clarity on things such as demonstrating completion of a competency; or if I would have to go back and do an Admissions competency set and interview since I completed Readiness, etc. The delays involved as I waited for clarity were more than aggravating, and I wish the new process had not been launched until these details had been worked out. There were also differing messages on timelines and processes for various stages of the process (i.e., how to assemble a committee for Phase I). As one CE likened it, it was as if the airplane was being built while we were flying in it.
I will say that in general in the new process -- has generally felt collaborative and supportive, such that one would not meet with a committee until the CE and CCR were in agreement that the candidate was ready. However, I cannot emphasize how difficult it was to be caught in between two certification processes.
5 years. The new process is a good idea poorly executed. CECs are asked to write about things they don't even know yet. The amount of materials needed to get entry is enormous with no guarantees of entry. Now there are more out of pocket expenses for coaching, etc. It makes it difficult to make administrators understand how the CEC uses time because they haven't been accepted into the program for quite a while. I feel this is done to eliminate those who fail BEFORE they enter the program so it doesn't look bad for ACPE.
N/A
Over 10 years. . . Old process was more student and process-focused and less prescriptive and directive in terms of what and how to learn the art of supervision.
20 years supervising CPE Educators plus. Currently as VP/ administrator, not supervising directly....
I have supervised CECs but it has been a while and it was in the former process. I answered this question in 17.
I have only supervised in the old process and unfamiliar with the new processes.
I have been a primary and peer trainer of CES/Cs for more than 10 years. The new process is a "learn as you go" process, with details unexplained to primary training Educators, which makes CES/Cs feel insecure - hindering durability in the supervisory relationship. More open conversation with and seeking out of training educator's voices in the planning process would have been helpful.
I think the new process does a better job of accompany a student through the process but the competency structure seems arduous and has done the opposite of its intent which was to speed up the process.
7 years. The new certification process is much better in my opinion. It is more relational and more objective. I really like it.
N/A
4 years--only in the new process though I came through the old process. I like the ability to progress at the student's pace, the support & consultation of three others in addition to

the TCE, and a more objective, competency based vs a subjective, personality based committee approach. While I like the competencies--there are too many, some redundancies, and many still presume a healthcare centric presumption. Also, and this is true across the organization--when tweaks and changes occur, they are often announced as needing to change immediately with no phase in time, or grandparenting of CEs already at that phase of education.

15+ years

5 years. No doubt it seems to require a lot more written work and is more akin to working with a doctoral committee.

NA

NA

See answer to 17. I have not supervised CEC's under the new process, just feel bad for those attempting to navigate it.

NA

About two years. The new process seems more cumbersome. It is more structured, which I appreciate, but there are still many gray areas where I am unclear. And when I want clarification, I have to go to the national office (and copy Marc) to get an answer--there's no regional head to help me navigate. That said, there were a TON of negative issues with certification at the regional level--I do NOT want to go back to that part of the old process. The good 'ol boy club was in full force (whether you want to admit it or not) and it did not serve us well for diversity, equity, and inclusion purposes (no matter what you may want to tell yourself). To summarize, I think the regional level for questions (e.g., an RD) and information/communication was better; I think the national process for certification is better; I think the steps and process are more cumbersome.

The new process was supposed to be easier. It is incredibly difficult and challenging and takes way too long.

15 yrs. So much is "uploaded" or locked in a portfolio that seems incredibly difficult to access. There seems to be far more emphasis on content and outcomes and less on integration.

28 yrs. As above. Being competency based is designed to make the assessment of students more closely fit the actual work of being an educator and to make the process more objective.

N/A

11 years. 2 in the new process requires greater advocacy and knowledge by the training educator. I like it but note the passive approach (the older model) by many peers means few candidates getting through. I also have a concern that candidates who are diverse in some ways are being accommodated and given passes while others are discouraged from even applying. Competence is the most important value for me.

6-7 yrs. More writing of the work, than praxis/demonstration of the work.

Giving the process more to the CEC for them to "lead" their process has also brought about an entitlement and expectation that when the student thinks they are ready --- everyone else involved must get on board or .... else.

Losing the live event of a pass/fail committee to finalize a process or a stage (or final stage) of a process has brought a loss of real life; real supervisory dynamics that needed to be managed and to demonstrate such competency in order to be certified. CEC who cannot get over the idea that colleagues would be "against" them, CEC who get lost in their own anxieties and thus transfer/project those anxieties outward on the group, or CEC that can't engage critique and feedback with collaboration and collegiality - are demonstrating they do these same behaviors with students. And if they "don't have" these type of dynamics in their group, further demonstrate an incompetency of group theory.

Overall - I have experienced "group theory" deteriorate significantly between supervising CECs, in CEC cohort groups and in sub-committees for certification.

2 years

About twenty years. The new process is overly complex with too many competencies requiring paperwork rather than confrontation and processing regarding them. It also requires too much time for primary educators in documentation and unnecessary presence.

N/A

I have been CEC educator over 30 years. I do not understand the meaning of some of the competencies and it seems extremely redundant. If there could be more clarity and fewer competencies, I would be happy.

