

Experience of Nontenured, Tenure-Track Faculty and Gatekeeping: A Qualitative Research Study

Meghan Butler
Marquette University

Recommended Citation

Butler, Meghan, "Experience of Nontenured, Tenure-Track Faculty and Gatekeeping: A Qualitative Research Study" (2017).
Dissertations (2009 -). 728.
http://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/728

EXPERIENCE OF NONTENURED, TENURE-TRACK
FACULTY AND GATEKEEPING:
A QUALITATIVE RESEARCH STUDY

by

Meghan Butler, MA

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, WI

August 2017

ABSTRACT
EXPERIENCE OF NONTENURED, TENURE-TRACK
FACULTY AND GATEKEEPING:
A QUALITATIVE RESEARCH STUDY

Meghan Butler, MA

Marquette University, 2017

Using a consensual qualitative research (CQR) approach, this study investigated the experience of nontenured, tenure track faculty (NTTTF) members involved in gatekeeping with students for non-academic concerns from American Psychological Association (APA)- and The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)-accredited programs. The study investigated the emotional and cognitive reactions, factors supportive/facilitative and discouraging/hindering of the decision to intervene, the impact the gatekeeping process had on NTTTF relationships and what the NTTTF learned from the gatekeeping intervention.

Participants were five female faculty members. Results indicated participants had little to no training in gatekeeping beyond informal training from mentors/colleagues, but suggested that faculty should receive a fact-based training/orientation and be provided with mentoring. The NTTTF cared for the gatekept student's wellbeing, but the student rejected the relationship. Supportive/facilitative factors for the faculty in intervening were a) support offered by other faculty; b) support sought from mentors; c) a sense of responsibility to protect future clients and the profession; d) confidence in their own experience, competence and evidence; and e) concern for the student. Hindering/discouraging factors were a) experience of negative affect, self-doubt, or anxiety; b) lack of support or engagement from other faculty members; c) lack of support from University officials; d) and departmental policies and procedures. Professionally, participants lost time and energy for publication and other professional responsibilities during the gatekeeping experience. After the intervention, they are faster to intervene with concerns, have more conversations with students about gatekeeping prior to problems, and are seen as the "go-to" faculty in their department for future gatekeeping and policy development. The intervention led to increased trust and connection with other faculty, increased communication and partnership with support staff, and increased stress in family relationships. Other students in participants' programs had questions about enforcement of training/professional standards related to the gatekept student. Results' relationship to Social Cognitive Career Theory are investigated. Implications for training and practice, as well as future directions for research, are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Meghan Butler, MA

To Dr. Knox – Thank you for your mentorship in research, and for guiding me in how to better explain what I find to others.

To Graham and Phil – Your time and talents were invaluable to this project. Thank you for your flexibility, dedication, and humor.

To Paul and Lisa – Thank you for the solid foundation I have in this field, and for the example you set that sparked this research endeavor. Your mentorship challenged me to grow, and put wind in my sails. I am grateful for the path it launched for me. My heart as a clinician will always be a Zag.

To Opal, Julie, and Anita – Your friendship and love has been a source of strength and consolation. There are so many things about our friendship that I am grateful for, but I know for sure that this dissertation would not have been completed without you. I am blessed to have such amazing women in my life.

To my family – thank you for everything. I am who I am, and can do what I do, because of your unwavering support and love for this bookworm. Mom and Dad - you have made all of this possible, in every way possible. There are no words that will ever accurately capture my gratitude and love. Brendan and Caitlin – I promise this is the last graduation you will have to sit through. I love you both immensely.

I do not know why I have been lucky enough to have all of you in my life, but it has been an honor, pleasure, and my significant blessing to have done so. Thank you.

And to the participants who shared their time and experiences with me – I hope I have done you justice.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

TABLE 1: GATEKEEPING TRAINING	80
TABLE 2: GATEKEEPING FOR NON-ACADEMIC CONCERN EVENT	92
TABLE 3: CLOSING REFLECTIONS	96

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	ii
 CHAPTERS	
I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Key Term Definitions	2
Gatekeeping	2
Competence.....	2
Gateslippage.....	2
Nontenured, Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTTF).....	3
Non-academic concerns	3
Problematic students	3
Study Rationale	4
Research Questions	5
II: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
Ethical Mandate	7
Prevalence	9
Identification of concerns.	9
Types of concerns.	17

Importance of identification.....	20
Gatekeeping Uncertainty and NTTTTF	24
Models of Gatekeeping.....	28
NTTTF implementation of gatekeeping models.....	33
Remediation	36
Interventions.	38
Dismissal.....	41
Impact of Gateslippage	48
Multicultural Considerations	49
Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT).....	52
Mechanisms of agency.....	53
Adaptive career behaviors.....	55
Conclusion and Recommendations.....	57
III: METHOD	59
Description of CQR	59
Study Procedures	63
Project development.....	63
Inclusion criteria.	63
Protocol development and pilot interviews.....	65
Research team.	66

Addressing bias	67
Addressing power dynamics	68
Recruitment	69
Data collection	72
Data analysis and interpretation.....	73
IV: RESULTS.....	76
Demographics	76
Participants.....	76
Students.....	78
Gatekeeping Training.....	78
Received.....	79
Suggested.....	79
Gatekeeping for Non-Academic Concerns	81
Nature of gatekeeping concern.	81
How brought to participant’s awareness.....	82
Gatekeeping intervention process.	83
Closing Reflections.....	94
General thoughts.	94
Why participated.....	95
Experience of interview	95

Illustrative Example	96
V: DISCUSSION	101
Training.....	102
Gatekeeping for Non-Academic Concern Event	104
Nature of gatekeeping concern	104
How brought to participant’s awareness.....	106
Gatekeeping intervention process.....	107
Actions/Timeline.....	108
Supportive/facilitative and hindering/discouraging factors.....	109
Impact of intervention on NTTTF.....	115
Impact on other students	118
Closing Reflections.....	118
Limitations	119
Implications for Training and Practice	121
Training.....	121
Professional practice	125
Implications for Research	127
Conclusions.....	128
REFERENCES	130
APPENDIX A: Letter to Potential Participants	140

APPENDIX B: Protocol	142
APPENDIX C: Informed Consent	144
APPENDIX D: Demographic Form	146
APPENDIX E: Recruitment E-mail.....	148
APPENDIX F: Feedback Letter.....	150

I: Introduction

Gatekeeping is an ethical responsibility for all involved in the training of mental health professionals (American Counseling Association [ACA], 2005; American Psychological Association [APA], 2010). It is a responsibility to safeguard from entry into the profession individuals who would present a danger to the general public in the delivery of clinical work. While those involved in delivering training may include a range of professionals (e.g., supervisors, faculty), this study will focus on the gatekeeping responsibility of faculty members, and specifically nontenured, tenure-track faculty (NTTTF). While extant literature has focused on gatekeeping theory and models, little has focused on the actual experience of the faculty members who are charged with executing this responsibility. In addition, no literature could be located that explored the intersection of gatekeeping and the unique experiences NTTTF. This consensual qualitative research (CQR; Hill, 2012, Hill et al., 2005; Hill et al., 1997) sought to fill that gap by empirically exploring the experience of NTTTF members in mental health training programs involved in a gatekeeping intervention with a student for non-academic concerns.

This project was born out of this writer's experience of having observed gatekeeping processes that ultimately resulted in the removal of several students from a counselor training program. The faculty involved, however, were senior faculty members who had almost 50 years of combined experience as counselor educators, and more than a decade together as colleagues. These faculty had a well-established procedure for remediation and, when called for, dismissal of students. This researcher's interest was

piqued when thinking about what it would be like to be a new faculty member trying to establish her/himself within the profession and department, and being involved in the remediation or termination of a student. Pursuing this project served a personal and professional research interest, and contributed to a body of literature important to the training and education of students in the helping professions and the professional development of nontenured faculty.

Key Term Definitions

Definitions are crucial for any study, but are all the more salient here because of the lack of consensus within the profession on many of the key terms in this study.

Gatekeeping. A universally agreed-upon definition of gatekeeping has proved elusive in the published literature; however, some common strands run through many of the offered definitions, as described in Chapter 2. For the purposes of this paper, and in an attempt to synthesize the common elements presented across the literature, the term “gatekeeping” will be defined as a process of monitoring and evaluating a trainee’s competence; and intervening when a trainee is not prepared with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary for the practice of counseling/psychotherapy (Bodner, 2012; Brear & Dorrian, 2010; Ziomek-Diagle & Christensen, 2010).

Competence. Competence is defined as the consistent demonstration of a combination of effective therapeutic skills and professional dispositions necessary for the practice of counseling/psychotherapy (Frame & Stevens-Smith, 2005; McAdams, Foster & Ward, 2007; Swank, Lambie, & Witta, 2012).

Gateslippage. Alternatively, “gateslippage” refers to students identified as problematic for whom “no remediation, dismissal, or follow-up actions” (Gaubetz &

Vera, 2002; 2006) were instituted. So, if a student is identified as problematic, and s/he is not “gate-kept,” s/he is said to have “gate-slipped.”

Nontenured, Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTTF). The population under study, NTTTF, encompasses all nontenured, tenure-track, full-time faculty members who teach in Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) or American Psychological Association (APA)-accredited (clinical or counseling psychology) programs. Counseling programs accredited by CACREP will include the clinical mental health, couples and family, and school counseling programs, in addition to programs holding the older community counseling designation. It excludes those who teach in on-line only programs, as this researcher believes that the face-to-face interactions with students will be influential in the experience of the early-career faculty as it relates to gatekeeping, and may be missing from an on-line only training program.

Non-academic concerns. Non-academic concerns, as distinct from academic concerns, can be broadly defined as personal factors that are likely to make a student unfit for the profession, and necessitate a gate-keeping intervention. As noted by Herlihy & Remley’s (1995) work, a trainee may have strong academic or intellectual abilities, and still lack the personal characteristics necessary to be an effective mental health professional. Difficulties may thus arise within the course of training, ranging from interpersonal conflict with other students to an inability or unwillingness to adopt dispositions deemed required for competent practice (Forrest, Elman, Gizara, & Vacha-Haase, 1999; Lumadue & Duffy, 1999).

Problematic students. Various terms have been used throughout the extant literature to describe the students for whom a gatekeeping intervention is needed, and

these terms will be explored in greater depth later (see Chapter 2). For the purposes of this study, the term problematic (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Evans, Carney, Lakin, & Stafford, 2013; Goodrich & Shin, 2013; Veilleux, January, Vanderveen, Reddy, & Klonoff, 2012) will be used to refer to students for whom a gatekeeping intervention may be warranted.

