INTRODUCTION
AND
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In May 2014, the ACPE Board of Representatives commissioned the Organizational Design Work Group to address governance and structural questions facing the association. Rising competition from other organizations offering versions of CPE, legal and governance concerns about financial management and accountability, major changes in healthcare (some of which remain unsettled), and the rising international conversations are but a few of the challenges and opportunities to be addressed in a new structure.

A key early action by the ODWG was clarification on “who are we” as an organization. What do we stand for? How do we behave? The result of asking those questions was the development and adoption of a new mission, vision and set of values for ACPE. These statements serve as a guide to the work group and to all the proposed changes. They will serve as a guide going forward into the implementation of any revised structure for ACPE.

ACPE MISSION

A community of professionals committed to nurturing connections to the sacred through experiential, transformational education and spiritual care.

ACPE VISION

“The consistency and exceptional quality of experiential education provided by our association creates measurable and appreciable improvement in the spiritual health and transformation of people and communities in the US and across the globe.”

ACPE VALUES

Diversity and inclusion - demonstrated through cultural humility, attentiveness and collegiality.

Integrity - demonstrated through trust, respect and excellence.

Curiosity - demonstrated through listening, experiential models, innovation and creativity.

Process - demonstrated through action/reflection, listening, experiential and relational models.

Service - demonstrated through compassion, authenticity and growth.
Keeping the Mission, Vision and Values in mind, the Organizational Design Work Group developed a structure recommended to and accepted by the ACPE board. Keep in mind this is the “architect’s work.” This is the fundamental “what” for the program delivery and governance of ACPE. It is not the “how.”

If approved by the membership this moves to an implementation team. Think of the implementation team as the general contractors. This team will modify and adapt to best fit form and function together. This team will reach out for input and reflect on all the possibilities and requirements for each area, just as a general contractor has to deal with where and how large the electric, water, and other access when building.

**Key elements of the proposed new architecture:**

- The essential nature of membership involvement and inclusion is enhanced in this model. Members are members, be they supervisors, SES, clinical, interested party. Members serving in volunteer roles will have more responsibility and authority.

- The board of directors is elected by the membership at large in a contested election format. Individuals interested in serving will apply and be vetted through the new Leadership Development Committee. This committee will be charged with identifying and selecting individuals for the ballot using all dimensions of diversity and a competency matrix for the board.

- The board level of engagement is elevated, no longer receiving and ratifying actions, but investing in strategy and oversight. This puts the authority and the responsibility for action in the membership of the commissions and committees.

- There are new committees in the recommended model to build on the vision of exceptional education and transformation of people.

- There are fewer regions but fully open opportunities for communities of practice to form wherever there is interest or need. Communities of practice are not bound by the artificial boundaries of areas or regions. Areas are designated to facilitate delivery of services, not to pronounce where one can associate.

- A consolidated financial model is included to respond to the legal issues uncovered in the audit. The board will no longer have exposure to fiduciary liability. The consolidated model allows fundamental data processes to be centralized for efficiency and accuracy.

These are significant changes for ACPE. We have been blessed with growth and community through the structure established by our founders. The world has changed around us. This new structure, presented to all members with the recommendation of the board, positions ACPE for the next 25 years: enhancing member involvement, streamlining processes, focusing the board on strategy and improving connections with
centers, supervisors and members, creating the structure to be more flexible and nimble to respond to the multitude of challenges we face.
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Introduction

Every association on the planet was created for the same reason: A group of people discovered that there were some things of value and worth that they could do better together than alone…

Successful associations—those that consistently provide real value to their members over time—are guided by a culture of collective leadership that appreciates this distinguishing characteristic…. Successful associations are led by policy and strategy, not by the personality of the moment. They exhibit coherency in the pursuit of what really matters….

Coherency is not the same thing as rigidity; policy and strategy must always be kept in balance with nimbleness. Today’s associations operate in an environment of explosive change, increasing competition, and higher expectations from more diverse constituencies. The interplay of these external forces has heightened the historic tension volunteer leaders must navigate between flexibility and coherency. In such a competitive environment, effective organizations will take the fullest possible advantage of distinguishing attributes that are of particular value to those they serve. For associations, one of these distinguishing attributes is a special ability to pursue high-level, worthy outcomes that can only be accomplished through consistent and organized attention over time.