I have been involved in training a CEC for about two years. I was not involved in supervising anyone in the old process, so I can't really assess the difference.

I like the old process because there is an ownership by the region, and there is great collaboration by the region. We not only worked on helping the CECs to know the theories, we helped the CECs to grow as a person. We developed them professionally. In the current process there are so many people involved from different parts of the country, it feels like the CEC can be pulled toward different directions.

20 plus. In some ways, the CoP's developed for reviewing the entering person's work and development have been strong and effective.

2 years

\

22. What do you think have been the benefits and limitations of the ACPE operating under executive leaders who are not certified clinical educators. Explain as fully and specifically as you like. 103 responses

Positive	21	
Negative	34	
Neutral	10	
Mixed	29	
Mixed +	2	(Mixed answers leaning Positive)
Mixed -	7	(Mixed answers leaning Negative)

Benefits = good management overall, good listening by Marc Medwed, doesn't take away from needed educators in field. Downside = sometimes significant educational questions are not considered.
ACPE Educators are not necessarily skilled/trained administrators. I'd rather a skilled administrator that knows the ins and outs of nonprofit and educational management than a CPE educator. If they are both, great.
I am trying not to be opinionated about this, but why don't we have someone there who understands ALL that we went through to become process oriented. Why did we hire someone who not only doesn't know this process intimately, but disparages supervisors? This work is sacred to me and I cannot stomach hearing those who speak ill of some of us (and we are a difficult bunch), lead the organization without an understanding of what we exist to do. Maybe those who are not certified can support those who are certified at the national office. Did we not trust each other enough to hire someone like us to lead us?
I think our executive leadership is excellent. They work hard to communicate well, and they are each good at what they do. However, I would question the selection of themes for annual conference, which I have not found helpful in the last 3 years.
I don't see this as a problem at all. This survey seems unsupportive and disrespects the current staff and the heartfelt and capable efforts they have made to bring the ACPE up to more current professional standards that will ensure that the ACPE survives into the future.
We have needed better leadership as we are more like a 3rd generation family business at this point. We have needed new expertise for a larger association.
I have the lingering feeling of being misunderstood in the complex nature of the clinical work educators do. Misunderstood and hence unsupported and isolated. The lack of a representative board compiled of regional representatives and having no clinician steering the boat in the office is problematic. Yes, we did need better admin skills in the executive office. This is true. But we also need someone who actually knows what it means to do the work we do. Having both is crucial. Yes, our database is better, and accreditation work is better. The website is better and it's great to have a professional email address for our use. It's about time. But I fear we lost our soul in the process. What are we without it?
The main benefit appears to be that they are singularly focused on running the business of ACPE. However, the case can be made that this is also a limitation (as noted above re the operational decision making regarding educational matters). Having non-CE leadership is evident in the tone of the office operation - stories and experience with non-responsiveness. Also, in the sense that volunteer leaders defer to the staff in clinical education matters, which should be engaged by CEs. With no CEs in the office, I wonder how fully serious issues, like the present shortage of CEs, has been addressed as an educational matter.
I see advantages that there is a lot of collaboration with non-chaplaincy organizations
Not sure.

They are helping ACPE move forward with professionalism. This is a huge benefit from my perspective. The limitation is the lack of a CE to give a perspective from the active educators. Until recently we had a certified educator and I would hope we would replace her in the near future. I also hope we avoid using "retired" CEs as the voice of Centers. We need to go forward and to augment our excellent organization.

Benefits: we are trained to be educators not administrators. 99.99% of CEs could not create a database or manage thousands of data points. We had the yellow card system for how many years? It was a mess; created by CEs for CEs. Financially, we had regions with thousands of dollars completely unaccounted for (some accounts weren't even known to the regional leadership). We were lucky that either no RDs stole from us or that we never realized it. Having actual non-profit administrators running the administrative functioning of the ACPE has been a major improvement. Most people don't remember that when Deryck was running ACPE the organization was in ruins. Rose-colored glasses remember things a certain way. ACPE today has an actual foundation that is paying for innovative programs to start. We have a system in which our students can instantly get a transcript. I can manage my enrollments and registrations without mailing a yellow card in and can reasonably assume that I will be billed correctly (by one organization rather than trying to pay regional and national fees, which my hospital hated). I see few limitations to having no CE in the national office. CEs should be running CPE.

More innovation and clarity of educational outcomes. However, there seem to be less sensitivity to process education. COVID did not help.

They have the administrative skill set many CEs do not have. They add a different and important perspective which reflects the value of an interdisciplinary team.

Decreased understanding and valuing and sensitivity of our community.

Centralized organization could be good but there is no substitute for having a real person to work with CEs in their struggles and success. Our work is about caring to people but centralizing with limited resources and people made the CE and center suffer from disconnection. It is like a corporation and purely business. Human need for connection is compartmentalized thus lost the heart of what CPE is about. Centers and CE who provide education are important in the ACPE, we are the center of it all.

They don't have an inside look at the practice

Cannot identify any benefits. The limitations are I no longer feel heard or appreciated for the work I do.