Study Rationale

This study attempted to explore the intersection between the experience of being an NTTTF member, and the experience of gatekeeping a student for non-academic concerns. While the literature review will elaborate on the nature of these experiences, it is important to note that no study was located that explores the experience of NTTTF gatekeeping students for non-academic concerns. Given the importance of the gatekeeping responsibility (APA, 2010; Bodner, 2012; Brear, Dorrian, & Luscri, 2008); the impact that gateslippage can have on other students, the profession, and the public (Forrest et al, 1999; Gaubetz & Vera, 2006); and the unique vulnerabilities that may be faced by NTTTF when they exercise their role as gatekeepers (Bradey & Post, 1991; Reybold, 2008; Sofronoff, Helmes, & Pachana, 2011), understanding the experience of NTTTF gatekeeping students for non-academic concerns is of significant importance to the training literature in counseling and psychology. This study thus allows for an understanding of what factors may inhibit faculty from acting as gatekeeping, what factors may encourage them to act on this responsibility, and what the gatekeeping experience was like for them.

A qualitative methodology was selected for three primary reasons: 1) To foster greater depth in the exploration of the emotional experiences of the faculty members than

would likely be available in a quantitative study; 2) To examine an area in which many important variables (e.g., identification of competencies for problematic students, non-academic concerns) currently lack consensus definitions, and thus standardized measures are unavailable; and 3) To facilitate a preliminary investigation of a previously under-researched area. Only by gaining a better sense of what this experience is like, a sense gained by hearing the voices of those actually involved in such experiences, can this area of research be advanced.

Gatekeeping represents a significant responsibility – to the profession, to other students, and to the public – that counselor educators carry. NTTTF represent a specific group of counselor educators who shoulder this responsibility. The potentially unique challenges present for NTTTF in executing this responsibility for non-academic concerns has yet to be investigated. It is this researcher’s hope that this study will shed light on the experience of these NTTTF members, and how they navigate the important responsibility of gatekeeping at a vulnerable time in their career development.

Research Questions

Given the literature currently available, and the desire to look more specifically at how being an NTTTF member affects the experience of the gatekeeping process, the following research questions will be addressed:

- 1) *What is the experience of gatekeeping a student for non-academic concerns like for an NTTTF (emotionally and cognitively), before, during, and after intervening?*
- 2) *What factors did the NTTTF consider when deciding to intervene?*
 - a. *What factors supported/facilitated intervening?*

b. What factors hindered/discouraged intervening?

- 3) What impact did engagement in this process have on the way that the NTTTTF builds relationships with students and other faculty/administrator during and after intervening?*
- 4) What, if any, preparation did the NTTTTF have for taking on this role as a gatekeeper?*
- 5) What did the NTTTTF learn from this event?*

II: Literature Review

This literature review will critically examine the role and process of gatekeeping in counselor training, and the experience of NTTTF involved in gatekeeping activities. This review will broadly cover: (1) gatekeeping theory, models, rationale, and legal ramifications, as well as (2) the experience of NTTTF members as it relates to their role as gatekeepers, and explain the necessity of examining the experience of NTTTF's as it relates to gatekeeping interventions. For the purposes of this review, the term "counselor educator" refers to all faculty involved in training mental health professionals, and "counselor education programs" refers to all such training programs in mental health.

Ethical Mandate

As previously discussed, a universal definition for gatekeeping does not exist within the published literature. What has been agreed upon is that gatekeeping is an essential responsibility for counselor educators (APA, 2010; Bodner, 2012; Brear et al., 2008), and that it is a process that must view students, and their skills, through a developmental lens (APA, 2010). The view of gatekeeping as a process is fundamental, for it suggests that gatekeeping is an on-going responsibility of educators throughout a student's training, rather than a responsibility that can be satisfied through a single specific action or response (Brear et al, 2008). It is important to note here that while gatekeeping is both an action that can be taken and a response to a behavior or action demonstrated by a trainee, gatekeeping is also a process by which intervention with, and evaluation of, a student is made. It is this process that is the primary focus of this review.

So gatekeeping is both a specific action, a response, and a process, specifically a process that considers a trainee's actions and behaviors within a developmental context.

The developmental focus on students and their skills implies that there is more being evaluated than just a student's capabilities in the classroom and his/her ability to acquire specific knowledge and interventions. Rather, faculty are also charged with an evaluation of the student him/herself (professional dispositions) and determining if a student is a good fit for the profession. This is not to say that the student must demonstrate the skills or dispositions of a professional with sophistication at the start of their training, but rather that it is clear that the student could reasonably develop these skills over the course of her/his training. In other words, do the dispositions and skills the student presents with now suggest that s/he is likely to be a good fit for the profession upon graduation? In the counseling field, the person of the therapist is important to the therapeutic work, and therefore an important variable to be evaluated during training. Faculty must, as a way of safeguarding the profession and future clients, restrict access to the field to only those deemed qualified, and likewise offer training to those who reasonably will become qualified. If, at any point over the course of the training, it becomes clear that the student is unwilling or unable to develop these skills and dispositions needed for the profession, then it is the responsibility of the training faculty to engage in a gatekeeping intervention.

While it can seem confusing to differentiate between a process, an action, and a behavioral response, what the literature does make clear is that the professional mental health community holds that gatekeeping is not an optional task for educators, and it is not one confined to the classroom. APA, as well as ACA, have specific statements within

their ethics codes relating to these requirements (APA, 2010; ACA, 2005). While not all training programs are accredited by these organizations, nor are all practitioners members (and therefore not bound to their statement of the ethics), they are the two largest accrediting bodies and professional organizations for applied psychology and counselor educator programs, and their policies carry substantial weight within the mental health community. Both statements mandate that interventions be made with students-in-training who exhibit behaviors or characteristics that make them a concern to the profession.

Prevalence

Identification of concerns. The task for the counselor educator is to evaluate a human being, in all her/his complexity, for the potential fit for the profession of counseling (Lumadue & Duffy, 1999; Spurgeon, Gibbons & Cochran, 2012). This task, while challenging enough, is further complicated by the fact that even the language for these identifications is confusing. Terms such as deficient, bad, troublesome and impaired (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Brear et al, 2008; Oliver, Bernstein, Anderson, Blashfeild & Roberts, 2004) have been used at various times throughout the gatekeeping literature. However, impairment (implying that an individual has achieved a competency level in the past, but for some reason is not currently performing at that level, and intervention is needed to return her/him to competency) has been criticized due to a failure to differentiate it from incompetence (a term suggesting that competency was never gained) (Brear et al, 2008), as well as the inclusion of impairment in legislation involving individuals with disabilities (Americans with Disabilities Act, 1990; Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Oliver et al., 2004). Use of the term “impairment” when discussing a

student with whom an intervention is necessary could open the trainers and training program to litigation if they do not consider the ADA's mandate that reasonable accommodations be made by employers to facilitate the functionality of those with disabilities (Falender, Collins, & Shafranske, 2009). Trainees, despite their (potentially) unpaid and training status, are considered to be covered by the requirements for workplace accommodations (Falender et al., 2009). Seeing as impairment and incompetency problems would require different types of interventions to remediate (i.e., the goal of one is to remove the obstacle to competent functioning so the practitioner can return to a previously attained level of practice; the goal of the other is to teach the competency for the first time), and a desire to avoid the implication that those with disabilities are a bad match for the profession, (as well as to prevent the suggestion that students in need of remediation be granted the legal protections of those with a disability), specificity in identification and terminology is important.

Other researchers have identified students using the term "unsuitable," and this was in fact the term used at the 2002 Competencies Conference: Future Directions in Education and Credentialing in Professional Psychology held by the Association for Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC, 2002 as cited in Brear et al., 2008). The rationale given is that the term is deemed non-emotive and non-value-laden as it implies that while a student is not a good fit in this profession, s/he very well could be a fit in another profession (Brear et al, 2008). To this researcher, however, this argument does not ring true. "Unsuitable" implies something fundamentally unchangeable, which is not always the case with regards to gatekeeping concerns, and this term fails to account for a developmental perspective. Problematic students (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998;

Evans et al., 2013; Goodrich & Shin, 2013; Veilleux et al., 2012) is the term that has been selected for use in this study because it denotes that the student is performing below acceptable standards, including “deficits in clinical skills or psychological issues that could potentially impact clients, peers, and/or the counseling profession” (Evans et al., 2013, p. 2). The term “problematic” does not imply something unchangeable, but rather something that could be solved. In addition, “problematic” avoids the confusion with language used to identify those legally entitled to accommodation (e.g., “impaired”). Furthermore, “problematic” does not elicit the question of whether an individual has attained a competency before (as is the case with “impaired” or “incompetent”), but rather focuses simply on the traits being expressed in the moment that are problematic.

Pinpointing a term that accurately captures and describes the students who are the target of this discussion, however, is only part of the problem. There is no one agreed-upon set of characteristics that make a good counselor, and therefore no single standard to which to compare problematic students. There is, in fact, significant debate surrounding the competencies required to be an effective professional in this field. If the field cannot agree on what qualities are required to make a successful counselor, how can the field agree on when intervention is necessary during counselor training? How can consensus be reached about whether someone is a bad fit for a profession?

In order to develop a standard of competencies, a variety of competency models that encompass students’ academic work, clinical skills, ethics, multicultural awareness, as well as interpersonal skills and emotional functioning would need to be synthesized. The problem here lies not in that there are too few models available to draw from, but rather that there are too many (including Bernstein & Lecomte, 1976; Chiko, 1980;

Ridley, Mollen, & Kelly, 2011a; 2011b). Additionally, groups such as APA and the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) have developed competencies for specialty areas (such as advocacy, multiculturalism, addictions) rather than general competencies for the profession (Kaslow et al., 2004; Middleman, 1984), which further increases the models available to which a problematic student could be compared.