—Glenn Tecker, “Sustaining Association Success that Matters”

In 1967, a group of visionary CPE leaders crafted the organization we know and love today. The world in which we now work has changed dramatically in these 50 years. In fact, there is little we can think of that has not changed. The need for spiritual care may be greater than ever. The places in which we teach and practice, the community of practitioners, and the technology have altered learning and affected our locations of clinical practice in ways we could not imagine in 1967.

What that means is that ACPE today is a valuable resource and connection for many. The work of our supervisors has a significant impact in so many areas: theological education, healthcare, and society at large. Our students find the education process transformational, no matter the area of practice they pursue. The dedication, deep loyalty, and commitment to lifelong learning demonstrate a quality of professionalism that continues to keep ACPE as the model for clinical pastoral education.

The changes in our environment mean we need to anticipate changes coming our way and position the organization for the future. Our business model was crafted before computers were considered essential tools and before interstate banking was legal. The ACPE Organizational Design Work Group believes there are areas of opportunity that a new structure can help ACPE take advantage of.

Through the input of ACPE members in response to surveys, conversations at meetings and other feedback identified the things we need to consider as we look at reshaping the ACPE for the future.

---

Process and key member concerns

In the fall of 2014, a task force was formed – the Organizational Design Work Group (ODWG) – to lead the membership through the process. The ODWG is chaired by David Carl, and the members include Carlos Bell, Jasper Keith, Dick Haines, Amanda Jones, Barbara Bullock, and Peter Yuichi Clark. Trace Haythorn has served as staff support.

The following spring (May 2015), the ACPE Board of Representatives, utilizing a competitive bidding process, selected Tecker International to help lead us through a reorganization process. Donna Dunn, CAE, is leading this effort for Tecker.

The process began with an online survey in the summer of 2015. In the months that followed, regions engaged in facilitated conversations to identify the critical issues and opportunities before the ACPE.

Critical Member Issues

**Strengthen recognition of ACPE accreditation and certification**
Members were clear about the value of our accredited centers and our certification of educators and practitioners. Is there a way that our structure can spread the news of that value and help all our members and students be seen as the essential contributors to care that we know they are? One thing we do know from other organizations is that strong accreditation and certification programs have a national/headquarters component that coordinates all the pieces that make these programs successful.

Service delivery may happen in many ways. Coordination of things like banking means efficient use of resources and stronger support for our individual and collective success.

**Support essential relationships and local connections**
The connections you have with each other and with new practitioners, students and centers, are essential to your work and practice. What do we need to meet the opportunities and possibilities in the coming years? How can we be structured to make certain that local connections and networks remain?

**Take advantage of technology**
In 1967, the idea of video conference calls were the stuff of science fiction. Today, they are part of how we do business. Looking at structure means thinking about how such tools – and tools we have not even imagined yet, might change the way we work and learn, and change the structure for ACPE. Technology has already affected staffing and support for ACPE centers and members. That will continue.

**Seize new opportunities**
ACPE regularly receives inquiries about emerging opportunities: international expansion, collaboration, requests for service. We need to have a structure that helps us take advantage of these opportunities where appropriate; that allows for efficient, but thorough, decision-making; that allows us to pilot new programs; and that provides for flexibility in staffing and support.

**Engage each succeeding generation**
We all have been in conversations around generational changes. While we are focused in the near term with retiring baby boomers and the influx of the millennials, there will always be “the next generation.” Whatever structure ACPE takes, the ways people work and will work, the levels of engagement and places of engagement, all must be considered to position ACPE for the next 25 years.

Our conversations and work about ACPE’s structure is about the future. How are we structured and positioned for the years to come? Any challenges or problems we have today will be sorted out as we build for tomorrow.

It is important to note that at each step in the process the synthesized data and the raw data was made available on acpe.edu.

The ODWG synthesized the data and presented this first step to the Board of Representatives for their consideration at their November 2015 meeting. The conversations about the data led the Board to think carefully about the ACPE mission and core values and to update our “core ideology,” i.e. our purpose, mission and values statements. This framework now guides the work forward and is the leading set of statements in this document.

The critical step in the process occurred at the ACPE national meeting in Denver in May 2016, where almost 500 people gathered (450 in person; 50 via video) to develop, critique and redevelop models for consideration. Led by Donna Dunn and Glenn Tecker, 50 tables each developed models, made arguments for their strengths, and passed on their best ideas to the ODWG. After a day of work, the ODWG convened to consider the 50 models. Using the data from the process as the lens for review, five models were chosen to bring back to the body. The next morning, the 50 tables reconvened and provided input on the advantages and disadvantages of each of the five models. Through a vote the assembled narrowed the results to three possible rough designs. The ODWG met at the conclusion of the conference to clarify and enhance all three models, again using the data collected up to this point.