As an Educator needs to be present to and attentive to his/her group and their practice, the ACPE administration needs to be present to and attentive to Centers and Educators - it is called parallel process. When an Educator gets over involved in institutional advancement or civic service, etc., students and programs suffer. When administration gets over involved with building, enhancing, digitalizing, competing with other vendors, or seeking some kind of glory, Centers and Educators suffer. That is happening. Perhaps an Educator in the national office could refocus on CPE practice and cutting back a bit on business/organization building.

I see it positively. ACPE educators are trained and certified to supervise CPE not run a non-profit organization. It is important to have a capable non-profit leader in the role of executive director.

Not much sensus fidelium

Several of the ACPE leaders come purely from a "business" model. Several are from a purely educational model that is not process oriented. Some are not from an adult education model and are from a deductive approach as opposed to an inductive approach to teaching/learning. If the leadership is not understanding of the uniqueness of the CPE model of teaching and learning and does not have the input of a person who is a seasoned CE, the leadership may propose a "business" model of leadership that prevents and inhibits the inductive approach of teaching and learning to be fostered and to flourish in the CPE centers of ACPE.

Easy answer - why fool with what was working fine.

Benefits: none that I can see, other than expanding the head office work force that you can rarely have a personal phone conversation, preferring to communicate with by electronic sources that is self-

referencing to the website and processes that have been set up to meet a web based impersonal style.

To the question: The whole centralization and not having an administration that understands what's it's like to be "in the field" has brought about policies and processes that are laborious, repetitive and useless, i.e., the portfolio. In my previous positions establishing centers by the old pre-centralized processes (three) and being reaccredited (two) were assessed as superior and without problems. It took work and consistent focus over the six year period to keep up with the Standards. With this new Portfolio system, I'm always anxious if there isn't some minutia that wasn't filled out or doesn't meet the expectation of some "reviewer." At present our center has been waiting for an annual review for the past three months and the assigned reviewer is over her head in similar issues in her center. We have a 3 year review that is due this year and I am waiting on the annual review to assess the issues that may need consideration and action in that annual review. It's a mess as far as I'm concerned.

Secondly and more importantly, there is no personal connection when a program is struggling with issues brought about by a non-functional certification and accreditation system. For example, I sit on a PAG of a local institution whose CE retired six months ago. They engaged a contract supervisor for the past six months, but she apparently did not want to continue. They have been unable to recruit a new CE. In recent meetings of the PAG, the medical system administration announced a decision to put the program "on hold" and if a CE was not recruited in the next year, to let the program "sunset"—a euphemism for "die". The budgeted funds that supported the residency are being reallocated to hiring to new staff.—another sign of death for the program. Everything tells me that this program is on Institutional hospice. What is tragic about these developments is that this program is the second oldest continuously running program (if not the oldest) in the west, and my fear is that, because the new processes that are so distanced and impersonal, is not really sped up the process of certification this "old soul" of the west will die a death that is unrecognized and uncared for by the administration in Georgia.

They do bring a business world view that many CE's may not as in tune especially if the CE's are in a small shop.

They are professional administrators, not educators trying to expand their skills, often out of their own home office. They have helped us professionalize in ways unlikely with less qualified and disparate team of part-time, less trained regional leaders. Our executive director has an advanced degree in education and captures the work of CPE better than some educators, in my opinion. Our legal/risk/compliance work and financials have advanced.

There is always a certain level of translation that needs to occur (or that does not occur). That is why an Educator should be represented. This often happened at Accreditation Commission meetings when ACPE leadership proposed something only to discover that this would have otherwise unknown implications for the individual CPE Educator and or CPE center.

They lack the experience and knowledge that certified clinical educators have.

I tend to think it is more important to have executive leaders who have proven not for profit organizational leadership skills than to have professional practitioners as executive leaders. That said, it is important to have practitioners as consultants, advisors and leaders of the parts of the organization that deal with professional competence and development. The executive leadership should look to the practitioners to guide the mission and identity of the organization. It seems to me this is the way other professional organizations function.

I think it's probably a good idea to have some leaders who have experiences in business, fundraising, etc. However, I think there should also be one or more certified educators as part of leadership so that our interests are understood and promoted.

I think our executive leaders have deep familiarity with CPE, which is a great asset. Since their work is not primary CPE, but organization leadership, I don't think it is essential that leaders be CPE Educators. (It does help that ACPE Educators are represented on the Board). At the same time, someone who is an ACPE Certified Educator would bring specific insight to respond to the challenges of leading the organization. It would be a plus for leaders to be ACPE Educators, but not essential.

I think we have very talented executive leaders in the national office, and they have done a good job helping to professionalize some parts of the organization. I value their leadership, insight, business practices, and help in coordinating commissions and the organizational structure of the organization. I believe it would be incredibly helpful to have one or more CE positions on the national office staff, and have them directly report to the board. I would love to be able to call a CE in the national office if I needed wisdom, direction, and/or guidance about our CPE program. It would be great if they could visit center's again, like the original plan was designed. I would also love for a CE on staff to help with national office changes, decisions, and day-to-day operations. I consult informally in my COP, but I also think having a CE in the national office structure would help CE's who feel alone, isolated, and/or abandoned by the organization. I have heard multiple CE's express similar hopes for a CE to be on the national office staff. I appreciate every CE who volunteers their time on the board and other commissions, and I look forward to hearing more about the LaPiana process. I want our organization to grow, be relevant, provide community and relational support to one another, and to have connection which goes beyond virtual meetings and online newsletters. We need to create a bridge between our past and our future, and to attend to the needs of our community.