In 2011, APA did unify the various competency standards that were present within the literature, and created a benchmarks approach to student evaluation (APA, 2011). This approach operationalized core behaviors that would be present and consistently displayed by trainees when ready for practicum, internship, and independent practice (APA, 2011). These behaviors were part of 6 overarching “clusters” (professionalism, relational, science, application, education, and systems) that were further broken down into 16 “core competencies” (such as advocacy, intervention, and relationships) that were then operationalized by 55 “essential components” (including addressing referral questions, supervisory practices, and reflective practice) (APA, 2012; Kaslow et al., 2009). These professional functions were then operationalized by three specific “behavioral anchors” that would indicate readiness for practicum, internship, and entry into practice (APA, 2012). Published alongside these competencies were assessment tools that could be used to evaluate students and their progress towards these standards (Kaslow et al., 2009). This model has several advantages: It is comprehensive, it takes into account the development of the student, it is produced by a national accrediting agency, and it includes tools for implementation, suggesting that there could be some standardization (across programs) in how students are evaluated.

The downside of APA's model, however, is that it does not assume that all the clusters, competencies, and components apply to all programs, nor that faculty have to use the behavioral anchors presented (APA, 2012). In the guidebook published to assist programs with implementation of this model, faculty are encouraged to choose those elements deemed relevant to their training goals, to add others that it feels are needed for their program, and to change behavioral anchors to better apply to their specific training program (APA, 2012). While such flexibility makes sense, given that each program has its own training goals and emphases, it may dilute the impact that a national model could have in terms of increasing the standardization with which students are evaluated. Would the assessment tools even apply if a program created its own standards and behavioral anchors? Essentially, APA has given permission for the model to be modified, but one wonders if too much permission has been given, and if the utility of the model will be lost as each program makes modifications.

Another comprehensive model for professional development was created by The American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (AAMFT). Their competencies consist of 128 task-statement items (e.g., understands the process of making an ethical decision; establishes and maintains an appropriate and productive therapeutic relationship with clients) organized in six domains (admission to treatment; clinical assessment and diagnosis; treatment planning and case management; therapeutic interventions; legal issues, ethics, and standards; and research and program evaluation) and five subdomains (conceptual, perceptual, executive, evaluative, and professional skills) (Nelson & Graves, 2011). Interestingly, the competencies are not all designed to be met during training. Some are meant to be mastered only at the completion of post-graduate training, when

the clinician is ready for independent practice (Nelson & Graves, 2011). While such an approach is helpful for ensuring that the developmental process of the trainee is considered, it creates further confusion with regards to gatekeeping. Nelson and Graves (2011) argue that the 128 task-statement items could indeed be used as an assessment of student performance. Doing so, however, would still leave significant ambiguity for a counselor educator: What standards must be met before the student exits training? To what level of expertise must a competency be met, and at what stage of training, for a student to be considered on-target? How far off of a “standard” growth curve to achieving mastery of a competency must a student be to be deemed problematic?

Clearly, none of these models are without problems. Integrating them has proven even more challenging, for while there is certainly overlap in these models conceptually, the operationalizing of key terms and definitions into objective behavioral criteria (as recommended by Foster & McAdams, 2009 & Lumadue & Duffy, 1999) has not seen much overlap. This lack of overlap suggests that programs could be creating their own models for the assessment of competencies, and/or operationalizing the competencies differently. Attempting to gather data on the prevalence of these problematic students is then difficult, as there is no single standard to which to compare students. Each program could have its own definition.

In addition, research attempting to gather prevalence rates has been approached haphazardly. Forrest et al. (1999) looked at 10 studies that utilized survey methods that were published between 1975 and 1995, but drawing conclusions from these studies was difficult. Studies have included a variety of stakeholders (training directors, faculty, students), and data collection was constrained (e.g., respondents were given surveys with

narrowly prescribed experiences they could endorse). With no single standard for competency across programs or terms for identification (bad, unsuitable, impaired) (Forrest et al., 1999), it is hard to know if this research actually captured what was occurring at each program. In addition, many of the studies failed to consider potentially important contextual demographic information (e.g., program size, cohort model, accreditation status, written policies for gatekeeping, on-line only) (Forrest et al., 1999) that may (though no study has yet confirmed this) have an impact on prevalence. Different methodologies, sample sizes, and response rates further add to the confusion when attempting to draw conclusions across these studies. Additionally, no study attempting to capture prevalence has ever been replicated (Brear et al, 2008; Forrest et al., 1999).

The only located source of prevalence information gathered after the publication of the Forrest et al (1999) study is from 2002. Gaubetz and Vera (2002) conducted a survey of 118 faculty members at master's level community and mental health counseling programs across the United States. Faculty teaching in 29 different CACREP programs and 38 non-CACREP programs were represented in this study. While an overall average of 10.4% of counseling trainees were estimated to be presenting problematic behaviors, the range of reported problematic students was from 1% to 75% of a program's enrolled students (Gaubetz & Vera, 2002). Because the size of these programs was not reported, how many students are represented by a 75% rate of problematic students is unknown. Participants reported intervening with about 50% of their identified problematic students. Previous literature estimated that 4-5% of students were found to have been remediated (Forrest et al, 1999). Interestingly, CACREP program faculty estimated significantly

lower ($p < .0001$) numbers of problematic students (7.2%) than did non-CACREP program faculty (12.9%). This difference disappeared, however, when only considering the percentage of students remediated or dismissed. The difference between CACREP and non-CACREP programs lies in the percentage of students estimated to be problematic for which an intervention or remediation process is not initiated (Gaubetz & Vera, 2002).

Thus, prevalence is an area in need of more thorough investigation from a nationwide survey of all relevant stakeholders (students, faculty, directors of training) with an eye towards analysis of program-specific factors (e.g. size of cohort, faculty-to-student ratio, accreditation status) that could have an impact on the rate of students in need of remediation, as well as factors that influence identification and intervention. However, this analysis will prove impossible until a consensus has been reached around identification of core competencies, such that the competency language can be standardized across surveys. Interesting to note, however, is that no study has looked at a program's established criteria for identification of concerns against the concerns that they later report addressing (Forrest et al, 1999). This investigation is something that could be done, despite the lack of standardization around competencies, as it is looking for internal program consistency, and may provide valuable information about the types of problematic behaviors to which faculty attend, or do not attend, based on their models of evaluation.

Regardless of the methodological challenges inherent in studying this phenomenon, however, all of these studies are demonstrating that there are students in

need of gatekeeping interventions in mental health programs. The following section will consider what concerns may bring these students to the attention of their faculty.

Types of concerns.

Academic concerns. Over the course of the training program, the academic and intellectual demands of graduate coursework may exceed the capabilities of the student. Indeed, Bradey and Post's (1991) survey of master's-level counselor education programs indicated that 77% of educators had dismissed a student for academic concerns. In these cases, a failure to successfully complete assigned coursework would result in the initiation of gatekeeping procedures (Forrest et al., 1999). These cases are relatively straightforward: The student lacks the academic capabilities to complete the coursework. In this case, gatekeeping in a counselor education program follows the much more standardized process of repeating a course, or in more severe cases, dismissal from a program, steps common in other academic disciplines. The predictability of these scenarios occurring and the standardization of their presentation (i.e., there are not as many variables at play when a student fails a multiple choice test; the student objectively failed) lend them to comparatively easier policy making and guidelines for addressing this problematic student. The consistent presentation across disciplines (i.e., failing a multiple-choice test in a counseling class is the same as failing a multiple-choice test in a biology class) lends itself to formal, university-wide policies that address such situations.

Non-academic concerns. Nonacademic concerns, on the other hand, create situations for which it is harder to create standardized policies. Non-academic concerns can be broadly defined as personal factors that are likely to make a student unfit for the profession. As noted by Herlihy & Remley's (1995) work, a trainee may have strong

academic or intellectual abilities, and still lack the personal characteristics necessary to be an effective counselor. Difficulties may thus arise within the course of training, ranging from interpersonal conflict with other students to an inability or unwillingness to adopt dispositions deemed required for competent practice (Forrest et al., 1999; Lumadue & Duffy, 1999). Bradey and Post's (1991) survey indicated that 73% of educators had dismissed a student for emotional and psychological reasons. A number of individuals who enter graduate programs in counseling present with mental health concerns, and use training as a socially appropriate substitution for treatment (Lumadue & Duffy, 1999; de Vries & Valdez, 2006). Indeed, White and Franzoni's (1990) study of 180 master's level counseling students from a single program found that graduate counseling students display significantly higher rates of psychopathology than does the general population. Sample size and representativeness prevent this study from being generalizable. Additionally, first-year students in the program who opted not to participate (White & Franzoni, 1990) may have done so out of anxiety around what the results would show or how the results would be used (White & Franzoni, 1990), and the inclusion of these students could have affected the levels of psychopathology.

Beyond specific mental health concerns, as previously mentioned, research around the identification of counselor competencies is growing, and models from national accreditation agencies have been published. However, they have been too recently adopted to determine whether they indeed represent a consensus around required competencies and whether these competences are being accurately assessed, or are standardized across programs.

Even with competencies identified, the myriad of ways that a person can present a deficiency makes it difficult to catalogue or account for all permutations. Mearns and Allen (1991), in developing their survey, created a list of 38 possible presentations of problematic behaviors. The lack of consistency in presentation of problematic students, as well as the lack of clarification on competencies themselves, can make it difficult for faculty to objectively justify the need for intervention. Unlike a set of academic objectives listed in a syllabus, then, personal factors are far less clear in stimulating a need for intervention (e.g., how much empathy does a student need to be able to express in order to be effective as a counselor? At what level does having difficulty in interpersonal processes with classmates indicate that a student would have clinical difficulties?) or delineating the process that can be taken to address these factors. Regardless of the mental health status of the students, then, this researcher believes that the identification of non-academic concerns is far less clear than that of academic concerns, as non-academic concerns often do not rely on objective requirements or expectations (such as a syllabus or written work samples, as is often the case for academic concerns), and instead frequently arise from concerns about clinical performance or dispositions feared to negatively impact clinical performance.

However, the delineation between academic and non-academic concerns in counselor education is not as clearly defined as it is presented here. An important overlap must be highlighted when considering clinical coursework. A failure to achieve minimum standards in clinical coursework could more appropriately fall under non-academic concerns, as it is possible that a dispositional issue has arisen that prevents a student from meeting required competencies in these courses (McAdams et al., 2007). If a student

were dismissed from a practicum site due to his/her inability to get along with other co-workers in the agency, for example, the student may fail the practicum course, but would have done so due to an interpersonal process concern that prevented her/him from completing the required training hours rather than failing an examination. It is also possible that a student could fail to turn in paperwork on time, which could be a dispositional or an academic concern. For example, the student could be willfully refusing to do the paperwork due to a disagreement with a faculty member (dispositional), or s/he may be unable to maintain the organization required to succeed in graduate school (academic concern), and have simply missed the deadline. This lack of timeliness could result in a course failure, but it could also leave the educators confused over the source of the behavior and confused as to how to address this concern.

