ACPE Curious Orienteers Community of Practice Survey
(123 total survey responses)
Thematic Qualitative Analysis
Compiled October 24, 2022

Open Codes: concepts/sentences conveying an idea in response to the question
Focused Codes: Gathering of open codes into groups with similar content
Major Themes: Choosing focused codes that seemed to most fully express positive and
negative/constructive sentiments about ACPE organizational and educational changes

Initial Codes: Centralization

List of notes from question 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

1. Changed connections and affirming relationships – not sure which focused code
2. Struggled with regional community - possibly generational, possibly minority religious
   background
3. Need organization to speak with and demonstrate value of CPE to hospital administrators
4. 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 – focused code
5. Hate it
6. Lost connection for career growth offered through the region
7. Feel connected nationally to people who look like me, but disconnected and isolated
   locally – focused code
8. Changes seem isolating, not offering sufficient support – focused code
9. Less voice, less say, less influence
10. More equitable processes
11. Big improvement over folksy, inefficient ways of the past
12. Educators isolated in our sites
13. Networking very limited
14. Shared projects or education meetings rare
15. Educators have little input into strategies, philosophies, and objectives of ACPE –
    focused code
16. I find it confusing
17. More unified and efficient association – focused code
18. Centralized association is clearer about goals
19. Centralized association is all pulling in the same direction
20. Primarily negative
21. Regional structure could have been revamped to address issues and yet retained
    community aspects

22. Loss of relational opportunities for networking and accountability major impact of loss of regions – focused code
23. Centralization great for efficiency – i.e., accreditation
24. Appears not to be financially more efficient as was predicted
25. Essential work of certification and accreditation falls on smaller group of people who are all volunteers
26. Decisions on daily operation of all education matters are made by non-CE folks
27. No one concerned about keeping connected to CEs in their professional functioning and personal lives (as Regional Directors used to do)
28. No evidence of give and take that epitomized the regions
29. Lack of connectedness
30. No longer have relationships outside my center
31. No longer hear reports from what's happening at the national level
32. Less connected with and invested with the organization
33. Essential work has not changed – focused code
34. What has changed is limited relationships, some of which results from Covid
35. Centralization has basically had no impact on my center
36. 9 regions often run by an elite old guard; found no value in them – focused code
37. Loss of consistent community
38. I have become completely out of touch with the association
39. Lost opportunities I once had for leadership development
40. Uniform the work (does anyone understand what this means? jrr)
41. More dependent on the use of digital technologies – focused code
42. struggled since the change to feel a sense of coherence and support in the organization
43. CoPs don't replace the regional support we had – focused code
44. More fair and just financially with all centers paying the same fees
45. Opened up more continuing education opportunities
46. Made relationships around the country which has enriched my practice
47. Feel disconnected from my colleagues
48. Growing disillusionment with ACPE
49. Grieve loss of relationships especially RD who is like a chaplain to CEs – focused code
50. Emotional, Spiritual, social, and physical support are missing
51. Regional structure fostered more collegiality
52. Current structure supports administration and alienates educators
53. Advocate a model with CEs in leadership with more local autonomy and decision-making
54. Shifted focus from CPE practice to organizational enhancement
55. Streamlined unwieldy 9 regions with different student fees
56. Where regions did not become CoPs, diminishment of community
57. Alienation from the Board due to lack of consultative process – focused code
58. Atlanta-centric with all money and all power now in Atlanta
59. New system separates rather than embracing rich legacy of ACPE
60. CoPs put like-minded with like-minded; loses richness of diversity
61. Not enough CPE focus in the national office

62. Ending the regions took the heart out of ACPE
63. Further isolation from peers and the Association
64. I am no longer connected to ACPE except in my town
65. It has enhanced our work, resource, credibility and focus within and beyond the organization
66. We are becoming increasingly professional, genuinely interfaith – focused code
67. It has made it more difficult to have a sense of community and collegiality – exacerbated by the pandemic
68. I mourn the loss of the ACPE regions and all professional relationships that these offered
69. Experienced a negative impact of not having a region
70. negative impact of having all accreditation, certification and professional ethics activities move to only happening on a national level – focused code
71. 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
72. CoP experience has been more structured and means I have ability to go deeper in areas of shared interest – focused code
73. lost relationship with one another without the regions and regional work
74. lost touch with the leadership and they have lost touch with us
75. seems like decisions are made without member input
76. Centralization has had a positive impact on administrative functioning
77. I have experienced the office as being more responsive
78. downside for me has been the loss of collegiality, familiarity and identity that I associated with regional functioning – focused code
79. found my regional connection important to my inspiration and motivation, as well as closer contact with best practices
80. miss the regional meetings
81. I am grateful for the COPs
82. 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 – focused code
83. improved efficiency and saved a lot of money that would have been spent on regional meetings
84. 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 – focused code
85. taken leadership out of the hands of Regional Directors, who tended to be older white males which, though not intended, limited perspectives
86. more complaints from older white males who feel disconnected from newer, younger leaders who have emerged without "apprenticing up" through regional systems (often patriarchal).
87. some Educators blame ACPE leaders and staff for isolation and lack of community because they cannot distinguish between Covid isolation and missing regional fellowships – focused code

88. 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.
89. 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.
90. we have lost much of the connectivity that has contributed greatly to our work and ministry
91. 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 – focused code
92. harder to become known across the nation. Elections become more of a popularity contest
93. loss of our regional director has been the biggest loss - he was the cog that kept us all connected
94. RD notified us when a CE had lost a loved one, were leaving the region or had other significant life events.
95. RD kept us informed of new people so that we could welcome them
96. RD was a significant part of planning events - rather than leaving it for CEs, who already have enough on their plates
97. Losing all of this connectivity has resulted in more feelings of isolation, less creativity in CPE programming and made my work less fun
98. three positions of area "coordinators" were eliminated soon after they were established - something that I thought was a big mistake.
99. Being able to talk to a CE about CPE education and or difficulties in the clinic is important
100. 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
101. I like the CoP's for personal growth and connection
102. 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
103. There has been a significant economic advantage with less people on the Board – focused code
104. loss of community has been huge prior to Covid and on (was?) exaggerated by Covid and zoom meetings
105. very cumbersome to request money so far in advance and then to be denied is disheartening and maddening
106. 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 nontransparent process. – focused process
107. on-line manuals are impossible for me to navigate…so I don't keep current anymore; humiliating and demoralizing to rely on my more tech savvy colleagues

108.   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
109.   isolation and lack of collegiality
110.   referring so much to a National office which seems either disdainful at some times or remote at other times
111.   There were hierarchies that mentored folks

At this point, I'm going to choose what seem like key codes and put other codes under them; this is called focused coding. This starts on page 5 where you'll see the red stars and the words Started focused coding. If a new category suggest itself, I'll add that and note it.

Centralization was a necessary challenge for standardization across the association.(Focused Code)

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. – focused code

Centralization had a massive effect on my certification process – focused code

Significantly increased administrative workload of the educator to maintain Accreditation and Certification – focused code

I feel less connected to ACPE since the change – focused code

I like the emphasis on cultural diversity and anti-racism – focused code

How can the vital aspects of regions be created while the benefits of centralization be maintained. – focused code

Now, at the point of the stars on page 10, I'm going to stop pulling each individual code and move to only pulling codes that are particularly well said or contribute something new.

Suggestions for Improvement – focused code; all the other codes and focused codes are in the CE's own words. I named this one because of course the ideas are different.

Focused coding for Question 7: In what ways has centralization (changing from nine ACPE regions to one national organizational structure) impacted the ACPE's essential work and value?