The three models were then sent to the membership in a survey, with instructions to describe the advantages and disadvantages of each model. The three models were a further vehicle through which the ODWG could learn from the wisdom of our membership. All feedback over this two-year process fed into the discernment process regarding a proposed model.
Principles of the Organizational Design Work Group

We are an association: Merriam-Webster defines an association as “an organized group of people who have the same interest, job, etc.” ACPE is so much more. We are colleagues who have shared our celebrations, our struggles, our growth, and our pain with one another. We often share bonds as deep as families and as complex. We “associate” not simply because we like to gather together, but because we cannot be who we are and do what we do without one another.

As an association, we are also shaped by an organizational structure. While we are educators, we are different from educational institutions. While we are a not-for-profit, we are different from nonprofit institutions. And while we are an association, we are specifically a professional organization, making us part of a unique category.

As an association, we have a business model. Unlike most businesses, our customers, stakeholders and investors are all from the same constituencies: “Associations are unique because they are like a triple-helix DNA composed of three intertwined threads—members as owners, members as customers, and members as workforce…. Experience shows that member leaders are willing to alter the balance among the threads only when they are comfortable that their interests are being served by the alteration.”

Throughout our work, we were aware that we have been following in the footsteps of others who have tried to redesign the ACPE. Because of the feelings and memories related to those processes, a core principle for our work has been to engage inductively. We did not formulate an idea and simply hand it to the organization. We spent two years inviting feedback, listening to our colleagues, and working to make sure our proposal captured the major themes, concerns, hopes and dreams of the membership. Quite simply, transparency, open-ended and two-way communication, and active solicitation of feedback from membership were key to our process.

For the last 50 years, we have done amazing work. In the last two decades, technology, healthcare, theological education, and educational theory have changed dramatically. When ACPE began we were the only accrediting and certifying body for clinical pastoral education. Today, we are one of at least 15 organizations, many of whom offer programs of questionable quality at best. To continue to provide the level of quality as well as professional support and development, we need to restructure our organization to take advantage of the opportunities ahead of us.

---

Summary of the Data Analysis

The following represents a qualitative analysis of the data received by the ODWG to this point. This includes the surveys, regional meeting discussions, and responses to the draft models. Through all of these comment opportunities it is clear that there is a passion for ACPE among the members.

Key themes

Power and trust: The theme of power and trust runs throughout all member input. Be it spoken, unspoken, direct or implied, there is clearly a lack of trust. Who has power, how is it embedded in the structure, and what checks and balances are in place? For an organization focused on spiritual health, this is a challenge to our organizational health.

Nimbleness and efficiency: Many have concerns that our association is not nimble and/or efficient enough to respond to opportunities and challenges; others fear such a structure eliminates the grassroots history that has served ACPE for so many years. This tension can be a positive for organizational action or a drag on organizational effectiveness.

Relationships and loyalty: There is a palpable commitment to relationship and loyalty to peers. Our people love our people, and our people love to be with our people. Whatever structural changes are made, opportunity must be given to meaningful convening at the local level for years to come.

Value of all stakeholders: There is a tension between the knowledge and ownership that supervisors have of ACPE and the recognition of the value of other stakeholders in providing leadership (e.g. SES, clinical members, healthcare administrators/leaders, legal and business advisors, et al.). Earned or unearned, there is a sense that supervisors own the organization and all other stakeholders are of lesser value.

Concern about regions: Uncertainty in how regions or their successor structures would be organized are of concern. Also of concern is how national and regional entities would interact. The key issue is about maintaining and enhancing connections. (Note: this “how” will necessarily be addressed in implementation).

Fear: There is a prevalent fear of change. This fear is reflected in comments and directly relates to the power and trust issue at the start of this discussion. Who has power and how power will be exercised? How much of a member-driven organization will ACPE be with structural change? There is a fear around who is in control and who should be in control.

Centralization: The tension between the positives and negatives of centralization were expressed clearly. Efficiency of central business activities and local control. Can there be business activities that allow ACPE to continue as a movement?