The difficulty in delineating between these academic and non-academic concerns is also present in the literature. Indeed, while the field asserts that such a distinction exists (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004, Wissel, 2011), we remain unable to clearly define the boundaries between academic and non-academic concerns.

Importance of identification. Despite the challenges present in identifying competencies, and the many factors that influence an NTTTF member deciding to intervene, gatekeeping is an extremely important process. Not only is it important for the student in question and for the potential clients that he/she may serve in the future, it is also important for the student's classmates, faculty, and the larger educational institution, as problematic students can have a negative impact on others. The negative impact of problematic students can arise through missed educational opportunities (e.g., ability to have deeper or more reflective conversations, promoting self-disclosure in a group),

having to take on more responsibility in a group project, increased negative emotions, as well as the way that students view their faculty, overall program climate, and professional identity (Oliver et al, 2004).

Mearns and Allen (1991) conducted a survey of APA-accredited clinical psychology program faculty and students in which they asked about the responsibility that students and faculty felt for intervening with a problematic student, as well as what types of impairments and improprieties the students had witnessed in other students, and the reactions the students witnessing these behaviors had to these events. Their findings, which must be contextualized based on their small sample and low response rate, were that while both students and faculty felt the responsibility to intervene with problematic students rested more heavily on faculty, students perceived faculty as far less active in exercising that responsibility than faculty viewed themselves. In addition, while the researchers noted that incidents of blatantly egregious behavior (i.e., faking research data, inappropriate sexual boundaries) were less frequent than perceived personal inadequacies (i.e., poor social judgment, histrionic style) when rated by students, incidents of problematic functioning (regardless of type) were negatively correlated with student's ratings of their department's climate (Mearns & Allen, 1991). Faculty also underestimated the emotional impact that knowing about a problematic student would have on another student. Students identified strong emotional reactions (e.g., feeling angry, frustrated, conflicted) (Mearns & Allen, 1991). Based on this survey, it is estimated that 95% of students encounter a problematic peer during their training. This encounter places the non-problematic student in a situation that can trigger strong

emotions, and that leads students to an overall more negative evaluation of program climate (Mearns & Allen, 1991).

An updated study by Oliver et al. (2004), which included a small sample size and described no identified method for data analysis, noted that students felt that faculty were slow or unwilling to respond to problematic students. This lack of timely response left students feeling that “pretty much anyone can be a psychologist” and frustrated with a perceived lack of professional pride from faculty (Oliver et al., 2004, p. 143). In addition, some students felt that programs engaged in differential hand-holding, creating different standards for students in order to complete training and assisting students to finish despite incompetence (Oliver et al., 2004, p.143; Shen-Miller, Forrest & Elman, 2009.). Also notable was that while about half of the respondents in Oliver et al.’s study were unsure whether faculty knew about these problematic student behaviors (and many expressed gratitude that such students were not identified publicly), several were confident that only half of the problematic students were known to faculty. This study, while highlighting the possibility that students in need of remediation are overlooked by faculty (gateslippage), also noted the frustration that other students can feel when they perceive a peer with problematic behaviors is being allowed to continue in the program.

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) plays a role in the frustration that students are expressing here, and is worth a short discussion independent of prevalence rates. FERPA prevents faculty from sharing information regarding remediation and intervention with other students in their program (Wise, King, Miller & Pearce, 2011). Limits on the information that can be shared may affect other students’ views of impaired classmates and the seriousness with which they believe their faculty

takes their gatekeeping responsibilities (Evans et al., 2013; Oliver et al., 2004; Rosenberg, Getzeman, Arcinue, & Oren, 2005; Shen-Miller et al., 2011). If the faculty cannot talk about remediation plans with other students, then the students have no way of knowing that an intervention has been initiated. While the privacy of the problematic student is to be protected, and the rationale for the protection of student privacy is certainly understandable, this lack of open communication can further entrench the questions that students have about their faculty's commitment to gatekeeping (Oliver et al., 2004; Shen-Miller et al., 2009) and complicate faculty relationships with students.

Returning to prevalence now, Gaubetz and Vera's (2006) survey of master's-level students in many ways parallels the findings of Bradey and Post's (1991), in that students estimate that more than 21% of their peers were problematic, which was significant ($p < .0001$) when compared to faculty perceptions of problematic students present in their programs. Student estimates were moderated by a series of factors. Being accredited, having fewer full-time faculty, and lacking a formal gatekeeping policy all contributed to high reported rates of problematic students (as identified by students) (Gaubetz & Vera, 2006). Formal written policies were found to mediate the estimated numbers of problematic students even in programs that were not accredited or that relied heavily on adjunct faculty.

Interesting to note, however, is that the types of impairment students identified impacted their perception of the faculty's need to intervene. Veilleux et al. (2012) surveyed graduate-level clinical psychology students at both the master's and doctoral level, and noted that students made a distinction between problematic students that they perceived as displaying trait problems (e.g., lack of self awareness) from students with

externalizing psychopathology (e.g., drug and alcohol problems) and different still from students displaying other forms of psychological distress (e.g., anxiety, depression, financial concerns). Students went so far as to suggest that different types of remediation be instituted for students who were displaying what their peers perceived as diminished functioning rather than an inability to achieve competency.

These were the only publications located that attempted to conduct a nationwide study of the prevalence rates of problematic behaviors that included student views. The use of student views is important, as students have access to different information than do faculty in regards to peer functioning, and the inclusion of student views in addition to faculty views allows for some triangulation of the data collected. However, researchers must be careful not to preference student views by suggesting that they are more accurate than faculty views. Despite the significant flaws presented in these studies, they are the best estimates the field has for the rates of problematic students in counselor education programs. Until some of the methodological challenges present in trying to conduct a study of this kind (such as defining what makes a student problematic) are resolved, these estimates are the best that the literature has to offer. What does emerge across the previously described articles, however, is that problematic behaviors, and the students who display them, negatively impact the students around them. The failure of faculty to intervene with these problematic students has an effect far beyond the current students in training, however, and has implications for the entire field.

Gatekeeping Uncertainty and NTTTF

Imagine now, in the midst of all the uncertainty already involved in this process – terminology, identification, prevalence – an NTTTF member’s nontenured status is

added. For NTTTF, there are a variety of challenges in adjusting to academia. The role of faculty member, and the various sub-dimensions of that position (e.g., researcher, teacher, advisor, academic citizen) all require some socialization on the part of the new faculty member.

NTTTF members face a variety of pressures while transitioning from student to faculty (Magnuson, Norem, & Lonneman-Doroff, 2009). Faculty must be prepared to engage as researchers, teachers, and as academic citizens in service to the university. While completion of a doctoral degree would indicate some familiarity with these roles, students interested in faculty positions state that they do not feel prepared to take on these roles at the faculty level (Golde, 2004). The impact of this perceived lack of preparation is most salient for NTTTF members, because there is not much time for them to find their footing in these areas (Golde, 2004). To earn tenure they must show themselves as productive members of the academy from the very beginning. This pressure to earn tenure, often discussed in the context of “publish or perish” (Conley, 2005; Reybold, 2005; Reybold, 2008; Williams, 2005), while feeling unprepared for the roles that are required, could make a faculty member hesitant to engage in a gatekeeping process that places further demands on her/his time (Bradey & Post, 1991; Sofronoff et al., 2011). Academic service, a historically ignored aspect of institutional rewards systems that decides tenure and promotion, and a particularly confusing aspect of the expectations for NTTTF (who often lack a definition for academic service, as well as an understanding of what to expect at each institution) (Reybold & Corda, 2011), can further place a burden on female and minority faculty members because they are tapped to serve on more academic committees than male and majority faculty members to assist the university in

meeting their goals for minority representation or to demonstrate a commitment to diversity (Conley, 2005; Reybold & Corda, 2011; Williams, 2005). This time demand could make it even less likely that female and minority NTTTF's may decide to engage in a gatekeeping process, one that inevitably will also consume substantial portions of time.

In addition to the individual challenges that NTTTF face when transitioning from the student role to the faculty role, the academy is often a complex political world, and competition among faculty members themselves can create challenges for early career academics (Reybold, Brazer, Schrum & Corda, 2012; Reybold & Corda, 2011; Sorcinelli, 2002). This competition can involve securing research, travel, and professional development funding; gaining access to graduate assistants and other support services (which can aid in the ever-important time crunch in which NTTTF find themselves); and serving on dissertation committees or in other service appointments that increase an NTTTF member's network and human capital across the university, even if they are often not considered in tenure and promotion decisions (Reybold, 2003; Reybold, 2005; Reybold, 2008; Reybold & Alameia, 2008; Reybold, Brazer, Schrum, & Corda., 2012; Sorcinelli & Jung, 2007). Learning to navigate these new dynamics, while maintaining excellence in the areas of teaching, research and service to the university, is difficult.

All of these demands place NTTTF members in a vulnerable position. They may be unwilling to engage in the sometimes murky process of gatekeeping because they question how much support they would receive for doing so from other faculty, and they may fear damaging new and highly valuable relationships (that allow them access to department resources) with other faculty members. In addition, NTTTF may be facing

their own professional transition process to the role of faculty and be unable to identify and intervene with students as effectively as they might if they were settled in their own professional identity. A faculty member who is lacking confidence in her/his role as an instructor may be unsure of her/his ability to identify students in need of intervention, much less manage a new and unfamiliar intervention process.

Such challenges may also include ethical decisions. Reybold (2008) stated that NTTTF may be more vulnerable to professional ethical dilemmas because of the “inordinate stresses associated with the tenure and promotion process” (Reybold, 2008, p. 280). These challenges can range from the ethical dilemma of choosing to devote effort to teaching even when research may be more valued at an institution when evaluations for tenure and promotion occur, to ethical engagement with colleagues surrounding the sharing of department resources (Reybold, 2008). The model presented by more senior faculty (e.g., Do senior faculty work to balance all their roles as faculty members? Do they ethically share department resources?) has a significant impact on the way that NTTTF understand and execute their ethics and ethical obligations, but the temptation for speedy career advancement can override ethical decision making (Reybold, 2008). This necessity for ethical decision making is, however, exactly what is at play when an NTTTF member is confronted with a gatekeeping concern. Will he/she undertake the intervention even if it costs him/her valuable research time? Will he/she risk the valuable, and also new, relationships he/she has with senior faculty members/administrators should the need for intervention be contested? Failure to follow through with the ethically required gatekeeping intervention presents a myriad of problems (see gateslippage) for the department and the profession.