1. Changes seem isolating, not offering sufficient support
   a. 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
   b. Educators isolated in our sites
   c. Networking very limited
   d. Lack of connectedness
   e. No longer have relationships outside my center
   f. Loss of consistent community
   g. I have become completely out of touch with the association

h. Feel disconnected from my colleagues
i. Emotional, Spiritual, social, and physical support are missing
j. Regional structure fostered more collegiality
k. Where regions did not become CoPs, diminishment of community
l. Further isolation from peers and the Association
m. lost relationship with one another without the regions and regional work
n. lost touch with the leadership and they have lost touch with us
o. found my regional connection important to my inspiration and motivation, as well as closer contact with best practices
p. miss the regional meetings
q. we have lost much of the connectivity that has contributed greatly to our work and ministry
r. Losing all of this connectivity has resulted in more feelings of isolation, less creativity in CPE programming and made my work less fun
s. loss of community has been huge prior to Covid and on (was?) exaggerated by Covid and zoom meetings
t. isolation and lack of collegiality
u. There were hierarchies that mentored folks
v. Feel disconnected and isolated locally
w. Loss of resources of creative ideas, peer consultation, collegiality, clear communications
x. Disconnection between colleagues
y. I have not experienced much direct support from the national office
z. I sense a diminished feeling of community
aa. I think there has been a very significant reduction in the opportunity to network and form supportive and collegial relationships
bb. Loss of community
cc. Loss of collegiality, peership and gatherings which were life sustaining.
dd. attempt at stability and consistency seems to be at expense of mutual support, communal creativity, and a shared and collaborative vision
ee. Regions provided much more opportunity for fostering/maintaining relationships.
ff. I have felt a loss of community. The regions were how I felt connected deeply to colleagues
gg. Regions functioned as the sinew that connected local centers with the national office.
hh. 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
ii. the collegiality so important to ACPE has been diluted
jj. the relationships that are such a part of the work of CPE are lost when you move to a national model rather than regional
kk. The most negative effect, even with has been the lack of forming deep relationships in my local area

ll. Centralization has left me without a community. I feel alone and unsupported as an educator

mm. It leaves me lonely, less well-supported and less well-educated

2. CoPs don't replace the regional support we had
   a. There is an echo chamber effect of small, like-minded groups meeting with no spaces for the whole to address challenges and learn together.
   b. 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
   c. CoPs put like-minded with like-minded; loses richness of diversity
   d. COPs do not replace Regional resources or relationships.
   e. loss of networking opportunities among colleagues who wouldn't necessarily be part of communities of practice I would join
   f. I have tried to join Communities of Practice to fill in this gap but it has not had the same effect or impact.
   g. 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

3. Educators have little input into strategies, philosophies, and objectives of ACPE
   a. Less voice, less say, less influence
   b. Decisions on daily operation of all education matters are made by non-CE folks
   c. Current structure supports administration and alienates educators
   d. Advocate a model with CEs in leadership with more local autonomy and decision-making
   e. seems like decisions are made without member input
   f. In CoP's, many conversations are around understanding and conforming to changes we had no voice in creating
   g. Commissions were balanced with representatives from all regions rather than hand selected to support the desires of the national office and the board
   h. The decisions made at national, which is virtual, seem arbitrary, centralized, and without much input from the larger membership

4. It feels like a very closed nontransparent process
   a. 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.

b. 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.

c. Starting a CPE program with a satellite agreement across "regions" in the aftermath of their disappearance - the ambiguity of who remained responsible for what left our application languishing for well over a year

d. Hate it

e. Primarily negative

f. I find it confusing

g. Appears not to be financially more efficient as was predicted

h. Atlanta-centric with all money and all power now in Atlanta

i. Experienced a negative impact of not having a region

j. very cumbersome to request money so far in advance and then to be denied is disheartening and maddening

k. I don't understand who decides what is a worthy project/educational event or who to appeal to when things are not approved.

l. I feel less connected with the organization -- I don't feel that I have a sense of where things are going.

m. structure of ACPE is more hierarchal and thus the system of accountability is diminished

n. The new structure offers little room for dialogue; communication mainly flows from top down.

o. loss of regional governance has made our organization more top-down, less democratic, less CPE.

p. There is a disconnect between the national organization of ACPE and ACPE centers

q. billing by ACPE remains a mystery for student units.

5. More unified and efficient association
    a. More equitable processes
    b. Big improvement over folksy, inefficient ways of the past
    c. Centralized association is clearer about goals
    d. Centralized association is all pulling in the same direction
    e. Centralization great for efficiency – i.e., accreditation
    f. Centralization has had a positive impact on administrative functioning
    g. I have experienced the office as being more responsive
    h. improved efficiency and saved a lot of money that would have been spent on regional meetings
    i. connection with colleagues across the organization
    j. seems to have provided stronger financial stability as a whole

k. I do think financial stability has increased and the ACPE public relations/ marketing sort of needs are being well met

l. 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

m. more standardized educational and logistical way of operating across the organization

n. the standardization of the curricula for interns, residents and CECs is probably a net benefit in the way it has been approached

o. 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.

p. centralization of finances might be a net benefit

q. I also believe in the net benefit of a merger between APC and ACPE, and I imagine the centralization makes that merger more realistic

r. 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);

s. the business components of the work have benefited from these structures (budgeting, advocation, etc)

6. Loss of relational opportunities for networking and accountability major impact of loss of regions

a. downside for me has been the loss of collegiality, familiarity and identity that I associated with regional functioning

b. No evidence of give and take that epitomized the regions

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

d. The regions for the place for collegiality, shared learning, regional conferences and support of people going through training

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

f. the decision to eliminate ACPE Regions was a horrible mistake

g. Regional structure could have been revamped to address issues and yet retained community aspects

h. We have lost our way

i. 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

j. The RDs, regional councils and committee chairs managed, nuanced, brokered and negotiated that connection in representative and advocacy based ways

k. Some regions were working better than others. Eliminating regions, however, was not the answer

7. Nine regions often run by an elite old guard; found no value in them

a. Struggled with regional community - possibly generational, possibly minority religious background
b. taken leadership out of the hands of Regional Directors, who tended to be older white males which, though not intended, limited perspectives
c. more complaints from older white males who feel disconnected from newer, younger leaders who have emerged without "apprenticing up" through regional systems (often patriarchal).
d. the clicheness of the regions has dissipated and I have gotten to know people in areas besides my own.
e. Before with regional leadership, certification committees, annual meetings, and accreditation committees, I experienced them as not hospitable, very cliquish and gossipy.
f. 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.

8. More dependent on the use of digital technologies
   a. on-line manuals are impossible for me to navigate…so I don't keep current anymore; humiliating and demoralizing to rely on my more tech savvy colleagues
   b. Our gatherings and even e-mail and phone number lists have disappeared. My life-long professional relationships have become inaccessible.
   c. We have to rely on virtual gatherings for connection. Rather - we are dependent on it. There are strengths and limits to this dependency

9. Grieve loss of relationships especially RD who is like a chaplain to CEs
   a. No one concerned about keeping connected to CEs in their professional functioning and personal lives (as Regional Directors used to do)
   b. loss of our regional director has been the biggest loss - he was the cog that kept us all connected
   c. RD notified us when a CE had lost a loved one, were leaving the region or had other significant life events.
   d. RD kept us informed of new people so that we could welcome them
   e. RD was a significant part of planning events - rather than leaving it for CEs, who already have enough on their plates
   f. loss of a spiritual care provided/wise administrative guide in our Regional Director
   g. Our Regional Director was our go to person. Someone you could always contact with whatever you needed help with
   h. our regional director functioned in many ways as a chaplain to CE's.
   i. 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
   j. The regional director could talk to our institution's administrators with authority about a national perspective on whatever the issue was affecting us.

k. 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.

10. Centralization was a necessary challenge for standardization across the association.
    a. Streamlined unwieldy 9 regions with different student fees
    b. More fair and just financially with all centers paying the same fees
    c. 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
    d. I know we can't go back due to the IRS problems with the previous structure

11. Alienation from the Board due to lack of consultative process
    a. The Board, it appears to me, is increasingly sidelined and symbolic
    b. 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
    c. The CoPs are not connected to the Board or each other
    d. Members often feel that "leadership" including the Board, makes decisions without transparency or including memberships perspectives or desires.