It's been 8 years for Marc and about 9 years for Trace and some people will never forgive them for not being Educators themselves. This is an axe to grind that some folks will take to the grave. I have found Marc Medwed to be a valuable resource in his service to our Certification process in a number of ways, including helping us write/word our changes to outcomes for clarity and consistency and helping us stay on track in meetings, and accessing past documents that guide us in continuing to attempt process improvements. And he was accessible when I was going through my last Accreditation process (6-year in 2020/21). I work less directly with Trace but have felt comfortable with him as a person of integrity when we have talked.

I believe that both of these guys have at times been "whipping boys" for Educators that do not like decisions enacted by the ACPE Board of Directors which is Educator-dominated. Change comes through The Board. There have been times when Trace's influence on the Board has been questioned, like whatever the hell happened with the Ivy and Menking positions, but as far as I know everything requires a vote of serving Board Members and I think the "buck should stop" with the Board members.

Whether it adds anything to have an Educator in the Executive Office would depend greatly on who it would be, with no guaranteed benefits or outcomes. I probably knew Teresa Snorton best in that role and thought her leadership was pivotal/great. Have heard horror stories about others serving in that role. Though I had affection and loyalty to at least three different Regional Directors through the years, I am glad that power center is gone. It served a purpose in its day, but today's leadership is much more diverse than in the past and I am hopeful about the future.

On the positive side of the ledger perhaps provides a more objective professional perspective that protects from some idealization of ourselves. On the negative side I suspect it has been more difficult for such leaders to fully understand the strengths and weaknesses of certified educators or those who are engaging in the certification process and the struggles of both.

I think they bring gifts that we might not have otherwise; and, I'm not sure they understand the heart and soul of our work.

It's important to have ACPE educators inform the national office. However, being an ACPE certified educator does not automatically mean that one is a good administrator. I appreciate Trace's leadership

I imagine there are necessary skills needed in ACPE executive leaders that most Educators have limited training and experience. The same can be said on the other side; CEs bring an important perspective that has been lost or limited when not at the table where decisions are made. I also don't have enough knowledge to be specific.

There is a separation. It's basically men making decisions about women's health.

There is WAY too much for accreditation. This is overkill. In terms of the competencies, we're moving away from the core of CPE--self-awareness, emotional literacy--and adding in more than can be accomplished. The focus is turning to didactics verses group and verbatim seminars. These changes are turn-offs.

It seems to me, as a retired, mobility limited person, that the local connection has totally been lost. The national office used to serve the local centers, and thereby, the regions. Now the importance of the local centers, supervisors and regions have been obliterated and/or totally silenced, and thereby the unique genius of the CPE movement completely lost, unless some isolated individuals manage to experience and maintain it on their own,

Skill [is] needed in understanding role, life, current environment in which care, research and education are provided. The world of CPE is so unique that even though one might have some skills, it is the integrated skills and relational qualities that are needed. It is the difference between a job, work, ministry, service, vocation. In the world of spiritual care, education and research, having someone who has practiced in that world providing particular leadership and knowing what and how to utilize additional consultation is crucial to being creatively proactive rather than reactive.

By the way, my NA were because i was not responsible for those areas when working parttime in the last three years.

I don't think someone who has not gone through our process can understand what we do. Surely, we can find somebody who is a leader who is also a certified educator. I also dislike the term certified educator, I prefer the old term clinical pastoral education supervisor better. Certified educator does not say anything about the specifics of a discipline.

Having executive leaders who are well versed in organizational leadership with awareness of norms, standards, expectations, and requirements of Governmental oversight and professional organizations has made our organization stronger, more efficient, and less of a "good buddy" system. Keeping good boundaries about what is the work of the staff and what is the work of Certified Educators and the membership of the organization has also been a strength, although there are times that there are too many tasks put on one staff member's plate that I believe could be spread out better if there were more staff members to do the work. For example, I have been astonished by how many times the answer to my question of "Which staff member should I contact about \_\_\_\_\_?" results in the answer "Sheilah Hawk". Good Lord, how many tasks can we give her?!? Also, much of the work done on regional levels that were shepherded or entirely completed by paid regional directors has now become volunteer work by the membership body at large without any compensation. I'm not sure the organization was fully aware how many volunteer hours would be required to maintain certification, accreditation, CEC facilitation (both as primary Educators and Theory Mentors) with both the new certification and new accreditation processes. This is one area where I would believe it could make sense to have Educators serving in paid staff positions at the national level (perhaps the chair and chair elect of each of the commissions) working in conjunction with staff. At the very least the advocacy committee could put more energy and effort in communicating to local Health System Leadership about the national association expectations of CE involvement, time, and energy in maintaining accreditation and facilitating certification both for their own local shop and in assistance of other's so that staffing models can be readjusted. An insular shop of one educator just doing Level I/II groups isn't practical anymore and those small local shops are going to struggle with recruiting CECs, getting CECs through the process, maintaining Accreditation portfolios, and keeping abreast of best practices. Accreditation and Certification work dang near requires a half time position per shop to fully engage all that the new processes require. I don't think that's necessarily a bad thing, just that our systems don't know that yet (and probably won't see the value in allotting time in the "work week" for it unless we build the case for it).