In summary, there are a significant number of variables around the gatekeeping process –language, prevalence, identification – and at the same time the NTTTFs are in a stressful and precarious place within their careers, and may feel pressured to forego a time-consuming gatekeeping intervention in order to devote their time and energy to their other roles as faculty. Even amid such pressure, however, intervention may be needed. Assume for a moment that an NTTTF has begun to wade through the murky waters of a potential gatekeeping scenario, while also experiencing the career challenges described above, and has decided that gatekeeping is indeed warranted for a student. What, then, must the NTTTF do?

Models of Gatekeeping

Having a model of gatekeeping to follow can decrease some of the confusion educators may have over how to intervene with problematic students. Three models of gatekeeping were located in the current literature. These are the Frame and Stevens-Smith (1995) model, the Baldo, Softas-Nall, and Shaw. (1997) model, and the latest model, the Southwest Texas (SWT) model as outlined in Lumadue and Duffy (1999). The “models” presented here are referred to as such because they specifically refer to themselves as such (Lumadue & Duffy, 1999).

In the Frame and Stevens-Smith model, the faculty developed a form that would give them a formalized way of evaluating students on nine traits (being open, flexible, positive, cooperative, willing to use and accept feedback, aware of their impact on others, able to deal with conflict, able to accept personal responsibility, and able to express feelings effectively and appropriately) that they believed to be essential to the functioning of a developing counselor (Frame & Stevens-Smith, 1995). This form, known as the

Personal Characteristics Form, uses a 1-5 Likert-type rating system to evaluate students at the midterm and end of every semester. A low rating from any faculty member on any item on this form initiates a formal gatekeeping response from the faculty, with increasingly substantial interventions (e.g., requirement that a course be repeated, requirement that the student take a temporary hiatus from the program, dismissal from the program) should the student continue to receive low evaluations or receive numerous low ratings (Frame & Stevens-Smith, 1995). Faculty of this program indicated at the one-year mark post-implementation that they were being more thoughtful about their interventions with problematic students, and that students reported being more aware of the process by which they are evaluated (Frame & Stevens-Smith, 1995). While this model contributed the Personal Characteristics Evaluation Form and focused on the due process concerns of the both the faculty and students (see discussion of due process in “dismissal” section for further discussion), no study could be located that examined the adoption, implementation, or effectiveness of this model in other programs.

The Baldo et al. (1997) model followed shortly after the Frame and Stevens-Smith (1995) model, and the major modification in this model was to place the evaluation decisions on the entire faculty, rather than any one faculty member. This full-faculty evaluation was instituted as a result of a civil suit filed by a former student against one of the instructors at the University of Northern Colorado. The student focused his/her anger over his/her dismissal on a single faculty member, a situation that the Baldo et al. model seeks to avoid in the future. In addition, the challenge of having to defend their decision in court made the faculty aware of their need to document specific behaviors that demonstrated a lack of suitability for the counseling profession (Baldo et al., 1997),

rather than suggesting overly broad character categorizations (e.g., “the student is consistently tardy to class, demonstrating lack of respect for instructor and fellow students” rather than “student is disrespectful”). Much like the personal characteristics evaluation form (Frame & Stevens-Smith, 1995), Baldo et al. created a form to document these behaviors, which they defined as “an inability to demonstrate: empathic capacity, maturity of judgment, ability to work closely with others, capacity to handle stress, and tolerance for deviance” (Baldo et al., 1997, section entitled An Alternative Model). The major contributions of this model are the implementation of the remediation process by a faculty committee, and the focus on providing written feedback and obtaining written assent from students when a remediation plan is created. Written assent prevents a student from suggesting that he/she was never given specific feedback or specific guidance about how to address a concern, which would be significant violations of due process (Baldo et al., 1997). No data on program evaluation could be located for this model.

In the SWT model, as described in Lumadue and Duffy (1999), the authors and program faculty created an instrument called the Professional Performance Fitness Evaluation, which included a four-point rating scale and assessed five major areas: counseling skills and abilities, professional responsibility, competence, maturity, and integrity. These competencies were formed based on the ACA Code of Ethics (Lumadue & Duffy, 1999), which makes this the only model to explicitly base its measure on a national standard. Also included in this evaluation were specific behavioral components that defined these competencies (Lumadue & Duffy, 1999). Unfortunately, the instrument was not published with the article, so an examination of the behaviors used to define

these competencies could not be conducted. Different in this model than the other two offered is that each faculty member evaluates each student after each semester in which s/he teaches the student. In order to pass her/his classes, the student must receive satisfactory rankings on all evaluation components (Lumadue & Duffy, 1999). This model, then, has interwoven academic and non-academic concerns of gatekeeping into one overarching evaluation of the student. A problematic student would not be able to use academic success as a defense against dismissal, because his/her grades would be directly impacted by his/her deficiencies in other areas under evaluation. No evaluation information could be located for this model, nor were there articles indicating the adoption of this procedure at any other universities.

The use of behaviorally specific language, as delineated in the SWT model, is important when identifying problematic students as it avoids the trap that clinically trained faculty members can fall into when describing a student's actions. When being evaluated by licensed mental health professionals, as students in the helping professions often are, the use of language that implies a mental health diagnosis could qualify a student for the protections afforded those with a psychological disability under the ADA (Falender et al., 2009). So stating, for example, that a student "often acts manic" rather than stating that the student "is impulsive and verbose, missing social cues for appropriate behavior," could actually entitle the student to accommodations because a licensed clinician has just described her/him as "manic." In addition, this use of a diagnosis can inappropriately transition a training and supervision relationship into a clinical one, where the supervisor is diagnostician (Falender et al., 2009). Furthermore, ADA prohibits a supervisor from inquiring about the nature of an individual's disabling

impairment unless it is specifically related to exploration of accommodations necessary for the fulfillment of job-related duties (Falender et al., 2009). If a student were to be referred to in diagnostic terms, the training supervisor might place her/himself in a position of being unable to directly address or explore these concerns with the student, and instead be forced to consider what accommodations may be necessary.

As a deviation from the models that consider the student and his/her behaviors individually, a model for culturally responsive gatekeeping in counselor education was proposed by Goodrich & Shin (2013), in which they took a group systems perspective on the identification of problematic students and gatekeeping interventions. Group systems, in this context, meant that faculty considered their program and department as a system (with intrapersonal, interpersonal, and total group relationships), with a variety of systemic factors that may be influencing the expression of problematic behaviors by trainees (Goodrich & Shin, 2013). This model was the only one located that explicitly addressed multicultural factors within gatekeeping, though like the others, no evaluation of the implementation of this model was located.

Overall, these models offer step-by-step presentations of the processes used by three different schools to meet the gatekeeping responsibilities of counselor educators. While they all contain similar elements (written procedures distributed to students, instruments for evaluation of competencies), they all added something to the literature around gatekeeping as well, and build off of one another. The Frame and Stevens-Smith model added the creation of the Personal Characteristics Form, which created a formal tool to be used for transparent evaluation of students, though these evaluations were conducted by individual faculty members. The Baldo et al. model added to the use of the

evaluation tool by implementing evaluation by the entire faculty, thus preventing a student from targeting a specific faculty member as responsible for the negative evaluation a student receives. The SWT model added specific behavioral definitions for the competencies within their evaluation tool. The behavioral focus allows for an avoidance of any complications associated with ADA. Goodrich & Shin (2013) attempted to account for multicultural variables.

Despite the contributions of these models, nothing could be located that suggested that other schools have adopted these specific models. It is possible that handbooks across the country contain policies informed by these models, but there are no publications that substantiate this possibility. It is likely that these models represent a small fraction of the models employed by programs across the country, and that these models undergo significant reorganization and amendment with each experience a faculty has with the gatekeeping process, or as further legal precedents emerge.

This apparent lack of standardization in gatekeeping intervention processes further complicates the position of NTTTF. Having now made the decision to intervene, there may be uncertainty in how to do so. While ideally this process is delineated in a student's handbook, and there is a formal procedure for intervention for NTTTF to follow, such guidelines are not guaranteed.

NTTTF implementation of gatekeeping models. Additionally, the NTTTF may not have previous experience with the implementation of any formal model for intervention. Graduate programs often provide little training to prepare future faculty for these types of interventions (Jacobs et al., 2011). In fact, training for a faculty position is largely determined by the challenges that a future faculty member encounters during

her/his own training, rather than any systemized program (Golde, 2004; Reybold, 2003). For example, many training programs do not have students complete coursework on gatekeeping in graduate programs, and training received on this subject is either haphazardly included in other courses, or arises from the student being somehow involved in the gatekeeping of her/himself or of another student. The types of challenges that one might have seen in her/his own training are also determined by the role the future faculty member played in the department in which s/he trained (Golde, 2004; Reybold, 2003). For instance, a teaching assistant has a much higher chance of being party to a gatekeeping process than a research assistant, given the nature of his/her work and the number of students with whom he/she interacts. FERPA would also prevent current faculty from discussing such processes with any future faculty who is not directly involved, leaving a large swath of potential future faculty who have no experience with this core responsibility until they, themselves, are faculty. So NTTTFs have to implement a model that may or may not be clearly delineated, and with which they have little to no experience.

None of these models, however, are any good if faculty choose not to use them. Often, faculty prefer to address concerns with problematic students in an informal way (Foster & McAdams, 2009; McAdams et al., 2007). Informal intervention is due to both a well-intentioned desire to avoid overreacting, as well as a hope that students will make the necessary adjustments on their own (Foster & McAdams, 2009), sparing the faculty member the time required by a formal gatekeeping procedure. In addition, faculty who are trained as clinicians are trained to see the potential in people, and may show a bias for wanting to understand and assist the problematic student with making progress in the

program, rather than initiating a process that could feel punitive (Forrest et al., 1999; Foster & McAdams, 2009; McAdams et al., 2007). The desire to maintain good relationships with students is potentially even more salient for NTTTF, as they rely on teaching evaluations for tenure and promotion decisions (Gaubetz & Vera, 2002). Gaubetz and Vera's (2002) study also noted that programs that reported higher rates of gateslippage also had faculty report more perceived institutional or legal pressure to avoid dismissing problematic students, as well as reported pressure to obtain favorable teaching evaluations (Gaubetz & Vera, 2002).