12. I feel less connected to ACPE since the change
    a. New system separates rather than embracing rich legacy of ACPE
    b. No longer hear reports from what's happening at the national level
    c. Less connected with and invested with the organization
    d. struggled since the change to feel a sense of coherence and support in the organization
    e. Growing disillusionment with ACPE
    f. Shifted focus from CPE practice to organizational enhancement
    g. Not enough CPE focus in the national office
    h. Ending the regions took the heart out of ACPE
    i. I am no longer connected to ACPE except in my town
    j. 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
    k. 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
    l. The work I do with students is the only remnant of true. CPE that exists for me now
    m. I experience a lack of congruence and disconnect between what we claim to be as an organization and how we function
    n. I try to stay connected to the spirit of CPE through and the CoP's, but topics of conceptual learning are not CPE

o. 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
   p. I don't like it and I feel alienated from the organization
   q. We have become top-down, overly sensitive to the Department of Education and its accreditation requirements
   r. the loss of regional connection and history is deeply, deeply felt
   s. I felt proud to be a member of ACPE - this is less so today.
   t. Centralization may have strengthened the organization financially, but it has alienated the member and distanced them from the organization

13. We are becoming increasingly professional
   a. I like the emphasis on cultural diversity and anti-racism
   b. Feel connected nationally to people who look like me
   c. genuinely interfaith
   d. It has enhanced our work, resource, credibility and focus within and beyond the organization
   e. 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.
   f. I am more supported in my volunteer role as a peer portfolio reviewer for Accreditation. Portfolio reviews are more transparent and less murky.
   g. 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
   h. There has been a significant economic advantage with less people on the Board

14. Negative impact of having all accreditation, certification and professional ethics activities move to only happening on a national level
   a. Essential work of certification and accreditation falls on smaller group of people who are all volunteers
   b. Lost opportunities I once had for leadership development
   c. 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
   d. referring so much to a National office which seems either disdainful at some times or remote at other times
   e. the loss of region seems to have really curtailed the pipeline of ACPE members doing certain work in the organization such as accreditation
   f. 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.

15. CoP experience has been more structured and means I have ability to go deeper in areas of shared interest
   a. Opened up more continuing education opportunities

b. Made relationships around the country which has enriched my practice
c. 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
d. I am grateful for the COPs
e. I like the CoP's for personal growth and connection
f. 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
g. 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
h. COPs are a real and substantial contribution to our culture and practice

16. Being able to talk to a CE about CPE education and or difficulties in the clinic is important
    a. three positions of area "coordinators" were eliminated soon after they were established - something that I thought was a big mistake
    b. Being able to talk to a CE about CPE education and or difficulties in the clinic is important
    c. 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.
    d. 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.

17. Some Educators blame ACPE leaders and staff for isolation and lack of community because they cannot distinguish between Covid isolation and missing regional fellowships
    a. What has changed is limited relationships, some of which results from Covid
    b. It has made it more difficult to have a sense of community and collegiality – exacerbated by the pandemic
    c. 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.

18. 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
    a. Lost connection for career growth offered through the region
    b. Shared projects or education meetings rare
    c. harder to become known across the nation. Elections become more of a popularity contest

19. Essential work has not changed

    a. Centralization has basically had no impact on my center
    b. The work of ACPE still remains the same, spiritual care education and leadership of the field of spiritual care

20. 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
    a. I am hoping the centralization means more help for resourcing from the National office than I had under Regions

21. Centralization had a massive effect on my certification process
    a. There were times no one knew what was next for me in the certification process
    b. 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
    c. 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).
    d. with centralization, supervisory training now has "one size fits all" even as diversity is espoused
    e. Training is now heavily agenda driven, with the national office directing that agenda alone

22. Significantly increased administrative workload of the educator to maintain Accreditation and Certification
    a. "Portfolio" process & its relationship to Accreditation is a royal "pain in the butt".
    b. 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 students education & training.
    c. I haven't found anyone to be particularly confident in navigating the site review process.
    d. CE leading DMin course 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.
    e. 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.
    f. Most of the changes have made the work even more complicated and we feel removed from the organization
    g. The work the ACPE creates for centers and Educators is arduous and almost inhuman within organizations that are small and struggling as it is.

23. Suggestions for Improvement

a. How can the vital aspects of regions be created while the benefits of centralization be maintained?
b. I see a gap in leadership support without having a CE on the national office staff
c. Reconfigure the Professional wellbeing committee so it can support wellbeing of individuals who encounter distressing events.
d. 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
e. 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?
f. 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
g. 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.
h. I recommend we return to regions with regional directors.
i. Need organization to speak with and demonstrate value of CPE to hospital administrators
j. It would help me greatly if the elders of this community would ask me what I need
k. I'd value some kind of ACPE supported regional gatherings
l. 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
m. Reevaluating the centralization structure in light of how educator relationships are formed and maintained and best practices for educator education is a must
n. 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
o. I think we could use more specific education and examples about the portfolio process
p. 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

Question 7: In what ways has centralization (changing from nine ACPE regions to one national organizational structure) impacted the ACPE's essential work and value? (123 responses)

Major themes with representative quotes:

1. Centralization was a necessary challenge for standardization and professionalism across the association.
   Representative quotes:
   a. "It has enhanced our work, resource, 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."
   b. "Streamlined unwieldy 9 regions with different student fees into a more unified and efficient association."

2. CoP experience has been more structured and means CEs have ability to go deeper in areas of shared interest.
   Representative quotes:
   a. "Community of Practice groups serve as a way of connecting with ACPE colleagues through a common shared interest or geographical location."
   b. "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."

3. Loss of sufficient support.
   Representative quote:
   > "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 organization's programmatic process could have transitioned to a more centralized process without changing its structural form of regionalization."

4. Centralization feels like a very closed, nontransparent process offering CEs little opportunity for input into ACPE strategies, philosophies, and objectives.
   Representative quotes:
   a. "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."
   b. "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."

Question 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

Initial Codes:

1. more ongoing transparency and consultation might be good
2. I'd rather straightforward info in the newsletter and not have to click for the important info
3. inspirational reflections should not be mixed with compliance and organizational info
4. I appreciate the format
5. like that it touches upon various commissions and national resources
6. It is just about as useful as it was prior to the change – focused code
7. I like it.
8. Enjoy it
9. I like the newsletter
10. I find the newsletter helpful, informative – focused code
11. It seems to be working well from my perspective
12. Minimal communication, sometimes feels like spoon-feeding
13. If ACPE could allow those emails to go to our whole team, that would be actually useful and helpful.
14. a bit too much fluff in the newsletter and not enough content
15. it doesn't really touch upon the complex nature of the clinical work we do – focused code
16. like to see something with more substance in the newsletter
17. feels somewhat burdensome, as everything has the same level of importance and it is sometimes difficult to know where to focus my limited attention
18. 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 (focused code), except for the diversity presentations which dominate much of the newsletter.
19. I appreciate short frequent newsletters
20. Prior to the weekly newsletter, I had no idea what was happening in ACPE
21. It's quite good. There is a rich variety of topics
22. Confusing format.
23. It seems more like an announcement bulletin and not a newsletter – focused code
24. I appreciate the regular, consistent, weekly communication. Did not have this in the region.
25. It was informative
26. there is a disconnect with leaders
27. More about communities of practice and innovative programs
28. Could be improved (focused code) by reflecting more of what we do - clinical and congregational work with students
29. It lacks humanity.
30. No real change - never allowed open discussion of controversial topics or negative criticism of ACPE life and CPE practice
31. The newsletter is informative
32. My major concern about the ACPE (which is often reflected in the Newsletter) is the left leaning political bias 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. – focused code

33. The newsletter is hard to manage (focused code) on a cell phone
34. ACPE newsletter is essential no matter which system of governance is in place
35. Needs more attention to the educators especially those who die
36. I hardly read it unless there is an Accreditation or Certification issue or change
37. 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. – focused code
38. I miss the neighborhood feeling of knowing what's happening in my 'region. – focused code
39. It is consistent, relevant, and inclusive.
40. It is a central part of my access to the goings on and resources of ACPE – focused code
41. 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.
42. I like the newsletter format. I can quickly skim the headings for articles I want to read fully.
43. I feel it keeps me in touch with what is happening on the national/administrative level of ACPE.
44. I especially enjoy personal testimonies of various kinds, and for me it could be improved by including more of these
45. I would love to see a quarterly printed edition with all major changes and highlights mailed to membership.
46. I have found links and invitations in it to presentations that I have used in my student programs – focused code
47. 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
48. I think the effort to explain monthly Ethics standards is admirable and progressive.
49. Seems informative about what top end leadership is doing
50. A couple of good poems that made inspiring reading
51. Improvement?--maybe dealing with conflict/controversy in less subtle, more straightforward ways
52. I read it primarily to see what I should or shouldn't be doing - like it comes down from "on high."
53. I'd like to see more transparency that ACPE talks diversity but does not necessarily rise to the level of the talk
54. It is confusing. Sometimes inspirational. Sometimes informational. Sometimes essential.
55. Sharepoint is a HUGE pain to both get onto and navigate
56. I find most of the newsletter to be irrelevant to me, and, as far as I can discern, to local centers – focused code
57. It seems largely propaganda for the national office and personnel.
58. Feels more like a business newsletter, would appreciate seeing more about people I recognize
59. The shift from a clinical relational experiential model to a business model has lost its soulness and ability to be trustworthy in the current context of our world