It is 100% limitation. I do not experience any benefit to this. Consulting with those who are not clinical educators is advantageous, but allowing them to make decisions without consultation with us is unacceptable.

Not sure

I hope the business end of the organization is stronger, though I'm not sure. I frequently hear answers to my questions that seem idealistic but a little out of touch with the reality of being an educator in a center without support from an administrative assistant.

As an institution, ACPE is becoming fossilized. But the old ACPE is long dead now; the new ACPE is here.

I to think that leadership of an organization such as ACPE is complex. I think very few if any ACPE Educators have this training and skillset. Therefore, I see value in it. That said, the almost complete absence of ACPE Educators in the national office is a significant loss. It is very important to have that perspective at the day to day table -- not just on the Board.

I think Trace and Marc are doing an excellent job of administration. They seem unable to receive feedback that it would be very helpful to have an ACPE CE as part of the executive leadership. Having a leader who understands the culture of ACPE and can support CEs and help develop centers with an understanding of what the process entails "on the ground" is essential to the emotional, mental, and spiritual health of the movement. Having lost Regional Directors, having lost Area Directors, we at least need one CE in a key leadership position.

My understanding is that the board (of Educators) still makes the decisions for our organization and so having leadership who are administrative experts to operate the organization makes sense to me. We need solid administrative professionals to organize us so that the Educators can do the core work of ACPE. While they may not understand the pressures we are under as Educators and Leaders of Spiritual Care and Education I don't really need that from leadership I just need folks who will manage our resources ethically, and aid us in navigating the legalities of being a business which is ultimately what we've become. The Educators, Psychotherapists, Spiritual Care Professionals, and Students are the clinical ministry movement not ACPE.

Clearly a limitation. Out of touch with what is happening in the field and not committed to the clinical method and the growth of established programs. It has clearly developed a business model which does not seem to draw on the reason for CPE as a movement which refines processes for theoretical development, integration and effective local practices to support the growth of the ACPE.

There is a detachment on the part of the leaders. There is also a lack of understanding. This is one of my chief complaints about the present leadership. It makes no sense to me.

Sorry but no other space to say this if #11 &12 above had a both negative and positive, I would have selected it.

This question 22 would better be served in a dialogue, which current structure inhibits, imo.

C.f. my answer to # 7. I think all those negative results & their increasing presence in our lives have been the direct consequence of the ACPE now being run by "executives" & "administrators" instead of educators. My guess is that the necessity & testimony of this question/entire survey testifies to the limitations of our current system.

It's important to have a CE as part of the executive team. I do not believe the ED of the ACPE needs to be a CE, however, it is bizarre to not have someone who understands and engages in the work firsthand represented.

It's crazy

The only person I've had contact with at the national office has been Marc Medwed around accreditation issues since I serve on accreditation. While he is always professional, there seems to be a disconnect between what a Certified Educator does and accreditation -- it feels like there is a lot more work to maintain accreditation year to year and the "deep dives" in a center's portfolio have felt like an added layer of work. I also struggle with the new certification process which feels like we are passing through people who are good at checking off boxes in an excel spreadsheet, but aren't as relational and don't have the deep interpersonal skills. For example, in our regional CEC meetings I have noticed many CEC's no longer show up. They have figured out they just need to produce evidence than present to a peer group and get feedback. One person who was recently certified just landed a new job and almost immediately had difficulty with her boss -- I could see this coming, but it was never addressed in her certification process since it was more about checking boxes than working on some interpersonal skills to manage conflict and to learn how to manage up. While I was certified in the old process and it was hard, I learned a lot about myself and it set me up for success when I landed my first job after being certified. I knew what my "buttons" were, how I was triggered, and have been able to manage the changes within my organization quite well (alongside a great therapist!). I'm not sure people in the new process get this depth of feedback -- or at least not the people I have seen recently certified in the new process.

I think there are benefits because executive leaders have training and credentialing in leading large, complex nonprofit organizations with multiple layers of leadership.

I fully support the work of Trace Haythorn to lead ACPE into a new era. I like what he has done to make connections with Chaplaincy Innovation Lab. He has responded in a timely and thoughtful way to every text and email I have sent him. He seems to have the confidence of the national staff. Personally, I think the national staff should get back to an office-based, in-person work environment. That is what is expected of me where I work.

I have a problem with Marc Medwed. He has a lot of opinions about how things should be done. I don't think he has a clue what clinical pastoral education is all about. He has managed to insert himself in just about every process from accreditation to certification. I do not experience him as someone who listens to membership.