Board composition and identity: Strong interest in a board that includes both representation and expertise/competencies. Essential need for clarity about board responsibilities. There are concerns about how members select/elect members of the board.

As a coda, we offer a balancing insight regarding the fear named above, quoting one of our supervisory colleagues:
Basically, I trust us to work for integrity and justice in how we certify and accredit. That implicitly means the on-going process of evaluating who we are, what we do, and how we do it. So I don’t want for ACPE as an organization to overreact to changes we make in those areas. If something we try doesn’t work, we try something else. We’re good at that. Right? I look forward to the future of ACPE.

Those words resonate as an affirmation that, if we choose a governance path and it later appears that we need to change course, we can summon the courage and creativity to do so.

Finally, an undercurrent of the central theme is a shared understanding that the core of ACPE’s identity is education. Whatever form the governance and program models take must keep that at the center, as it is the value we bring to the larger world of religious leadership and chaplaincy more specifically.
A Model for ACPE’s Future
The Elements of the Governance Structure

This is the “architectural design” proposed for ACPE. This forms the structure. The “how” of implementation offers opportunities for modification to the details presented in the following items. The implementation team will solicit input and comment upon approval of the governance structure by vote of the membership.

Where the composition and selection section notes appointment by the board, this continue current process with recommendations coming from the committee and commission for acceptance/approval by the board. Final numbers for each body will depend on the feedback of members and the work of the implementation group.

The Board of Directors:
- **Number** of Board Members: Three officers: President, president-elect, secretary/treasurer. Maximum of nine directors-at-large. Minimum of six directors-at-large.
- **Composition and Selection** of Board Members: Three-year terms for the directors. Two or three elected annually. Secretary/treasurer serves a three-year term. President-elect succeeds to president. Directors-at-large may be nominated for one additional term with no possibility for reappointment after no less than five years after last board service. Secretary/treasurer may be nominated for one additional term. President-elect/president may not have an additional term. A call for interest will be sent to all ACPE members by the Leadership Development Committee. The committee must identify at least two candidates for each open position who meet competency criteria, taking into account all dimensions of diversity. Candidates must be members in good standing of ACPE. All members are eligible to vote for the candidates of their choice using a virtual election process.
- **Meeting Schedule**: No less than two face-to-face meetings annually; two or more virtual meetings annually.

Leadership Development Committee:
- **Number** of Committee Members: Six members plus the Board’s immediate past president.
- **Composition and Selection** of Committee Members: Each year the Board will appoint one member for a three-year term. The Leadership Development Committee will identify two candidates for a contested election for one three-year term on the Leadership Development Committee with no possibility for reappointment for no less than five years. All candidates must be members in good standing of ACPE. Leadership Development Committee selects its own chair.
- **Responsibilities**: Annually solicit nominations (by colleagues or self-appointment) towards creating a slate of candidates for contested (i.e. more than one individual for each office when interest and qualifications permit) elections both for the Board of Directors and the Leadership Development Committee. Must take into account competencies needed for the Board and for the Leadership Development Committee. Must take into account all dimensions of diversity to enhance discourse, knowledge and decision-making. Initiates and provides direction to leadership development programs and education. Note: This is a standing committee of the Board.

---

3 Definition: Members in good standing have not been subjected to a competency review in the last three years, are not currently involved as a respondent in an ethics matter, and are current in their dues and related membership criteria.
• **Meeting Schedule**: No less than four meetings, all of which may be virtual.

**Finance/Audit Committee**:
- **Number of Committee Members**: 5 with the secretary/treasurer as chair.
- **Composition and Selection of Members**: Appointment is by the Board. Two members must be ACPE members; others may or may not be ACPE members to meet needs of the association; any ACPE members must be in good standing. Two individuals are appointed for three-year terms in years A and B. In year C a single individual is appointed to a 3-year term.
- **Responsibilities**: Review monthly financial reports. Develop annual budget with staff for presentation to the Board. Select audit firm with input from staff. Review audit prior to Board review. Note: This is a standing committee of the Board.
- **Meeting Schedule**: Quarterly by conference call or virtual meetings unless otherwise required by the work.

**Commissions and Committees**:
A Commission functions with a great deal of autonomy. Its actions are directed by its Board-defined mandate. Commissions are included in the Bylaws. A Committee serves as directed by the Board of Directors to advance the mission of the Association in particular ways as needed. With the exceptions of the Leadership Development Committee and the Finance/Audit Committee, the Board may create, dissolve or reconfigure committees as needed. Committees are included in the Governance Manual.