60. I would prefer more personal sharing and connection about our direct work rather than all focused on national issues of leadership
61. I appreciate the layout and headings making it easy to find information from / about commission work, manual changes, deadlines, etc. – focused code
62. the content starts getting very repetitive with little changes to some of the postings
63. 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.
64. It doesn't serve me at all. The amount of time it takes to read it is not worth what I take away
65. I usually feel patronized by leaders speaking information I have not had input into in a coaching tone that fuels my grief
66. Authentic process conversations and consensus decision making are gone.
67. It serves me to see upcoming deadlines and news. I do read it each week.
68. It is repeatedly caught in my organization's filters, and I often don't see it.
69. I miss the communications about PEOPLE that we used to get from the regional director.
70. I just read it for any news.
71. The newsletter is an upbeat affair with no room for various viewpoints.
72. 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
73. 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.
74. Could be more representative of the educational method and support our students in their learning/growth
75. It appears to be driven by announcements and perspectives of very few persons vetted by board and national office – focused code
76. I like the idea of the weekly online newsletter
77. the weekly newsletter has not used by ACPE leadership to help us understand decisions that are being made – focused code
78. 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.
79. Newsletter information is necessary & useful.
80. I scan it every week to see if there are updates
81. I am not sure I need to receive a newsletter on a weekly basis since several items do not change from week to week – focused code
82. I have appreciated the ACPE Newsletter to know what is going on nationally, but it feels far away and "out there."
83. 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
84. Not sure the process to have something included in the newsletter and unsure of the criteria for something to get published – focused code
85. our regional newsletter focused on issues nearer to the ground and was more relevant.
86. We live in a digital age. I have no problems with the change from a printed newsletter to a digital newsletter

87. The newsletter introduces me to people I do not know (focused code), and also is a helpful reminder of committees at work
88. 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
89. For the most part I like the newsletter. I wish people would read it.
90. It is akin to the weekly business update I receive from the healthcare system where I work.
91. I don't read it often
92. I like the weekly news. Feel much better informed about the wider association
93. I wish it would be emailed to me. I don't get on the SharePoint very often.
94. 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.
95. I find it informative.
96. I like that I can start each work week with an opportunity to keep ACPE in the forefront of my professional agenda.
97. In general, I like the information that is shared weekly
98. 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
99. 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?

At this point in the highlighted text, I'm taking new codes and putting them under already existing focused codes or, if they represent a new category of thought, making a new focused codes. I'll list new focused codes here.

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

It sometimes does encourage me and inspire me – focused code

Q13 – Newsletter – Focused Codes

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

1. It is a central part of my access to the goings on and resources of ACPE

    a. 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.
    b. like that it touches upon various commissions and national resources
    c. It is consistent, relevant, and inclusive

d. I feel it keeps me in touch with what is happening on the national/administrative level of ACPE.
e. I think the effort to explain monthly Ethics standards is admirable and progressive
f. Seems informative about what top end leadership is doing
g. It serves me to see upcoming deadlines and news. I do read it each week.
h. I just read it for any news.
i. 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.
j. I scan it every week to see if there are updates
k. a helpful reminder of committees at work
l. I like the weekly news. Feel much better informed about the wider association
m. I like that I can start each work week with an opportunity to keep ACPE in the forefront of my professional agenda.
n. It's easier to keep up to date with changes and expectations for accreditation
o. I have found links and invitations in it to presentations that I have used in my student programs
p. I have alerted emerging Educators and students to jobs I thought they might find interesting advertised in it
q. It sometimes does encourage me and inspire me
r. A couple of good poems that made inspiring reading
s. weekly news conveys important information I need to effectively run my program
t. I find the newsletter helpful, informative
u. I appreciate the format
v. I like it.
w. Enjoy it
x. I like the newsletter
y. It seems to be working well from my perspective
z. I appreciate short frequent newsletters
aa. Prior to the weekly newsletter, I had no idea what was happening in ACPE
bb. It's quite good. There is a rich variety of topics
cc. I appreciate the regular, consistent, weekly communication. Did not have this in the region.
dd. It was informative
ee. The newsletter is informative
ff. I like the idea of the weekly online newsletter
gg. Newsletter information is necessary & useful.
hh. For the most part I like the newsletter. I wish people would read it.
ii. I find it informative
jj. In general, I like the information that is shared weekly
kk. I appreciate the layout and headings making it easy to find information from / about commission work, manual changes, deadlines, etc.
ll.

mm.   I like the newsletter format. I can quickly skim the headings for articles I want to read fully.

2. I find most of the newsletter to be irrelevant to me, and, as far as I can discern, to local centers
    a. What I trained to do in CPE supervisory relationships bears little resemblance to what is being espoused and driven through agenda at the present time
    b. It doesn't really touch upon the complex nature of the clinical work we do
    c. 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.
    d. The shift from a clinical relational experiential model to a business model has lost its soulness and ability to be trustworthy in the current context of our world
    e. I would prefer more personal sharing and connection about our direct work rather than all focused on national issues of leadership
    f. It doesn't serve me at all. The amount of time it takes to read it is not worth what I take away
    g. 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
    h. I have appreciated the ACPE Newsletter to know what is going on nationally, but it feels far away and "out there."
    i. our regional newsletter focused on issues nearer to the ground and was more relevant.
    j. I don't read it often
    k. The Newsletter is just noise in an already overcrowded inbox
    l. I hardly read it unless there is an Accreditation or Certification issue or change

3. 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

    a. Often, the information provided about leadership actions is vague, defensive, self-protective, and critical of any questions or dissent.
    b. there is a disconnect with leaders
    c. I read it primarily to see what I should or shouldn't be doing - like it comes down from "on high."
    d. It seems largely propaganda for the national office and personnel
    e. Authentic process conversations and consensus decision making are gone
    f. It appears to be driven by announcements and perspectives of very few persons vetted by board and national office
    g. Minimal communication, sometimes feels like spoon-feeding
    h. I usually feel patronized by leaders speaking information I have not had input into (delivered) in a coaching tone that fuels my grief
    i. The newsletter is an upbeat affair with no room for various viewpoints.

j. Feel like it a further instrument in distancing us from ACPE Staff.
k. 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.
l. often it is communicating a new burden
m. I feel like it has become a propaganda tool for ACPE rather than an exchange of information and important concerns
n. 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.
o. It seems like the only ACPE Educators who write "articles" for it are those who 100% agree with everything the national organization is doing
p. 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.
q. I feel as if information is not shared but it is more of directives.
r. the weekly newsletter has not been used by ACPE leadership to help us understand decisions that are being made

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

a. No real change - never allowed open discussion of controversial topics or negative criticism of ACPE life and CPE practice
b. ACPE newsletter is essential no matter which system of governance is in place
c. We live in a digital age. I have no problems with the change from a printed newsletter to a digital newsletter
d. I'm not aware (of) the change

5. Suggestions for improving the newsletter (my words, not participants)

a. dealing with conflict/controversy in less subtle, more straightforward ways
b. more ongoing transparency and consultation might be good
c. inspirational reflections should not be mixed with compliance and organizational info
d. If ACPE could allow those emails to go to our whole team, that would be actually useful and helpful
e. feels somewhat burdensome, as everything has the same level of importance and it is sometimes difficult to know where to focus my limited attention
f. More about communities of practice and innovative programs
g. Could be improved by reflecting more of what we do - clinical and congregational work with students
h. Needs more attention to the educators especially those who die
i. I especially enjoy personal testimonies of various kinds, and for me it could be improved by including more of these
j. I would love to see a quarterly printed edition with all major changes and highlights mailed to membership

k. Feels more like a business newsletter, would appreciate seeing more about people I recognize

l. Could be more representative of the educational method and support our students in their learning/growth

m. 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.

n. 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?

o. perhaps a bi-weekly or monthly format would be more efficient and substantive.

p. It would be helpful to have information about what the various CoPs are doing, innovatively and relationally

q. I would like to see more educator resources and stories

r. 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

s. The newsletter is hard to manage

t. Not sure the process to have something included in the newsletter and unsure of the criteria for something to get published

u. I'd rather straightforward info in the newsletter and not have to click for the important info

v. The newsletter is hard to manage on a cell phone

w. Confusing format

x. It is confusing. Sometimes inspirational. Sometimes informational. Sometimes essential.

y. SharePoint is a HUGE pain to both get onto and navigate

z. It is repeatedly caught in my organization's filters, and I often don't see it.