I think the limitations of the executive/corporate model of governance are the bureaucratic implementation of new policies and procedures that promise efficiency and transparency and accountability that substitute functions for relationships. I think the role of the Board, as far as I can tell, has become diminished in setting the direction of ACPE. I do not understand the role of the President and the Board and how they provide leadership in comparison to the executive leaders. Who answers to whom? Is it a collaborative or consultative or consensual relationship. Where is the power in our organization and does that power serve the best interests of the organization as a whole as well as the members?

One way to think about ACPE is to see it as totally like, somewhat like and totally unlike other non-profits. Have we lost the "totally unlike" aspect of our movement while focusing on the "totally like" and "somewhat like" aspects of ACPE in comparison with our competitors in the marketplace?

Benefits are real and added above. However, the top-down communication makes me feel, at times, as though my perspective is not important, my opinion not valued.

Regarding #19- one of the problems with the old process was centers got emotionally involved with and attached to their CECs, and sometimes missed seeing their limitations. The new process was supposed to help with that. Instead, the burden even more so falls on the center's educator to fully see their student. Committees only judge by their written work in the competencies. They are trusting the supervisory CE and are limited in what feedback they can give them and their student.

Regarding executive leaders, ACPE has moved to a business model, leaving behind the "heart" part of our work that is so important. When leaders are not CEs they do not understand the work we do, the limitations to a certification process that is based on writing rather than the ability to make connections, and the loss we feel in moving to a national model. They have not heard nor addressed the distress of the centers who feel alienated.

I know that this has been a source of discomfort, anger, etc. with many. I'm not sure that having an educator in the office makes for better relationships or oversight. There were educators in the national office and many weren't happy with that or who they were. It's really hard to say. I've been around ACPE a long time and I'm not sure we functioned better then.

While the executive leaders of ACPE do know a great deal about what CPE is about, and the role do the Certified Educators, they do not have the nuanced knowledge of what that role involves, related to what it takes to build a relationship, to flex to meet the needs of students in a variety of contexts and with a variety of histories. SME[?] in the administrative office make a difference in terms of having a voice who can advocate from a position of "knowing" rather than a position of managing.

We needed an CEO-type executive to deal with the complexity of the transition out of our old regional structure which was no longer viable given IRS regulations (I was on a regional board at the time of the transition). I also believe our previous ACPE supervisor-leaders lacked the necessary knowledge to

navigate the complexity of the modern national organization. While there has clearly been loss, I feel that the national office is functioning with integrity and with our best interests at heart.

I think having staff who are not CE's has many advantages. They are able to focus their full attention on the administrative work of ACPE and are not biased by their old way of doing things. The current staff clearly understands that they do not make the decisions — that the decisions are made by the Board and commissions. I feel we could use more non-CE staff to lighten some of the administrative burdens of the board members and commissioners. Our current staff work hard, are committed and are very responsive to questions and concerns.

Although leadership benefits from having an insider's perspective, the skills, competencies, and experiences required of executive leaders go beyond what a CE brings to the table. I have no problems with having a non-CE executive leader if they are effective. I would have a problem with a CE as an executive leader if they had limited experience outside of ACPE.

The benefit is more objectivity and an easier way to avoid the "we did it that way when I was..." There appears to be a bit less "favoritism" for "my peers, former students, buddies." I am appreciative of the work the senior leadership has done to listen and respond to "field educators." I do at times feel there is an emphasis on what is seen as efficient vs. realistic based on the needs of CEs in their institutions or what "some" CEs would like to have happen vs. how do the majority feel? An example was going from 45 day to 21 day evaluation writings. I can see the need to shorten the time--would 30 days not have worked? Most higher education institutions allow 30 days to turn in final grades, could that not have been our model? Especially since we value fairly involved written evaluations vs. assigning a grade.

We need executive leaders who bring different experience, education, and perspectives; and we need a certified educator(s) who understands the aspects of CPE that cannot be learned from observation. I wonder what it would be like to hire educators of different social locations and clinical settings, including urban/community, to serve as consultant from time to time.

Having never been in the trenches of teaching CPE students, executive leaders feel like they're out of touch or not congruent with what we as educators face most days of our career. This feels like a real deficit in terms of the executives identifying with the real world of CPE.

I am less concerned about the status of the executive leaders than I am about the ACPE actually working on our behalf both financially and as related to infrastructure. You are creating a sinking ship for many of us both professionally and personally. It's not healthy and I do relate it to centralization. I was in favor of this model but I'm afraid it's creating more damages than benefits.

It has lost its soul and become like any other not-for-profit organization. The problems are treated as organizational issues without the nuance of what we do. It is hard to take your practice challenges to proper who do not know what you do.

Somehow their being outsiders lets them take a stance that represents an outsider's point of view, and has given us useful feedback. In other ways, they don't value what we value. I'm willing to call it a wash and chalk up difficulties to personalities rather than to the system.