While the desire to seek an informal, rather than a formal, resolution is certainly understandable, doing so may well render the faculty more vulnerable to litigation. A fear of litigation is, in fact, described as the primary fear for faculty in initiating gatekeeping procedures. However, the protective factors (formalized review of students, and engagement in clear policies for intervention) that are used in defending the program should litigation take place, are not used by faculty who prefer informal intervention (Gaubetz & Vera, 2002; Forrest et al., 1999; Foster & McAdams, 2009; McAdams et al., 2007), potentially increasing the likelihood of litigation, or of an undesired outcome should litigation occur.

This hesitation to risk beginning or following through on gatekeeping procedures may be especially true if NTTTF are unsure of the support they would receive from other faculty members or the institution (Borders et al., 2011; Gaubatz & Vera, 2002; Reybold, 2008; Wissel, 2011). The participants in Wissel's (2011) study stated that the support of other faculty was the biggest factor in their ability to follow-through in a gatekeeping situation, as well as handle the fallout that occurred when dismissing a student (Wissel,

2011). McAdams, Foster, and Ward (2007) noted that one factor that was helpful in their successful defense in the litigation process was the involvement and support of administrators, specifically, an assistant dean. A new faculty member who may not have built a significant amount of human capital with administrators may question whether such support would be provided to him/her by the institution at large. At a vulnerable point before tenure, an NTTTF member may worry that the institution may end its relationship with the faculty member rather than risk the time and expense of a legal fight following a dismissal. Dissonance is thus created, as the potential personal and career costs that could be paid for initiating a gatekeeping process contradict an ethical mandate to intervene with a problematic student (ACA, 2005; APA, 2010; McAdams et al., 2007). While more senior faculty often try to protect NTTTF from being placed in this situation, protection is not always possible (Magnuson et al., 2009) from this very real concern.

Remediation

While the literature around the identification of problematic students is limited, the literature around the actual remediation and dismissal of students (beyond the above mentioned models) is even less developed. There are no universally accepted models of remediation, nor are there empirically-validated approaches to intervention (Shen-Miller et al., 2009). In addition, any remediation plan must attempt to balance a student's right to due process with the program's responsibility to protect itself and any potential future clients (Ziomek-Daigle & Christenson, 2010).

One of the ways that counselor education programs balance the need for remediation with a student's right to due process is through their policies and procedures. Usually laid out in a program handbook, these policies should note to a student how

he/she is being evaluated, how feedback is provided to students, as well as what steps will be initiated with a trainee displaying problematic behaviors (Lumadue & Duffy, 1999; McAdams et al., 2007, Wissel, 2011). However, Vacha-Haase and colleagues' (2004) survey of DOTs at APA-accredited clinical, counseling, and school psychology programs found that 53% of programs that were dealing with a trainee on remediation had no written guidelines, 83% of program directors did not consult with peers on this subject, and 92% of program directors did not consult with the APA either. Faculty in accredited programs reported using more formalized gatekeeping and remediation procedures than did faculty of unaccredited programs, and programs with more formalized gatekeeping procedures reported lower rates of gateslippage as well (Gaubetz and Vera, 2002). To note that more than half of the Vacha-Haase study's sample of accredited programs did not use formal written procedures, a factor correlated with decreased levels of gateslippage, then, could partially account for the rates of gateslippage in the field. The lack of a formalized process for faculty to initiate when they deem a student problematic could thus act as a deterrent to following through on their gatekeeping responsibilities (e.g., fear of how an unknown process may unfold may increase a faculty member's desire to avoid the process, thereby avoiding her/his gatekeeping responsibilities), and open the program to additional legal scrutiny (McAdams & Foster, 2007), as addressed below.

Formal written policies or not, however, once counselor educators have identified a student as problematic, in need of intervention, and have decided to intervene, a remediation program must be instituted. To be effective, Forrest et al. (1999) stated that these remediation plans must:

(a) identify and describe deficiencies that are directly tied to the program's evaluation criteria, (b) identify specific goals or changes that need to be made by the trainee, (c) identify possible methods for meeting these goals, (d) establish criteria for judging whether remediation has been successful, and (e) determine a timeline for reevaluation. (p. 650)

Creating this type of a plan necessitates the selection of interventions to address the areas of concern.

Interventions. Much like the previously discussed aspects of gatekeeping, the selection of interventions for students is an area lacking in definitive research. There are no empirically validated interventions for problematic counseling trainees (Forrest et al, 1999; Shen-Miller et al., 2009). There have also been no studies that have looked at the relationship between the types of impairment and the types of interventions selected to be part of the remediation plan. No studies have examined the efficacy of different interventions or factors that correlate with positive or negative remediation outcomes (Forrest et al, 1999).

Again, part of the difficulty in validating interventions could be due to the variety of presentations that could qualify a student as problematic. Conducting a study that would empirically validate an intervention would require access to a significant number of trainees, across a substantial number of training programs, that were in need of the same intervention.

Lack of consensus on competencies would further complicate such a validation attempt. If the field cannot agree on what is required in order to be a competent professional, and therefore cannot agree on exactly what identifies a student as problematic, then it would come as no surprise that the field would have difficulty agreeing on what would constitute "success" in interventions with problematic students.

Given that a specific definition of success for the remediation is needed for a complete remediation plan (Forrest et al, 1999), defining success is likely done in a case-by-case and program-by-program specific fashion, based on each program's definition of what is problematic. Despite the practical and definitional challenges to conducting this type of research, however, what is clear is that the field has "fallen short of our commitments to scientist-practitioner or scholar-practitioner training models because we have not gathered data on how we design, implement and evaluate remediation plans established to address trainee deficiencies" (Forrest et al, 1999, p. 651).

Despite the lack of empirical data, the most often cited interventions for problematic students are personal therapy, increased supervision, increased advising and mentoring, repeat or extra coursework, repeat practicum, personal growth groups, group therapy, self-structured behavior change, tutoring, mobilization of support systems, and a leave of absence (Forrest et al., 1999; Vacha-Haase et al., 1995; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). While little specificity can be offered in terms of how these types of interventions are implemented, given the lack of empirical research on their use, one that has drawn specific focus is the use of personal therapy for problematic students. Besides the ethical questions (who chooses the therapist? who would pay for the therapy? what information will be communicated to the program, and how?), there is no guidance in the literature as to factors that may impact the efficacy of the care (nature, length, focus of therapy, qualifications of the practitioner, nature of problematic behavior) leading to a successful remediation.

The little guidance that does exist surrounding the use of personal therapy as a remediation intervention is primarily drawn from the literature surrounding the use of

therapy by practicing clinicians, the use of therapy for those who have had sexual contact with clients, as well as the literature encouraging or mandating therapy for all students in professional training (Pope & Tabachnick, 1994; Pope, 1994; Forrest et al, 1999, p. 649). While Pope and Tabachnick's (1994) survey of 800 psychologists found that personal therapy can be helpful in assisting a professional with personal concerns, and is believed by practitioners to be helpful to those in training, this was not universally true, as 22% of the psychologists rated their personal therapy as "harmful" (Pope & Tabachnick, 1994). Additionally, only one third of these same psychologists believed therapy would be helpful as a mandated intervention for professionals who violate professional standards (Pope & Tabachnick, 1994). So, while these clinicians supported mandated therapy for those in training, they did not universally believe that mandated therapy was helpful for practicing clinicians, or would be helpful as a remediation strategy for professionals. The "lack of concrete information concerning the usefulness of personal therapy for therapists calls [sic] its mandated use for ethical violations into question" (Layman & McNamara, 1997, p.287). Other researchers suggested that the possible harm that can occur from individual therapy was more prevalent in situations where therapy was mandated for trainees (Orlinsky, Schofield, Schroder, Kazantzis, 2011) than when it was freely chosen by the professionals. Mandated personal therapy was seen as increasing stress and adding financial pressure for the student (Kumari, 2011), as well as potentially negatively impacting the trainee's clients, as the trainee may become overly distracted by the work that he/she is doing in her/his own therapy (Grimmer & Tribe, 2001) and be unable to fully focus on client concerns.

Missing from the above discussion about the mandating of personal therapy, is how the students feel about the intervention. de Vries and Valdez's (2005) study of master's level trainees found that 21% of their sample (an admittedly small sample of 86 students and certainly not generalizable) indicated that they would be unwilling to seek professional psychological services if needed. While there are several possible implications for training from these results, one is consideration of how useful therapy will be when a subset of students would be unwilling to seek help, or may see professional psychological help as ineffective. Further studies of the attitudes towards mental health care by specifically problematic students would be an interesting addition to the needed empirical studies of various interventions.

Dismissal. Whatever interventions are used, however, there are four possible ways of concluding a remediation plan. The first is that the student makes adequate progress and no longer is in need of remediation. The second is that the student has made progress, but has not completely alleviated the concerns of the training team, and another remediation plan is initiated. The third is that the student does not make progress and he/she is counseled out of the profession. The fourth is that the student has not made enough progress and formal dismissal procedures are started (Forrest et al, 1999). The frequency with which each of these outcomes occurs after a student is placed on remediation is unknown, as no study could be located that addressed this question (Forrest et al, 1999). This gap is fitting given that there has been no empirical investigation of the success of different intervention methods, and no study of what interventions are effective for what types of concerns that need to be addressed. A study that is able to examine the common factors shared among cases where students left or

were removed from their program against the factors shared by those students that were able to retain their position within their training programs, would be invaluable. While such a study would still be subject to the same definitional concerns present in identifying problematic students (e.g., the competencies used to evaluate problematic students would differ by program and could therefore be difficult to compare), there is still value in knowing what types of interventions worked (or did not work) for students who were placed on remediation plans.

While an accurate count of how often these four possible outcomes to remediation occur does not exist, there are data on the number of students who are dismissed from their programs. In a synthesis of several studies with varying program types surveyed and with varying sample sizes, Forrest et al. (1999) concluded that of the students identified as problematic, 12-22% are dismissed, and of those dismissals, 4-24% are contested. During any three-year period, faculty are dealing with four to five possibly problematic students within their program. Of these four or five problematic students, one will be dismissed, and one of every 4-20 of these dismissals will be contested (Forrest et al., 1999). These contested dismissals usually involve litigation (see below).

Dismissal is not the end of the gatekeeping process, however, for many counselor educators. There are some responsibilities that the counselor educators have towards the students who are being dismissed. These responsibilities often include referrals to outside mental health providers, as the student may have presented with mental health concerns that have impacted his/her studies, or he/she may experience distress as a result of his/her dismissal (Sampson, Kelly-Trombley, Zubatsky & Harris, 2013). In addition, CACREP

standards (2009) explicitly require that if counselor educators deem it possible, they are to assist in facilitating students into a new area of study (p.4).