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

bb. 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

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

dd. Some articles are too long. Some things are only posted once and if I miss a week, I can miss something important.

ee. It would be much easier if it didn't send you to sharepoint.

ff. A newsletter with all the information in the link would be easier to manage when at the hospital.

gg. I am not sure I need to receive a newsletter on a weekly basis since several items do not change from week to week

hh. the content starts getting very repetitive with little changes to some of the postings

ii. 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.

jj. It seems more like an announcement bulletin and not a newsletter

kk. a bit too much fluff in the newsletter and not enough content

ll. like to see something with more substance in the newsletter

mm.	It lacks humanity

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

6. Differing perspectives on diversity (my words, not participants)
    a. I'd like to see more transparency that ACPE talks diversity but does not necessarily rise to the level of the talk
    b. 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.
    c. Left leaning political bias 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.
    d. diversity presentations dominate much of the newsletter

7. I miss the neighborhood feeling of knowing what's happening in my 'region.'
    a. I miss the communications about PEOPLE that we used to get from the regional director.
    b. 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
    c. 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
    d. My overall disappointment with ACPE since centralization effects how I read the newsletter. I peruse it, but rarely read it.

Question 13 – ACPE Newsletter – Major Themes conveyed via representative quotes

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

1. "It is a central part of my access to the goings on and resources of ACPE"
    a. "I appreciate the regular, consistent, weekly communication. Did not have this in the region."
    b. "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."

2. "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."
    a. "Often, the information provided about leadership actions is vague, defensive, self-protective, and critical of any questions or dissent."

b. "The weekly newsletter has not been used by ACPE leadership to help us understand decisions that are being made."

Q 17 Open Codes – text conveying important ideas - jrr

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

1. best has been less "old boys" systems and more collegiality
2. The current process is very relational and student centered
3. takes away the shame of failing a committee in the former process where committee appearances had little to do with supervisory competence
4. committees in old process clearing out the dregs – focused code
5. New process is not as engaging but is far healthier for the CEC's.
6. I found it in some ways vague and confusing – focused code
7. Overwhelming number of competencies CEC is required to demonstrate. – focused code
8. Competencies are not necessarily the best way to assess one's mettle as an educator. – Focused code
9. The new process is less abusive and less subjective.
10. 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. – focused code
11. It is better having clear competencies on which students need to demonstrate their work – focused code
12. not enough meeting with the other CE when appearing
13. the go signal to appear depends on the mentor. a big work for the mentor.
14. The new process is less focused on interpersonal and more academic in approach.
15. Eliminating regions eliminated a significant socialization opportunity and certification committees were closer to the kind of open, interactive process that makes up CPE.
16. In the PREVIOUS Certification process it was supportive of Regional nurturing of Candidates and their supervisors – focused code
17. Unless you are supervising a CEC, the local CE's are not kept abreast of what is happening in the whole certification process
18. Dynamically, the certification process is now a transaction between ACPE - ATLANTA and the local individual and center
19. A process that was intended to be more streamlined and "shorter" is now multi layered, complex, and drawn out. – focused code
20. The process is more predictable, professional, anti-bias/subjective, developmental, collaborative – focused code
21. 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 – focused code
22. don't see any more people getting certified more quickly

23. Regional certification work, in my view, increased members involvement with and advocacy for candidates
24. the sense of community among committee members at the Regional level was significant.
25. 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. – focused code
26. It appears to be taking students EVEN longer than the old process did - which isn't a good thing
27. The grids demand a lot from students - time and energy.
28. Passing committee is sort of anti-climactic, since the student knows going in to the interview that they will pass.
29. Certainly some of the anxiety and frustration has been eliminated; I'm not yet sure if that is good or bad
30. Both systems are definitely flawed – focused code
31. In the old system, too much responsibility given to the Commission to determine competencies without adequate relationship to evaluate in context- focused code
32. 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 – focused code
33. I fear we will turn out more "surgeon like/task oriented CE's than ones with good relational process skills.
34. My sense is that each committee acts as a commission would have. Much more random.
35. 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- focused code
36. I am an experienced certification committee member, and during the structural changes and afterwards, I have not once been consulted or invited to participate in the new certification process
37. I'm currently working with a CEC and am baffled by the skill, task, demonstrating competence through writing emphasized throughout
38. Where is the interpersonal, experience/reflection, authenticity emphases so essential to adult transformational learning? – focused code
39. It is so painful to work within a national model of certification that is so disconnected from the learning I'm trying to facilitate with our CEC
40. meeting committee used to require integration that I am not currently seeing in the new process
41. Taking even more time for CE certification.
42. Difficult for centers to commit more time up front before candidates are able to work with students. – focused code
43. Cost prohibitive for centers.
44. the process is now more fastidious/onerous than engaging.
45. The educational theory behind the changes seems to favor transactional learning rather than transformational learning.

46. I like the fact that everyone gets to know people across the organization not just a select few. – focused code
47. I like that having to start all over from scratch when someone is not granted has gone away. – focused code
48. In the current process, there are opportunities to review material before getting to an assessment point. - focused code
49. 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
50. some kinks that need to be worked out in the current process but that's what happens when a group is doing something new – focused code
51. I think the new process does a better job of accompany a student through the process – focused code
52. the competency structure seems arduous and has done the opposite of its intent which was to speed up the process.
53. My main critique is that (previously – jrr), I have witnessed persons of diverse backgrounds navigating the certification process through diverse contexts and pathways. Now that outcomes and competencies have been pressed 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
54. There is no entry point for those of us who do not have CEC at our centers. Seems very insular – focused code
55. It was important to have SOS and other opportunities to meet folks who do not know the CEC so well.
56. How are the new folks learning to navigate what is difficult? To navigate with strangers and their differences.
57. Newly minted CEs come out of the process much stronger in theory than they used to.
58. Access to virtual peer groups supports minority students and students in geographically isolated centers. – focused code
59. More CEs are involved in a typical student's process, building in a stronger relational matrix amongst educators in the organizations.
60. 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).
61. The new process has more safeguards against forcing a student's theories to be expressed in Christian language – focused code
62. scheduling of the nodal interviews is sometimes really difficult with students having to wait a long time to meet an interview team
63. educators' resistance to using the competencies forms means many students do not get the feedback on their work they deserve. – focused code
64. students are still vulnerable to educators who do not respond quickly (especially in Theory Mentorship)
65. students are still vulnerable to educators who do not keep up to date with the certification process, assessment of students is still uneven. – focused code

66. What was gained is a focus on concrete outcomes.
67. What was lost was dynamic demonstration of competencies with a group of peer educators with authorization to practice at stake
68. efficiency with way too many outcomes.
69. Gained - a more flexible schedule and individual mentors and theory writer support, and overall a more supportive relational process;
70. Lost - the number and variety of people who served regionally and nationally to support the process - very few opportunities to serve.
71. Lost: Broader connection with the Candidates as they go through Certification.
72. Gain-: CoP's for Certification have become strong
73. 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… we began to lose this.
74. students are still vulnerable to educators who do not keep up to date with the certification process
75. assessment of students is still uneven

Question 17 – Focused codes – Major theme groups
Cynthia – Previous and Current rather than old and new

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.