**Accreditation Commission**:
- **Number of Commissioners**: 15 including a chair and vice chair/chair-elect.
- **Composition and Selection of Commissioners**: Appointment is by the Board. Members must demonstrate specific competencies (to be determined). Each member except the chair and vice chair have three one-year terms with potential for renewal for an additional three one-year terms. Four new members appointed each year. Vice chair is selected every other year and succeeds the chair. Vice chair and chair are two-year positions equaling a four-year commitment with no possibility for reappointment for no less than five years. Must be ACPE members in good standing.
- **Responsibility**: Vote on all accreditation membership actions. Recommend policy. Conduct, with local volunteer teams, accreditation reviews and accredit new centers. Maintain USDE recognition and other accreditation-related affiliations when directed by the Board of Directors.
- **Meeting Schedule**: Twice per year face to face. Work may be conducted by sub-groups or volunteers meeting as necessary to achieve the outcome assigned.

**Certification Commission**:
- **Number of Commissioners**: 15 including a chair and vice chair/chair-elect.
- **Composition and Selection of Commissioners**: Appointment is by the Board. Members must demonstrate specific competencies (to be determined). Each member except the chair and vice chair have three one-year terms with potential for renewal for an additional three one-year terms. Four new members appointed each year. Vice chair is selected every other year and succeeds the chair. Vice chair and chair are two-year positions equaling a four-year commitment with no possibility for reappointment for no less than five years. Must be ACPE members in good standing.
- **Responsibility**: Oversee and administer all certification activities, including but not limited to the education of new supervisors, theory paper assessment, appeals of certification decisions (in cooperation with appropriate representatives from other bodies per manual processes), and review and development of standards (per Board approval).
• **Meeting Schedule**: Twice per year face to face. Work may be conducted by sub-groups or volunteers meeting as necessary to achieve the outcome assigned.

**Professional Ethics Commission:**
- **Number** of Commissioners: 11 including a chair and vice chair/chair-elect
- **Composition and Selection** of Commissioners: Appointment is by the Board. Two or three members appointed each year for a five-year term with no possibility for reappointment other than as the chair for no less than five years. Chair serves a two-year term. Must be ACPE members in good standing.
- **Responsibility**: Conduct all ethics reviews in collaboration with the executive director, including but not limited to review and adjudication of cases, review of annual self-reporting process, development and maintenance of standards, review of joint process with cognate partners, and education of members regarding professional ethical standards.
- **Meeting Schedule**: Up to two face-to-face meetings per year. All other meetings are based on the requirements of reviews and complaints. Any other meetings must include visual contact (e.g., video conferencing).

**Research Committee:**
- **Number** of Committee Members: 11 including a chair and vice chair.
- **Composition and Selection** of Members: Appointment is by the Board. Three individuals are appointed each year to three one-year terms. The individual may be appointed to an additional three one-year terms. The vice chair is selected annually and serves for two years. The vice chair becomes the chair and serves a two-year term equaling a four-year commitment. Must be ACPE members in good standing.
- **Responsibility**: Responsible for identifying and collaboratively conducting essential research to advance ACPE and the practice of CPE and spiritual health education.
- **Meeting Schedule**: Twice per year face-to-face. Work may be conducted by smaller sub-groups meeting virtually.

**Curriculum Committee:**
- **Number** of Committee Members: 11 including a chair and vice chair.
- **Composition and Selection** of Members: Appointment is by the Board. ACPE members must be in good standing. May include experts outside of ACPE. Three individuals appointed annually for three-year terms. The chair is appointed for a for two-year term. The vice chair is appointed bi-annually and succeeds the chair, equaling a 4-year appointment.
- **Responsibilities**: Develop collaboratively with instructional design experts and others essential curriculum for Level I and Level II. Build consistency in education/instruction processes. Provide models for assessment as well as curricular tools to support educators across the association.
- **Meeting Schedule**: Twice per year face-to-face. Work may be conducted by smaller sub-groups meeting virtually.