I will simply state that where ACPE is going today bears little resemblance to how I was trained in supervision, and what has been important in supervisory relationships over many years. The choices appear to be either drink the "outcome kool-aid" to adopt the centrally driven agenda, or find some other context within which to do supervision, with few options between. I will take this opportunity to make one other comment that was not overtly raised in this survey. Several questions were raised about the CoP's, but there were no essay-focused questions for more specific feedback. Part of the centrally pressed agenda includes having peer reviews every 3 years instead of 5. This likewise driven process is forced through a web-based access portal that is nearly impossible to navigate (not to mention trying to access standards!), all in order to maintain one's "credentials". The CoP's look good on paper, but honestly, a number of them don't appear to be active beyond the name and coordinator. The whole process is simply about filling pre-determined boxes. I was part of a voluntary peer group in ACPE for some 13 years. Since many of those peers have retired, that depth of peer interaction is sorely missed in today's ACPE. Thanks for the opportunity to offer feedback outside "formal" channels.

Trace has done a good job. Not having any educators in the national office is detrimental to him and to the staff. I recently saw a picture of the office staff--mostly strangers to me. Sad. Marc is not a chaplain or

an educator, that is more problematic for me as he minimizes the difficulties of accreditation and portfolios. We thought appendix 19 was difficult, seven standards with all the indicators and exemplars--crazy making and I love accreditation. The thought was to be more flexible. Now I feel I have to prove more--for what? The standards still have so much overlap. One Note doesn't work well. SharePoint is a mess with hospital firewalls. I can only do accreditation at home--all data at hospital. I do not like the board structure--no representation. I am not connected to any board member. I don't see we are nimble. I see us more dispersed. Those whose regions formed a CoP seem less frustrated. I used to see people re: accreditation and certification activities in the region. Now I find we are more like the APC structure, disconnected.

Now that there is no office, how will the staff connect? How would an educator be part of staff? how would units be run out of the national office?

Benefits [include] that they excel at growing the organization given their specialties. Limitation is not knowing the work from inside - i think exposure to CPE at the least would be helpful.

I believe this gives a presence of expertise that we do not have as educators. Trace and Mark have insights that are not my skill set and I appreciate this.

The administrative issues are being address but the essence of ACPE is being lost

An executive educator would have a sense of the real-life demands of time and effort required to run a CPE program (and for many of us a Spiritual Care Department). Perhaps a CE could simplify the portfolio, and provide templates for creating and maintaining.

In some significant ways, executive leaders who are not ACPE Educators has been positive (grant applications, etc.), although there is not a lot of transparency, which is a definite negative. A limitation is that it is hard to communicate with the executive leaders [as one] who is not in leadership (on the board or on a commission/committee). The average ACPE Educator does not have the same cachet or priority for a response.

I don't think it's a problem that they're not CEs--in fact, I think it's better because they have more objectivity. I think the problem is that they do not appropriately seek out or utilize CE consultation. Marc got this Ph.D. in Education whatever and the whole new process seems to be based on \*his\* vision of what CPE is, not what we (CEs) understand CPE to be. I was in a group of CEs one time that included a very small handful of non-CEs including Marc. We did an IPR-like session together to process some things and it was very clear he did not understand the process of IPR or the nuances of how CPE works. Also, I hope you are aware of how very biased the questions in this survey are--they are very clearly designed to steer us toward answers that the designers of the survey want. For example, question 20--there is no nuance to that question. I appreciate what you are trying to do but I'm not sure the manner in which you're doing it is the most effective.

Leaders are leaders. One doesn't need to be a Certified Educator to be a good leader. Good leaders lead well, poor leaders don't listen and don't know what their constituents want and need. I know many certified educators who are angry, hurtful, damaged people. Nothing kept them from getting through the old process. In fact, the old process probably made them angrier. The new competencies are good, but each person should be held accountable to perform up to the competencies. If you can't demonstrate competency, then you shouldn't be teaching. What we need in ACPE is professionalism. All people working to high professional ethical, moral and educational standards of professionalism.

Having someone who has "been there" seems essential to running the organization and supporting the educators.

Benefits: In my years in ACPE we've never had stronger leadership than we do now. National staff are currently less encumbered by relationships with ACPE peers than before, therefore more even-handed with grievances and calls for review of supervisory and educational competence. They are not beholden to how things were. Their education in allied but different specialties than our own broadens our perspectives on our own work. I am less concerned about whether our leadership does or does not include an ACPE certified educator than on the quality of management, vision for the spiritual care movement, responsiveness in the office to inquiries about process, ability to adapt to changing circumstances quickly, etc. With our current leadership not being ACPE educators, the biggest limitation

seems to be the amount of energy lost to enriching our communities of practice by targeting national staff for not being ACPE educators.

Managerial and executive functions are now more effective and informed. Financial expertise is better, personnel management is better. Less influence of the competing old-boy networks and personalized investments in old history. Educator and association management skill-sets are not the same, and there are not many CE's who would be well-suited to the role and want it. Our current executive leadership is probably unusual in bringing association management experience and training to the role along with in-depth, appreciative experience as an ACPE customer. A successor might be more challenged to understand the distinctive character of our product, history, and process.