1. I think the new process does a better job of accompany a student through the process
    a. The current process is very relational and student centered
    b. I like that having to start all over from scratch when someone is not granted has gone away.
    c. In the current process, there are opportunities to review material before getting to an assessment point.
    d. Certainly some of the anxiety and frustration has been eliminated; I'm not yet sure if that is good or bad
    e. Gain-: CoPs for Certification have become strong
    f. I like the fact that everyone gets to know people across the organization not just a select few.
    g. More CEs are involved in a typical student's process, building in a stronger relational matrix amongst educators in the organizations

2. The process is more predictable, professional, anti-bias/subjective, developmental, collaborative
   a. Gained - a more flexible schedule and individual mentors and theory writer support, and overall a more supportive relational process
   b. It is better having clear competencies on which students need to demonstrate their work.
   c. What was gained is a focus on concrete outcomes.
   d. 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).
   e. Access to virtual peer groups supports minority students and students in geographically isolated centers
   f. The new process has more safeguards against forcing a student's theories to be expressed in Christian language
   g. New process is not as engaging but is far healthier for the CEC's.
   h. The new process is less abusive and less subjective.
   i. Newly minted CEs come out of the process much stronger in theory than they used to.
   j. 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.
   k. In the old system, too much responsibility given to the Commission to determine competencies without adequate relationship to evaluate in context
   l. 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.
   m. best has been less "old boys" systems and more collegiality
   n. takes away the shame of failing a committee in the former process where committee appearances had little to do with supervisory competence
   o. 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

3. A process that was intended to be more streamlined and "shorter" is now multi layered, complex, and drawn out.
   a. Overwhelming number of competencies CEC is required to demonstrate in writing
   b. The grids demand a lot from students - time and energy
   c. The new system has a better process but Phase 1 & Phase II grids are problematic; they are heavily determined by written abilities
   d. I'm currently working with a CEC and am baffled by the skill, task, demonstrating competence through writing emphasized throughout
   e. Competencies are not necessarily the best way to assess one's mettle as an educator
   f. efficiency with way too many outcomes

g. don't see any more people getting certified more quickly
h. It appears to be taking students EVEN longer than the old process did - which isn't a good thing
i. Taking even more time for CE certification
j. the competency structure seems arduous and has done the opposite of its intent which was to speed up the process
k. Previous Certification process was supportive of Regional nurturing of Candidates and their supervisors
l. Eliminating regions eliminated a significant socialization opportunity and certification committees were closer to the kind of open, interactive process that makes up CPE.
m. Regional certification work, in my view, increased members involvement with and advocacy for candidates
n. It was important to have SOS and other opportunities to meet folks who do not know the CEC so well.
o. Lost - the number and variety of people who served regionally and nationally to support the process - very few opportunities to serve.

4. We have lost some of the integrative strengths of the old process
    a. I fear we will turn out more "surgeon like/task oriented CE's than ones with good relational process skills
    b. Where is the interpersonal, experience/reflection, authenticity emphases so essential to adult transformational learning?
    c. The new process is less focused on interpersonal and more academic in approach
    d. meeting committee used to require integration that I am not currently seeing in the new process
    e. The educational theory behind the changes seems to favor transactional learning rather than transformational learning
    f. How are the new folks learning to navigate what is difficult? To navigate with strangers and their differences.
    g. What was lost was dynamic demonstration of competencies with a group of peer educators with authorization to practice at stake
    h. Now that outcomes and competencies have been pressed 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. 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.
    j. Seems very insular
    k. the go signal to appear depends on the mentor. a big work for the mentor.
    l. not enough meeting with the other CE when appearing
    m. There is no entry point for those of us who do not have CEC at our centers.

n. Unless you are supervising a CEC, the local CE's are not kept abreast of what is happening in the whole certification process
o. Dynamically, the certification process is now a transaction between ACPE - ATLANTA and the local individual and center
p. My sense is that each committee acts as a commission would have. Much more random
q. It is so painful to work within a national model of certification that is so disconnected from the learning I'm trying to facilitate with our CEC
r. the process is now more fastidious/onerous than engaging
s. I am an experienced certification committee member, and during the structural changes and afterwards, I have not once been consulted or invited to participate in the new certification process
t. Lost: Broader connection with the Candidates as they go through Certification
u. 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… we began to lose this.
v. Passing committee is sort of anti-climactic, since the student knows going in to the interview that they will pass.

5. Both systems are definitely flawed
   a. students are still vulnerable to educators who do not keep up to date with the certification process
   b. assessment of students is still uneven
   c. students are still vulnerable to educators who do not respond quickly (especially in Theory Mentorship)

6. some kinks that need to be worked out in the current process but that's what happens when a group is doing something new
   a. Educators' resistance to using the competencies forms means many students do not get the feedback on their work they deserve.
   b. Difficult for centers to commit more time up front before candidates are able to work with students.
   c. Cost prohibitive for centers.
   d. scheduling of the nodal interviews is sometimes really difficult with students having to wait a long time to meet an interview team
   e. I found it in some ways vague and confusing
   f. 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

Question 17 – Certification

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.
52 Responses to this question

Major Themes with representative quotes:

1. "The current process does a better job of accompanying a student through the process"
    a. "More CEs are involved in a typical student's process, building in a stronger relational matrix amongst educators in the organization;" e.g., "individual mentors and theory writer support."
    b. "CoPs for Certification have become strong."

2. "The [current] process is more predictable, professional, anti-bias/subjective, developmental, collaborative."
    a. "The competencies set the bar higher than the previous certification process did, more adequately preparing students for the actual work."
    b. "The new process has more safeguards against forcing a student's theories to be expressed in Christian language."

3. "We have lost some of the integrative strengths of the [previous] process."
    a. "The educational theory behind the changes seems to favor transactional learning rather than transformational learning."
    b. "What was lost was dynamic demonstration of competencies with a group of peer educators with authorization to practice at stake."

4. "The [current] process that was intended to be more streamlined and 'shorter' is now multi layered, complex, and drawn out."
    a. "The competency structure seems arduous and has done the opposite of its intent which was to speed up the process."
    b. "I'm currently working with a CEC and am baffled by the skill, task, demonstrating competence through writing emphasized throughout."

Q 18 – Open Codes - – text conveying important ideas

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

1. I think the process is fostering greater support for cultural, ethnic, racial and religious diversity. Focused code
2. I am not aware of any downsides at this point.

3. I don't mind the "new" process, but it does mean A LOT 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. – focused code
4. I much prefer the current process
5. 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. – focused code
6. 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. – focused code
7. The old process was essentially an interpersonal challenge. Could a SES 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 SES came through ready to participate in accreditation of a center; most passed if they could be good facilitating the committee) – focused code
8. 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.
9. old process dive in deeper in the personhood of the CEC.
10. New process just write what evidence was demonstrated
11. Lack of quality of Education in the new process
12. Old process was not perfect but it resulted in better quality of educators.
13. The local community nature of the old system typically involved S.E.S.s in longer term relationships integrating both practice reflection and theory development. This strengthened collegiality and interdependence
14. The new process is more collegial and transparent which is a positive development.
15. 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.
16. 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
17. The main benefit of the new process I see is that the CEC's 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
18. 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 firsthand ability to assess the competence of the CEC
19. 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.
20. The new process had difficulties in the first few years with working out of the 'phases' but seems to be better now.

21. 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. - Focused code

22. 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.

23. 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 – focused code

24. 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. – focused code

25. 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.

26. 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.

27. it doesn't appear to have greatly increased the successful navigation or time commitment of the certification process.

28. 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.

29. 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. – focused code

30. CPE training at all levels is getting more skill and external evidence-based and less personal/processional integration.

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

32. Concerned about how current candidates will learn the "art of supervision" as an educator.

33. Less clear what is "basic" level knowledge and skills needed, how to integrate new ways of providing spiritual care, how to "market" the discipline

34. The old process is too subjective in meeting the committee in my opinion, especially after all the work that entails getting to that point and being denied by five people you do not know.

35. The new process is incredibly cumbersome, and I find hard to understand, demand so much of the student and educator

36. 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?

37. After watching required videos on competency-based learning, our new student commented "this does not seem like CPE to me."

38. 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. – focused code

39. 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.

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

41. I like the new process because the bar for clinical competence is much higher than in the old process.

42. The competencies are quite interpersonal so those who say the soul of CPE is lost because we have competencies have not read the competencies.

43. 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.

44. Meeting committees regularly was a checks and balances on people lingering on when they should be leaving the educational process.

45. Meeting committees provided clarity and focus for the work that needs to be attended to. – focused code

46. I was a CEC who started in the old process and switched to the new one. This was a painful, negative experience… 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. – focused code

47. 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.

48. The new process is a good idea poorly executed. CECs are asked to write about things they don't even know yet.

49. The amount of materials needed to get entry is enormous with no guarantees of entry.

50. Now there are more out of pocket expenses for coaching, etc.

51. The new process makes it difficult to make administrators understand how the CEC uses time because they haven't been accepted into the program for quite awhile.