Remediation and potential dismissal of students is complicated by various legal processes in place to protect students from being dismissed based on the bias or prejudicial actions of a faculty member. While several court cases have also established the legal right of universities to determine a student's fitness for the field (*Board of Curators of the University of Missouri v. Horowitz*, 1978; *Harris v. Blake*, 1986; both as cited by Forrest et al., 1999), the likelihood of a judgment in a program's favor does not lessen the fear of entering a legal battle. In fact, and as noted above, litigation was listed as the primary fear that faculty had when considering dismissal of a student (Forrest et al., 1999; Vacha-Hasse, 1995) and for NTTTF, was a reason for not initiating a gatekeeping process at all (McAdams et al., 2007). In these contested dismissals, the credibility and integrity of the faculty member, program, and university as a whole may be called into question (Custer, 1994; McAdams et al., 2007). No matter how justified, or ethically bound, a counselor educator may believe that he/she is in dismissing a student, under litigation the dismissal "will likely be represented by the dismissed student's counsel as a malicious and punitive action and challenged as a violation of the dismissed student's right to fair and just treatment"(McAdams et al., 2007, p. 213). Baseless or not, a lawsuit of this nature is a long and expensive process (McAdams et al., 2007; McAdams & Foster, 2007). McAdams et al. (2007) indicated that they (the authors) underwent 18 working days worth of depositions, as well as the time required to testify at the trial. More than 1,000 pages of documents were produced as a response to discovery motions filed by the plaintiff (McAdams et al., 2007). This tally does not take into account the

three months worth of time spent dealing with the student before the dismissal (McAdams et al., 2007), nor the months between dismissal and trial, nor the emotional energy spent by the faculty in defending themselves and their program and institution. Nor does it count the emotional energy spent re-assuring students that they were still safe in the program and that their training would not be disrupted by this process (McAdams et al., 2007). The entire process from the beginning of the intervention to completion of the legal process took three years (McAdams et al., 2007). For someone adjusting to the roles required of a faculty member, and feeling the pressure to publish, the time that could be required in this type of an intervention may not be something he/she feels he/she can give and still make progress in his/her own career (Bradey & Post, 1991; Sofronoff et al., 2011). At a stressful and vulnerable point in their careers, and fearing litigation, engagement in the gatekeeping process may be a risk that NTTTF are unwilling to take.

If litigation were to take place, however, a program must be able to demonstrate its protection of both the substantive and procedural due process rights of the student. This means clearly communicating and delineating the criteria by which a student is evaluated, the way that feedback will be communicated, and the process for remediation of any identified concerns (substantive due process), and then strictly adhering to what is written in these policies when engaging with all students (procedural due process) (Behnke, 2012; McAdams et al., 2007). If the program is too prescriptive in their procedures, however, and formal policies are seen as contracts between the student and the university, the school may find itself defending against a breach of contract claim (Behnke, 2012; Forrest et al., 1999). This suggests that while there is a need for written policies, there is also a need for these policies to be written with sufficient flexibility to

allow the faculty to make needed accommodations as various situations and displays of problematic behaviors occur.

Beyond due process concerns, further litigation involving dismissal has resulted from challenges to a student's perceived first amendment rights. In *Ward v. Wilbanks* (American Civil Liberties Union [ACLU], 2011), a student refused to see a GLBTQ client, as same-sex orientation conflicted with the student's religious beliefs. While this case was ultimately settled out of court, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that because the school offered exemptions for secular concerns (such as a the right to refer a client for grief and loss work after having recently suffered a loss in one's personal life) but did make the same referral options available for religious objections, the school had in fact created a discriminatory situation (Behnke, 2012). The appellate court went on to place a limit on what the university could require of its students, stating that the university could not ask a student to change him/herself and a deeply held belief (Behnke, 2012). (The student wished to change what client he/she worked with by using referrals, rather than change him/herself.) This poses a problem for counselor educators, as it forces educators to define "deeply held belief," and to educate future counselors without mandating personal change in trainees.

In contrast, in *Keeton v. Anderson-Wiley*, 2011, a student was dismissed from a program after indicating that s/he would inform a GLBTQ client that his/her sexual orientation was wrong, and that if s/he was unable to help him/her stop his/her behaviors, that he/she would refer him/her to someone who practiced conversion therapy (Behnke, 2012). In this case, the court ruled in favor of the school because the student was directly imposing his/her religious views on a client. In these circumstances, the concern about

religious freedom was superseded by the perceived larger threat to client welfare (Behnke, 2012). The student refused to make a change in his/her direct contact with a client, and this refusal is what triggered the dismissal process. So, while *Ward* was seeking the right to refer clients based on religious beliefs, something the appellate court ruled the ethical codes would permit (Behnke, 2012), *Keeton* was not planning to refer, but instead to impose his/her views on the clients. This difference is what led to differing decisions in these cases. *Keeton v. Anderson-Wiley* was ultimately decided in favor of the school, whereas *Ward v. Wilbanks* (which during the appeal phase was called *Ward v. Polite*, 2012,) was settled after being remanded to the lower court for trial (Behnke, 2012). So, the courts have said that while a program can change the way the trainees interact with clients (e.g., can prevent them from imposing a religious value on a client), they cannot force trainees themselves to change their beliefs as a condition of continuing in a program.

These nuances, however, can be mystifying to a counselor educator, as the appellate courts are sorting out the implementation and practical enforcement of ethical codes in professional training programs in the light of constitutional law. It would thus be unreasonable to expect a counselor educator to be able to discern nuances in case law and apply this precedence to program policy. Forrest (2012) noted that discernment of the application of precedence is an area where professional organizations such as the APA and American Bar Association (ABA) could collaborate to create guidelines for programs.

Regardless of whether or not the dismissal results in litigation, the dismissal process can be distressing to both faculty and other students, and there may be a need to

process dismissals among the faculty, as well as to provide an opportunity for other students to express their own reactions to the dismissal (Sampson, et al., 2013; Wissel, 2011). FERPA, however, may prevent the kind of open communication and dialogue that may be necessary for the program to re-establish a healthy atmosphere. In following FERPA's guidelines, for instance, faculty are prevented from discussing a student's confidential educational information with another student, which includes information about the reason for the dismissal, or the steps take to remediate the student. If the student's behaviors were not obvious to the other students in the program, these other students may be left feeling insecure that they could be the next student dismissed. If the other students in the program were unaware of the remediation steps, the dismissal could feel arbitrary, or even punitive, on the part of the faculty members. Without open and honest discussion of the events that occurred, and a processing of the emotional impact such an event has on the faculty and the students, it would be difficult to establish a healthy relationship within a department.

The process of gatekeeping, from identification through potential dismissal of a student, looks different at every training program; furthermore, in programs without clear guidelines, the process could look different for every student within the program. NTTTF, then, may be uncertain how to initiate a process with which they likely have not had much experience. A lack of guidance on interventions that are effective further compromises best practices for the NTTTF in exercising her/his ethical responsibility in such matters.

Impact of Gateslippage

Students who are not remediated, but who present with deficiencies in their ability to function as professionals in the field, are said to have “gate-slipped” (Gaubetz & Vera, 2006). These individuals make it through the screening process that is supposed to guard entry into the field. As a result of gateslippage, there are practicing clinicians whose professional behavior and conduct is diminished, not through a temporary condition or situation, but because they never met professional standards and their conduct went unaddressed or unnoticed during their training (Forrest et al, 1999; Gaubetz & Vera, 2006). Gaubetz & Vera (2002) noted that 4.9% of counseling trainees may be deficient and yet receive no remediation. These data were further broken down to 2.5% of students in CACREP-accredited programs and 6.6% of non-CACREP-accredited programs. Despite a questionable assumption on the part of Gaubetz & Vera (2002) that gateslippage rates could be gathered by comparing students identified by peers as problematic against students that faculty identified as problematic, these numbers are alarming.

Given that a student’s perceptions of faculty engagement in gatekeeping has an effect on his/her willingness to engage in interventions with his/her classmates, and with her/his future professional peers around competency issues and problematic behaviors (Foster & McAdams, 2009; Oliver et al., 2004), a troubling precedent has been set. Faculty failure to address competency issues allows problematic students to become practicing professionals. Faculty failure to address problematic students leads other students (soon to be practicing professionals) to believe that they do not have an obligation to intervene. In short, the ripple effects of a problematic student extend far beyond the student him/herself. Gateslippage becomes a problem for the entire field, as

there are now problematic professionals who have not been held accountable by their trainers, and may not be held accountable by their peers. It is no surprise, then, that some supervisors noted that addressing some types of problematic student behaviors is impossible because the same type of problem exists among trainers (Gizara, 1997, as cited in Forrest et al. 1999), who themselves might have been able to gateslip.

The lack of accountability to other professionals, however, does take into account the way the profession is viewed by the public when unethical or problematic practitioners are admitted to the field. Beyond the damage that can be done to individual clients, the damage to public perception of the field's ability to help must also be considered. While there is certainly no way to know the proportion of ethical complaints that are a result of the conduct of individuals who gate-slipped, any proportion is cause for concern.

Beyond the desire to protect the public and the profession, however, faculty should have an interest in preventing gateslippage out of pure self-interest. If a program knew, or reasonably should have known, that a student was "impaired" and a client was harmed by the student's actions, then the program and training institution could be held legally liable for having graduated an impaired practitioner (Custer, 1994; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010).

Multicultural Considerations

Certainly, multicultural competence is a necessity for effective supervision and training in counselor education, and any identification of gatekeeping concerns, as well as any interventions selected, should be informed by this growing body of literature (Burkard et al., 2006; Chopra, 2013; Inman & DeBore-Krieder, 2013). The fear of

appearing biased, for instance, could prevent faculty from intervening with students from traditionally oppressed backgrounds. The fear that their colleagues may not validate them in their assessment may prevent faculty from under-represented or historically oppressed groups from identifying majority students as potentially impaired (Norton & Coleman, 2003; Shen-Miller, Forrest & Burt, 2012; Shen-Miller et al., 2009). Neither of these situations serves the field well, as both may result in problematic students in need of intervention passing through their programs unaddressed (gateslippage).