Same as having a VP for Pastoral Care with no CPE training and chaplain certification

They really are completely out of touch with what we do and what our needs are, and that our organization seems to be dying on the vine because we can't keep up with certifying educators at the rate that is needed. Centers are desperate and having to close. This shouldn't be happening. I don't understand what they continue to do for us on an ongoing basis - there is a lot of delegating to us as members and "volunteers" with extreme demands from the institutions that pay our salaries. This will all hit bottom.

Need a few educators to always be consulting and giving input. Note the success of the VA at highest levels in last 4 years.

Benefits: need outside eyes and vision from individuals beyond our scope and our focus to help create a vision for future.

Limitations: the membership continue to speak to their values through a specific lens and understanding of our work, and it isn't being heard - or tended to.

Dont know

It is important to me to have CE presence as part of executive leadership.

It needs to be diversified

I don't have complaints about specific leaders, but the recent assertions that the national office functions solely at the direction of the Board has been disputed by both the immediate past Board President and Accreditation Chairperson. They regularly directed me to Trace or Marc for information, decisions, and explanations of leadership decisions that ostensibly were Board or Commission actions. Even when serving on Accreditation review teams or doing portfolio reviews, Marc is the decision-maker and subject matter expert, not the Commissioners.

Benefits have been organizational and financial savvy, office smoothness, and a positive image to the world. Limitations include the inability to comprehend clinical education at its core and the needs of educators to maintain quality here-and-now educational processes. What we need in a team of at least two top executives who work together, one of them a seasoned clinical educator to monitor quality in all aspects of the organization, orchestrate area venues for comprehensive educator collaboration and availability for program and individual support/care with local program/institution problems, developing new programs, and cases of impairment.

Has enabled us to have leaders with relevant skillsets/assets that are not found in many educators; conversely, has resulted in a diminishment of our being a mission-driven movement in some subtle ways.

As mentioned above, I believe that the ACPE executive leaders are out of touch with the experiences and reality of educators in their centers. That might be helped by having a certified educator among the executive leaders.

Without personal positive buy-in and/or positive experience one's perspective is narrow and limited in its range of impact. It is important to have the perspective of all players in the process represented when policies and procedures are determined. Certification of educators, accreditation of centers, and education of students do not happen in isolation and without having tangential impact on peripheral systems.

It has been about 5-6 years now since the new operating systems have been in place. It is time for an

evaluative process to take place, considering the effectiveness and efficiency of 1) the new certification process and its resulting effect on chaplains and educators; 2) the new accreditation process and its effect on educators and institutions; and, 3) the new infrastructure and its effect on its administration and the membership. Are we producing more certified educators and accredited centers?

It is fine to have a non-certified ED but **would prefer to have others to be certified.**

I love our ACPE leadership. This may not directly respond to your question, but I think it's worth saying: We need to be thinking broadly, making connections with the chaplaincy/spiritual care movement nationwide.

I'm worried about the fact my center does not receive as many student applicants as we did in the past. Are students going to online courses like the Spiritual Care Association? Are they seeking to becoming "board certified" without ACPE? I also worry that hospitals, palliative care teams, and hospices often hire "chaplains" without 4 units of CPE. Why is our credential not demanded? prized? We are the best!

I also worry about us not having enough educators to replace those who are retiring. Centers are closing left and right because they cannot or do not replace the retiring ACPE Educator. I am also concerned we are investing entirely in CPE in hospital settings, whereas hospitals do not generally seem to want to invest in CPE. I work in a retirement community setting, and believe it is a very rich environment for CPE learning. I'd like to see ACPE broaden the places we offer CPE and expanding our partnerships beyond hospital settings.

To me - these all seem like survival issues. We've been through a tremendous amount of change since 2019. 1. New Accreditation process + portfolios. 2. New Certification process. 3. Moving on-line and dealing with the opportunities and limitations of the pandemic. 4. Lots of Educators retiring. I believe we are now in a position where we need to invest in a stable foundation (the new accreditation and certification processes seem to be getting to the point of stability vs. tumult). I believe we need to focus on training more educators, developing more student interest (making our case), and broadening our partnerships with more partner institutions (not relying almost exclusively on hospital settings).

I have found my colleagues at the ACPE national office to be responsive and helpful. I would like to hear more from Trace, as I trust him and believe in his leadership and am grateful for his devotion to us.

Not sure. Hard to make an assessment, not sure how in touch with our day to day reality they are. Also, there are probably competencies I don't have a vantage on.

**Less collegiality and understanding of our work; too bureaucratic; the Sharepoint has some strengths but maintaining the kinds of records required is taxing and one reason I'm ready to retire**

Our current executive leaders have a vision that helps us connect to current market demands. They are creative thinkers. **A partner executive who is a certified clinical educator would complement our current executive leader.** It's good to have a voice in the main office to translate the vision and add to it.

Benefits - (1) The people may have business mindset and broader perspective not limited to the field of chaplaincy training. (2) They may be able to enhance greater collaboration or communication with various organizations.

Limitations - (1) The people may not have good understanding of the good things we have done as an organization. (2) They may not understand our mentality, our concerns

Benefits: quick business/corporate model. Limitations: quick centralized business model. The everyday challenges of being an educator are often seemingly not understood or appreciated.

The leadership does not understand the needs and issues educators (and I would add psychotherapists) have.