52. 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.

53. The new process is a "learn as you go" process, with details unexplained to primary training Educators, which makes CEs/CECs feel insecure - hindering durability in the supervisory relationship. – focused code

54. More open conversation with and seeking out of training educator's voices in the planning process would have been helpful.

55. I think the new process does a better job of accompany a student through the process

56. the competency structure seems arduous and has done the opposite of its intent which was to speed up the process.

57. The new certification process is much better in my opinion. It is more relational and more objective. I really like it.
58. I like the ability to progress at the student's pace, the support & consultation of three others in addition to the TCE.
59. I like a more objective, competency based vs a subjective, personality based committee approach.
60. While I like the competencies--there are too many, some redundancies, and many still presume a healthcare centric presumption.
61. 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.
62. It seems to require a lot more written work and is more akin to working with a doctoral committee.
63. 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.
64. There were a TON of negative issues with certification at the regional level--it did not serve us well for diversity, equity, and inclusion purposes. I think the national process for certification is better.
65. The new process was supposed to be easier. It is incredibly difficult and challenging and takes way too long.
66. So much is "uploaded" or locked in a portfolio that seems incredibly difficult to access.
67. There seems to be far more emphasis on content and outcomes and less on integration.
68. 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.
69. the new process requires greater advocacy and knowledge by the training educator.
70. I also have a concern that candidates who are diverse in some way are being accommodated and given passes while others are discouraged from even applying.
71. more writing of the work, than praxis/demonstration of the work.
72. 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.
73. I have experienced "group theory" deteriorate significantly between supervising CECs, in CEC cohort groups and in sub-committees for certification. – focused code
74. 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. – focused code
75. The new process is overly complex with too many competencies requiring paperwork rather than confrontation and processing regarding them.
76. It also requires too much time for primary educators in documentation and unnecessary presence.
77. 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.

78. 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. – focused code
79. 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.
80. In some ways, the CoP's developed for reviewing the entering person's work and development have been strong and effective.

Q 18 – Focused Codes

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

1. Attention to diversity has increased
   a. I think the process is fostering greater support for cultural, ethnic, racial and religious diversity.
   b. There were a TON of negative issues with certification at the regional level--it did not serve us well for diversity, equity, and inclusion purposes. I think the national process for certification is better.
   c. I have a concern that candidates who are diverse in some way are being accommodated and given passes while others are discouraged from even applying.

2. 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.
   a. I don't mind the "new" process, but it does mean A LOT 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.
   b. 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.
   c. it doesn't appear to have greatly increased the successful navigation or time commitment of the certification process.
   d. The new process is incredibly cumbersome, and I find hard to understand, demand so much of the student and educator
   e. the competency structure seems arduous and has done the opposite of its intent which was to speed up the process.

f. While I like the competencies--there are too many, some redundancies, and many still presume a healthcare centric presumption.

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

h. It also requires too much time for primary educators in documentation and unnecessary presence.

3. 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.

    a. 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

    b. 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.

    c. 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.

    d. The new process is more collegial and transparent which is a positive development.

    e. 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

    f. The main benefit of the new process I see is that the CEC's 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

    g. 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.

4. 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.

    a. 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.

b. 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.

c. I like the new process because the bar for clinical competence is much higher than in the old process.

d. The competencies are quite interpersonal so those who say the soul of CPE is lost because we have competencies have not read the competencies.

e. 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.

f. I think the new process does a better job of accompany a student through the process

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

h. The new certification process is much better in my opinion. It is more relational and more objective. I really like it.

i. I like the ability to progress at the student's pace, the support & consultation of three others in addition to the TCE.

j. I like a more objective, competency based vs a subjective, personality based committee approach.

k. 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.

l. the new process requires greater advocacy and knowledge by the training educator.

m. The old process was essentially an interpersonal challenge. Could a SES 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 SES came through ready to participate in accreditation of a center; most passed if they could be good facilitating the committee)

n. 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 firsthand ability to assess the competence of the CEC

o. 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.

p. GOOD thing about the new process is that it doesn't feel as "gamey."

q. 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.

r. The old process is too subjective in meeting the committee in my opinion, especially after all the work that entails getting to that point and being denied by five people you do not know.

5. CPE training at all levels is getting more skill and external evidence-based and less personal/processional integration.
    a. 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.
    b. We have lost a good bit of accountability for personal/professional integration in the new process that I hope we move to correct.
    c. Concerned about how current candidates will learn the "art of supervision" as an educator.
    d. After watching required videos on competency-based learning, our new student commented "this does not seem like CPE to me."
    e. There seems to be far more emphasis on content and outcomes and less on integration.
    f. There is more time devoted to reflecting on how to complete the grids than reflecting on and understanding their learning needs/issues as a developing CEC.
    g. Old process dive in deeper in the personhood of the CEC.
    h. New process just write what evidence was demonstrated
    i. Lack of quality of Education in the new process
    j. Old process was not perfect but it resulted in better quality of educators.
    k. 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?
    l. The focus on competencies ignores the in-depth soul-making supervision requires.
    m. 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.
    n. It seems to require a lot more written work and is more akin to working with a doctoral committee.
    o. More writing of the work, than praxis/demonstration of the work
    p. The new process is overly complex with too many competencies requiring paperwork rather than confrontation and processing regarding them.
    q. I have experienced "group theory" deteriorate significantly between supervising CECs, in CEC cohort groups and in sub-committees for certification.

6. The new process is a "learn as you go" process, with details unexplained to primary training Educators, which makes CEs/CECs feel insecure - hindering durability in the supervisory relationship.

a. I was a CEC who started in the old process and switched to the new one. This was a painful, negative experience… 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.

b. The new process had difficulties in the first few years with working out of the 'phases' but seems to be better now.

c. The new process is a good idea poorly executed. CECs are asked to write about things they don't even know yet.

d. The amount of materials needed to get entry is enormous with no guarantees of entry.

e. Now there are more out of pocket expenses for coaching, etc.

f. The new process makes it difficult to make administrators understand how the CEC uses time because they haven't been accepted into the program for quite awhile.

g. More open conversation with and seeking out of training educator's voices in the planning process would have been helpful.

h. 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.

i. 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.

j. So much is "uploaded" or locked in a portfolio that seems incredibly difficult to access.

k. 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.

7. The local community nature of the old system typically involved S.E.S.s in longer term relationships integrating both practice reflection and theory development. This strengthened collegiality and interdependence

a. 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.

b. 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.

c. 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.

    d. 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.

    e. Meeting committees provided clarity and focus for the work that needs to be attended to.

    f. Meeting committees regularly was a checks and balances on people lingering on when they should be leaving the educational process.

    g. 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.

    h. 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

Q18 – CEC – Major themes and supporting quotes

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

Quotes that best represent a theme are followed by quotes supporting that theme.

1. "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."

    a. "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."

    b. "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."

2. "Known relationships in this guided system are producing confident, capable Educators with less abusive behaviors by Educators who used to serve on Committees in the last two process models."

    a. "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."

b. "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."

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

4. "The new process is a 'learn as you go' process, with details unexplained to primary training Educators, which makes CEs/CECs feel insecure - hindering durability in the supervisory relationship."
    a. "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."
    b. "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."

Q 22 – Executive leadership

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

1. Benefit - good management overall
2. Benefit - good listening by some in Executive Leadership
3. Benefit - doesn't take away from needed educators in field.
4. Downside – sometimes significant educational questions are not considered.
5. 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. – focused code
6. 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?
7. Maybe those who are not certified can support those who are certified at the national office.

8. 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.
9. I think our executive leadership is excellent. They work hard to communicate well, and they are each good at what they do.
10. I would question the selection of themes for annual conference, which I have not found helpful in the last 3 years.
11. 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. – focused code
12. 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.
13. I have the lingering feeling of being misunderstood in the complex nature of the clinical work educators do. Misunderstood and hence unsupported and isolated. – focused code
14. The lack of a representative board compiled of regional representatives and having no clinician steering the boat in the office is problematic. – focused code
15. 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. – focused code
16. 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.
17. 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 re: the operational decision making regarding educational matters.
18. Having non-CE leadership is evident in the tone of the office operation - stories and experience with non-responsiveness.
19. Volunteer leaders defer to the staff in clinical education matters, which should be engaged by CEs.
20. 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.
21. I see advantages that there is a lot of collaboration with non-chaplaincy organizations.
22. They are helping ACPE move forward with professionalism. This is a huge benefit from my perspective. – focused code
23. 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. – focused code
24. I hope we avoid using "retired" CEs as the voice of Centers. We need to go forward and to augment our excellent organization.
25. 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...Having actual non-profit administrators running the administrative functioning of the ACPE has been a major improvement.