**Professional Well-Being Committee:**
- **Number** of Committee Members: 11 including a chair and vice chair.
- **Composition and Selection** of Members: Appointment is by the Board. Three individuals are appointed for three one-year consecutive terms. The individual may be reappointed for an additional three one-year terms. The vice chair is appointed annually and succeeds the chair equaling a two-year appointment. Must be ACPE members in good standing.
- **Responsibilities**: Develop, collaboratively with staff and volunteers, new programs to engage current members and alumni in the work of spiritual health and personal growth. Includes both
the care of educators and those educated by caring for existing programs and creating new ones. Provides oversight for peer review.

- **Meeting Schedule:** Twice per year face-to-face. Work may be conducted virtually as needed or may be conducted by smaller sub-groups meeting virtually.

**Advocacy Committee:**
- **Number of Committee Members:** 7 including a chair and vice chair/chair-elect.
- **Composition and Selection of Members:** Appointed by the board. Must be members in good standing of ACPE. Two individuals appointed each year for three year terms. May be reappointed for an additional three-year term. Individuals representing particular areas of expertise may be added or included in an ex-officio capacity as needed.
- **Responsibilities:** Identify and determine strategies to address issues affecting spiritual health care in all settings. Coordinate with staff advocacy within Centers, with governmental entities, and among professional partners.
- **Meeting Schedule:** Face-to-face once per year. Virtually as needed for advancement of action on issues.

**What about Standards?**
For many years, Standards has served as the structural place where all standards for the organization have been developed and revised through the association's manuals; however, feedback from several respondents noted how ill-defined the role of Standards has been in terms of function. In practice, the three Commissions - Accreditation, Certification, and Professional Ethics - have taken responsibility for generating the standards related to their work. An ad hoc committee has borne responsibility for revising manuals. This proposal assumes that this practice will continue. The Curriculum Committee will be responsible for standards for Level 1 and Level 2 education as well as curricular tools, assessment, and outcomes.
Geographic Structure
The ODWG recommends six program delivery areas comprised of local communities of practice. The following map indicates a possible alignment of areas based on where current members and centers are located; the geographic distribution and staffing requirements to support members; the areas for greatest potential growth. Final borders/boundaries will be determined by the implementation group based on member feedback and Board approval.

Under this possible alignment (final alignment to be determined during the implementation process) the emphasis in the two western areas will be the support of existing programs, the development of new programs as well as strategies for convening those who are so disparately located. The emphasis in the southern areas will be the support of existing programs as well as expansion to new contexts. The emphasis in the northern areas will be the support of existing programs and engagement with the significant number of retired supervisors (twice as many as any other area).
The work of each area will be accreditation, certification, and professional development/education. The details of these functions will be developed with the Certification Implementation Work Group and the Accreditation Task Force. For example, the Certification-Professional Development proposal that has been approved assumes that much of the work of Certification will happen at a much more local level. We will no longer need a 35-member national Certification Commission. This also assumes that the current regional governance structure will be transitioned into education and program-oriented local communities of practice in concert with the Certification Implementation team. Three administrators will be hired to oversee the activities of the areas, each staff member taking responsibility for two areas. The details of these changes will be worked out by the implementation committee.

We will eventually develop a strategy for international programs. In the short run, international programs will be developed and managed by the ACPE national office in coordination with the Certification and Accreditation Commissions.

The Organizational Design Work Group also recommends the opportunity for the establishment of local communities of practice. These local groups will be formed around interests, geography, areas of practice, golf or whatever connects ACPE members. They will not require formal approval or formal structure. These communities of practice are not restricted by the boundaries of the recommended six areas of program/service delivery. The Implementation Work Group is tasked with creating the mechanisms and means for these groups to operate independently to build connections and relationships.

Financial Structure
The ODWG recommends the development and implementation of a consolidated budget, bringing all existing regional financial matters to the national office. This recommendation is based on analysis from our auditor and in recognition of the tools and significant changes in nonprofit financial law that have occurred in recent years. Two key issues are addressed in this recommendation: assurance that membership dues and Center fees are managed transparently and in compliance with best accounting, legal and fiscal practices, and enhancing the board’s ability to fulfill their fiduciary duty as it applies to financial resources.

This move will include the following:
• Creation of a national budget that encompasses the work of all geographic areas;
• Standardizing student unit fees to allow for single billing of all centers;
• Consolidation of all cash reserves and investments to reduce the overall costs of financial management;
• Management of all reimbursements for travel, conferencing, and business meetings through the national office;
• Unified support of travel, meetings, accreditation, certification, and other activities of the ACPE, including area-based educational and networking events.