26. Most people don't remember that when (previous member of National staff) was running ACPE the organization was in ruins. Rose-colored glasses remember things a certain way.
27. 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.
28. 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).
29. I see few limitations to having no CE in the national office. CEs should be running CPE.
30. More innovation and clarity of educational outcomes.
31. There seem to be less sensitivity to process education.
32. 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.
33. Decreased understanding and valuing and sensitivity of our community.
34. Centralized organization could be good but there is no substitute for having a real person to work with CEs in their struggles and success.
35. Our work is about caring for people but centralizing with limited resources and people made the CE and center suffer from disconnection. it is like a corporation and purely business.
36. They don't have an inside look at the practice.
37. Cannot identify any benefits. The limitations are I no longer feel heard or appreciated for the work I do.
38. 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.
39. 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.
40. Not much sensus fidelium (sense of the faith on the part of the faithful – per Google!)
41. 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.
42. Easy answer - why fool with what was working fine?
43. 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.
44. 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 fie 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.

45. 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"… my fear is that, because the new processes that are so distanced and impersonal, is not really sped up the process of certification this long-term program will die a death that is unrecognized and uncared for by the administration in Georgia.

46. They do bring a business world view that many CEs may not be as in tune with especially if the CEs are in a small shop.

47. 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.

48. 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.

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

50. 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.

51. 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.

52. 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.

53. 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.

54. 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 centers 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 CEs who feel alone, isolated, and/or abandoned by the organization. I have heard multiple CEs express similar hopes for a CE to be on the national office staff.

55. 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.

56. 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).

57. I work less directly with Trace but have felt comfortable with him as a person of integrity when we have talked.

58. 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.

59. 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.

60. 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 it its day, but today's leadership is much more diverse than in the past and I am hopeful about the future.

61. provides a more objective professional perspective that protects from some idealization of ourselves.

62. 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.

63. 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.
64. 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.
65. 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.
66. There is a separation. It's basically men making decisions about women's health.
67. 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.
68. 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.
69. 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.
70. 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.
71. 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.
72. 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.
73. 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.
74. 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.
75. 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.

76. 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.
77. 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.
78. 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.
79. 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.
80. 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.
81. 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.
82. 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.
83. 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.
84. I think there are benefits because executive leaders have training and credentialing in leading large, complex nonprofit organizations with multiple layers of leadership.
85. 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.
86. 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.
87. 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.

88. I think the role of the Board, as far as I can tell, has become diminished in setting the direction of ACPE.
89. 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? – focused code
90. The top down communication makes me feel, at times, as though my perspective is not important, my opinion not valued.
91. 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.
92. 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.
93. 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.
94. 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).
95. 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.
96. I think having staff who are not CEs 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.
97. The current staff clearly understands that they do not make the decisions — that the decisions are made by the Board and commissions.
98. 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.

At this point, I moved to focused codes and will only add focused codes from the narrative data to this list going forward. A reminded: some of the focused codes identified here will have been moved to supporting quotes when another focused code seems better suited to describe a theme.

Q 22 – Executive leadership – focused codes or major theme groupings

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

1. 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.
   a. 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.
   b. 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.
   c. I think there are benefits because executive leaders have training and credentialing in leading large, complex nonprofit organizations with multiple layers of leadership.
   d. 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.
   e. 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...Having actual non-profit administrators running the administrative functioning of the ACPE has been a major improvement.
   f. I see few limitations to having no CE in the national office. CEs should be running CPE.
   g. 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.
   h. They do bring a business world view that many CEs may not be as in tune with especially if the CEs are in a small shop.
   i. 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 non-CE executive leaders if they are effective. I would have a problem with a CE as an executive leaders if they had limited experience outside of ACPE.
   j. 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.

k. 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.

l. 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).

m. 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.

n. I think having staff who are not CEs 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.

2. I have the lingering feeling of being misunderstood in the complex nature of the clinical work educators do. Misunderstood and hence unsupported and isolated.

a. Downside – sometimes significant educational questions are not considered

b. 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.

c. 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?

d. 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.

e. Maybe those who are not certified can support those who are certified at the national office.

f. 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.

g. Having non-CE leadership is evident in the tone of the office operation - stories and experience with non-responsiveness.

h. Decreased understanding and valuing and sensitivity of our community

i. Our work is about caring for people but centralizing with limited resources and people made the CE and center suffer from disconnection. it is like a corporation and purely business.

j. 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.

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

l. Not much sensus fidelium (sense of the faith on the part of the faithful – per Google)

m. Easy answer - why fool with what was working fine?

n. 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.

o. I have a problem with (an executive leader). 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.

p. 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.

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

r. 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.

s. 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.

t. 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.

u. 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.

v. 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.

w. The top down communication makes me feel, at times, as though my perspective is not important, my opinion not valued.

x. 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.

y.

3. 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.
   a. 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.
   b. 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 re: the operational decision making regarding educational matters.
   c. 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.
   d. 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.
   e. 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.
   f. 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.
   g. 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.
   h.
4. They are helping ACPE move forward with professionalism. This is a huge benefit from my perspective.
   a. 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.
   b. 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.
   c. Benefit - good management overall
   d. Benefit - good listening by some in Executive Leadership

e. Benefit - doesn't take away from needed educators in field
f. I think our executive leadership is excellent. They work hard to communicate well, and they are each good at what they do.
g. I see advantages that there is a lot of collaboration with non-chaplaincy organizations.
h. 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. 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).
j. More innovation and clarity of educational outcomes.
k. Provides a more objective professional perspective that protects from some idealization of ourselves.

5. 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.
   a. 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 centers 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 CEs who feel alone, isolated, and/or abandoned by the organization. I have heard multiple CEs express similar hopes for a CE to be on the national office staff.
   b. 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.
   c. 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.
   d. I would question the selection of themes for annual conference, which I have not found helpful in the last 3 years.
   e. 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.

f. I hope we avoid using "retired" CEs as the voice of Centers. We need to go forward and to augment our excellent organization.

g. There seems to be less sensitivity to process education.

h. Centralized organization could be good but there is no substitute for having a real person to work with CEs in their struggles and success.

i. The lack of a representative board compiled of regional representatives and having no clinician steering the boat in the office is problematic.

j. Volunteer leaders defer to the staff in clinical education matters, which should be engaged by CEs.

k. 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.

l. 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.

m. 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.

n. 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.

o. 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.

p. 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.

6. 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.

    a. 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.

    b. 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.

    c. Most people don't remember that when (previous member of National staff) was running ACPE, the organization was in ruins. Rose-colored glasses remember things a certain way.

    d. 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.

    e. 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).

    f. 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.

    g. 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 it its day, but today's leadership is much more diverse than in the past and I am hopeful about the future.

    h. 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.

    i. 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.

7. 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?
    a. I think the role of the Board, as far as I can tell, has become diminished in setting the direction of ACPE.
    b. 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 Director of Community, Practice, and Member Development 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.
    c. The current staff clearly understands that they do not make the decisions — that the decisions are made by the Board and commissions.
    d. 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.

Q22 – Executive Leadership Major Themes and Supporting Quotes

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

Quotes that best represent a theme (1 – 3) are followed by quotes supporting that theme; 4 is a theme drawn from 2 collapsed focused codes.

1. "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."
    a. "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...Having actual non-profit administrators running the administrative functioning of the ACPE has been a major improvement."

b. "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."

2. "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?"
   a. "The current staff clearly understands that they do not make the decisions — that the decisions are made by the Board and commissions."
   b. "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."

3. "I 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."
   a. "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 centers 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 CEs who feel alone, isolated, and/or abandoned by the organization. I have heard multiple CEs express similar hopes for a CE to be on the national office staff."
   b. "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."

4. Expressions of perceiving misunderstanding and disrespect by those in favor of and those with concerns about the current model of Executive Leadership
    a. "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."
    b. "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."