The national office will provide additional staffing to take on these responsibilities. Our in-house CPA has designed a process for merging the current 10 budgets (i.e. 9 regions and the national budget) into a single budget. A conservative estimate of the anticipated annual cost savings for this consolidation is $220,000.
This Proposal Is a Beginning, A Commitment to Proactive Change

The structural recommendations set forth are the result of the input of all ACPE members who responded to surveys, attended and interacted at regional meetings, participated in the ACPE Design Summit in Denver, and responded to the draft models. The Organizational Design Work Group took all of that information, and the passion for ACPE it represents, and created a structure to move ACPE into the future.

The ACPE Organizational Design Work Group wants you to know what will happen should the membership reject the proposed changes. This is to be clear about the outcome of the choice made by your vote.

In reality, the alternative to this proposal is not a return to the status quo. While we fully expect elements of this proposal to undergo changes in the coming months and especially in its implementation, we are also clear that we must be proactive about the changes we need as an organization. The current structure will not be allowed to exist not because of ACPE, but because of external forces. There are changes ACPE must address because of significant financial liabilities, federal labor laws, and competition from other organizations.

The regional directors are now paid from the national office and will, over time, be required to become full employees of the national office. That will change the relationship of the RDs to the regions and the regional boards.

The funds that are held by the regions actually belong to ACPE, the national entity, not to the regions. The ACPE auditor made that abundantly clear. There is significant liability for ACPE to not have those funds consolidated and well managed. This liability belongs to the ACPE Board of Representatives. They hold the fiduciary obligation to protect association resources. Any exposure to financial risk – for example, having funds in a local bank that are not FDIC insured – are the responsibility of the national Board.

Those two areas are the legal reasons that the current structure of ACPE cannot continue. The less direct reason is that, based on the evaluation of similar organizations providing certification and accreditation, the lack of a central governing structure with unified programs and program delivery results in the slow demise of the organization. Those organizations that do not change have made the choice to fade away. It may not seem possible for ACPE, but it has been the fate of many other organizations: Fade away or “be merged” into better funded, larger organizations. Based on the amount of competition ACPE faces, that fate is more than possible.

Be assured, while we expect robust comment from the membership, the ACPE Board will implement the changes that will advance the mission of the organization, embracing the future and the opportunities it holds for our shared work. The ODWG believes it is critical that all are informed about the implications for our association should we not take decisive steps to address these issues.
Recommended Timeline for Implementation

➢ September 1, 2016: Members will receive electronically the Model, the revised Bylaws, and the ODWG report to the Board of Representatives (including any changes required by the Board) for electronic comments.

➢ October 21, 2016: Comment period closes.

➢ November 7-9, 2016: ACPE hosts a virtual meeting of members for voting on the Bylaws, officers and a 2017 revenue budget.

Pending approval by the membership:

➢ November 15, 2016: Board President appoints an Organizational Redesign Implementation Group.

➢ December 1, 2016: Financial consolidation process begins with invoicing of Centers and membership dues renewals.

➢ December 2016-December 2017: Implementation

➢ December 31, 2017: Implementation process complete.

Conclusion

When ACPE was formed in 1967, the association was not only the gold standard but was essentially the only provider of clinical pastoral education (CPE) in the United States. So much has changed since that first General Assembly:

• Today, we have identified as many as 15 different organizations providing a wide variety of CPE options.
• When we were formed, we did not have the technological resources that allow us to video conference, to provide webinars, and to make all of our materials available digitally.
• We could not even engage in interstate banking, thus necessitating regional and sub-regional financial management.
• When we were formed, administrators in the many contexts in which our members serve expected professionals to attend association meetings, supported service in organizational governance, and funded travel. Unfortunately, those days are mostly gone.
• The distribution of Centers and educators has changed dramatically since the regions were first conceived.
• The rapid changes in healthcare in particular and society at large require a nimble and proactive governance structure that allows our members to shape the future and their contexts, not simply respond to them.

While we have engaged in an intentional process for almost two years, discussions about these kinds of changes have been taking place for decades. It is time for ACPE to claim a new model that allows our members to do their best work and to be supported in that work by professional staff. We need a model that will provide the kinds of ongoing educational opportunities that feed the souls of our members while also recognizing the financial constraints of this profession. And amidst the cacophony of CPE models, we need a structure that allows us to continue to demonstrate to all of our stakeholders that ACPE CPE is the gold standard and will be for decades to come.