However, the reverse can also be true, as counselor educators must be aware of the possibility of over-identification of problematic students based on culturally appropriate behaviors that are interpreted as defensiveness or resistance (Shen-Miller et al., 2012). For example, trainers may be more willing to accept tears (a traditionally female emotional expression) than stoicism (a traditionally male emotional expression) (Shen-Miller et al., 2012; Swann, 2003), and may therefore over-identify male students as problematic. The pattern of over-identification and intervention with historically marginalized populations reinforces barriers that prevent the entrance of historically marginalized or underrepresented groups to the field, as it they affects not only the student identified, but also the program climate and the ability to recruit and retain students from underrepresented cultural groups (Goodrich & Shin, 2013; Shen-Miller et al., 2012; Shen-Miller et al., 2009). These negative results are likely exacerbated by the power differential present between educators and students, especially students identified as needing remediation, who may not feel able to advocate for themselves (Schwartz, 2012).

Surprisingly little research has been done, however, that looks at the intersection of diversity and gatekeeping (Shen-Miller et al., 2012). Gizara and Forrest (2004) found that trainers reported that racial and ethnic differences among themselves and/or with trainees complicated their evaluation processes of students. No study could be located that empirically examined the prevalence rates of intervention with students based on racial or ethnic minority or gender status. Boxley, Drew, & Rangel (1986) and Tedesco (1982) both conducted surveys of training directors of internship training sites, and both conducted visual analysis of data collected during their respective surveys on identification of problematic students, but came to different conclusions. [Visual analysis, as used in these studies, means that the researchers simply looked at the data, but did not conduct any statistical analysis.] Boxley et al (1986) concluded that there was no difference between the rates of student dismissals with regards to racial and ethnic minority or gender status. However, Tedesco (1982) concluded that dismissal rates were higher for men than they were for women, and higher for Whites than they were for non-Whites.

These studies considered only dismissal rates, and not intervention rates, so there is no way to determine whether a disproportionate number of minority students were being identified as problematic and were receiving interventions. The dated nature of these studies, the lack of statistical analysis, as well as the conflicting conclusions and the previously mentioned flaws associated with prevalence rate research in the area of gatekeeping, do not allow for definitive conclusions.

Interactions between students, or between faculty and students, are not the only places where multicultural issues emerge can impact gatekeeping. Shen-Miller et al.

(2012) conducted a grounded theory study looking at the interaction between faculty members around issues of multiculturalism and the impact of faculty climate on intervening with problematic students. They noted that “old wounds” (e.g., one faculty member consistently voicing multicultural considerations or concerns that are an annoyance or are dismissed by other faculty members; faculty members who refuse to consider the impact of multiculturalism on any interaction with students; differing levels of training on multiculturalism) present among the faculty members regarding issues of multiculturalism and multicultural competence were resurrected when problematic students were encountered, and these faculty dynamics were seen as the most complicated factor in terms of initiating gatekeeping interventions with students (Shen-Miller et al., 2012).

Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT)

In understanding the NTTTF member’s experience of gatekeeping, Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) provides a helpful lens for contextualizing the results. SCCT derives from Bandura’s (1986, 1997) Social Cognitive Theory, Krumboltz’s (1979) Social Learning Theory, and Hackett and Betz’s (1981) extension of self-efficacy as applied to women’s career development (Lent & Brown, 2013; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 2002). SCCT attempts to “trace some of the complex connections between persons and their career-related contexts, between cognitive and interpersonal factors and between self-directed and externally imposed influences on interpersonal factors” (Lent et al., 2002, p. 256). In a departure from more static career theories (e.g., trait-factor approaches, in which a trait is relatively stable), SCCT highlights the capacity of people to change, develop, and self-regulate (Lent et al.,

2002). In SCCT, a system of personal attributes (e.g., gender, physical abilities), external environment (e.g., support systems and culture), and overt behavior operate in a “triadic reciprocity” (Bandura, 1986, Lent et al., 1994; 2002) to influence career interest, choice, and performance. In this triadic reciprocity, three primary mechanisms influence how people exercise personal agency: self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals (Lent et al., 1994, 2002). These mechanisms will be addressed in greater detail below.

Mechanisms of agency.

Self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is the belief in one’s capacities and capabilities related to a given task. That is to say, self-efficacy is the degree of belief that one holds about one’s capability of completing a task. The self-efficacy component of this theory emerged out of Bandura’s (1986, 1997) work. Self-efficacy is primarily developed through experience (Lent et al., 2002). If an individual has previously had success, s/he likely has a higher sense of self-efficacy around a related task (Bandura, 1986; 1997; Lent et al., 1994, 2002). If, however, the same individual has a failure with a related task, s/he will likely have a lower sense of self-efficacy (Lent et al., 1994, 2002). It is not, however, always better to have a high self-efficacy. A false confidence in one’s abilities may lead someone to take on tasks for which s/he is not equipped. Or, an inaccurate detrimental assessment of one’s abilities may prevent someone from ever trying a task in the first place, for s/he may avoid the task to avoid failure (Lent et al, 2002). In the context of NTTTF and gatekeeping, self-efficacy relates to the participant’s belief in her/his own skills or abilities to undertake a gatekeeping intervention. Those who can accurately assess their ability to undertake the task of gatekeeping, based on previous experiences, may be more likely to engage in the process, and therefore may be more likely to participate in this project.

Outcome expectations. While self-efficacy focuses on capacities, outcome expectations focus on consequences (Lent et al, 2002). Outcome expectations are what the individual believes will happen or will be the consequence of his/her overt behaviors (Lent et al, 2002). Specifically with regards to NTTTF and gatekeeping, outcome expectations relate to the rewards (internal or external) and punishments (again, internal or external) that the participant believes s/he will face related to the intervention. If an NTTTF member were to believe him/herself capable of intervening (self-efficacy), but also see him/herself as likely to experience negative consequences related to that intervention (e.g., negative relationship with faculty or students), s/he may weigh the decision differently than if s/he anticipated positive outcomes (e.g., greater esteem from colleagues).

Personal goals. Goals are the determination to “engage in a particular activity or to effect a particular future outcome” (Bandura, 1986; Lent et al., 2002 p. 263). The overt behaviors that people display are not random, but rather motivated by their goals. Behaviors are organized to obtain a desired outcome. Returning to gatekeeping and NTTTF, the faculty member’s personal career goals (e.g., I would like to earn tenure, or be an administrator someday), or goals for their own self-perceptions (e.g., I want to see myself as someone with integrity who upholds ethical standards) interact with his/her perceived self-efficacy and outcome expectations when deciding whether or not to undertake the gatekeeping tasks presented during their career.

These three primary methods of exerting agency (self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals) remain in that “triadic reciprocity” (Bandura, 1986; Lent et. al., 1994, 2002) of mutual influence throughout all four models of vocational development in

SCCT. That is, these elements are common across all the models. These models are the second key component of SCCT, which proposes four overlapping models of vocational development: interest (i.e., how one develops interest in a career area), choice (i.e., identifying a primary career choice and embarking on a training path to obtaining the career), performance (i.e., the quality of one's accomplishments in the chosen field), and satisfaction/well-being (i.e., one's enjoyment of the chosen field). These models focus on the content of work and career, for example, how interest in a particular activity can lead to a particular chosen career (Lent & Brown, 2013; Lent et al., 1994, 2002). It is in the extension of these models Lent and Brown's 2013 paper, however, that SCCT moves towards examining the process of vocational functioning, by specifically considering adaptive career behaviors and the ways that "people manage normative tasks, and cope with a myriad of challenges" (Lent & Brown, 2013) in their careers. These adaptive career behaviors are the primary link between SCCT and this study.

Adaptive career behaviors. Adaptive behaviors, are "behaviors that people employ to help direct their own career (and educational) development" (Lent & Brown, 2013, p. 559). These behaviors are divided into five categories based on career and life stages and major life roles. These include a) growth (associated with children and students), b) exploration (associated with adolescents and students), c) establishment worker, d) maintenance worker, and e) disengagement/reengagement (retiree/leisurite) (Lent & Brown, 2013). The NTTTF could be best identified as being in the establishment phase, for while they have completed their training and are no longer students (meaning they are not in the growth or exploration stages), they are likely new to their departments

and new to their roles as faculty members as well. They are establishing themselves in their career paths and in their departments.

In the establishment phase, the adaptive behaviors include adjusting to work requirements, managing work stresses and dissatisfactions, managing work/life/family conflicts, coping with negative events, and developing new interests and skills (Lent & Brown, 2013). These adaptive behaviors may be relevant when considering the strategies a NTTTF may employ to navigate the challenges of conducting a gatekeeping intervention during a vulnerable point in her/his career as a faculty member. For example, as gatekeeping is likely a new work requirement for the NTTTF, how does s/he adjust to this new demand (e.g., how does s/he attend to it among her/his other work requirements, how does s/he cope with the inevitable stresses of the gatekeeping process)? By considering the gatekeeping *process* rather than simply the *outcome*, these adaptive behaviors offer a framework through which to consider the ways that the NTTTF navigate the internal and external factors influencing their decision-making process around intervention, as well as how they experienced the gatekeeping intervention process.

The framework of adaptive behaviors and the mechanisms of agency (goals, outcome expectations, and self-efficacy) in career development make SCCT a helpful context from which to consider the experience of NTTTF and gatekeeping. Specifically, this theory is helpful because of its applicability to the process of career self-management (adaptive behaviors, exerting agency) beyond the content of career choice. As gatekeeping can be understood as both a normative experience for faculty, as well as a

challenge, SCCT allows for consideration of the adaptive behaviors a faculty member might use to navigate her/his performance of the gatekeeping task.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Overall, gatekeeping represents a complex and multifaceted standard in counseling training. Competency issues among trainees can present in a number of ways (broadly divided between academic and non-academic concerns), and even finding a common language or definition that can be used to discuss and investigate the concerns presented by problematic students is difficult. As a result, empirical investigations of this issue have been approached haphazardly by the field, and an accurate estimate of how often students trigger a gatekeeping response, yet alone necessitate dismissal, is difficult to find.

What is clear, however, is that there is an ethical mandate borne by counselor educators to protect the public from an impaired professional, a mandate that requires that faculty initiate gatekeeping procedures with students when problems are identified. Yet shifting legal precedents can make it difficult for a faculty member to discern the best course of action for initiating and following through with these procedures. In addition, FERPA restrictions can prevent a program from being able to address the challenges presented by a problematic student in a transparent and healthy way for the department and other students.

Adding to the difficulties, NTTTTF face special challenges in executing their gatekeeping responsibilities, as they are adjusting to the academy and are in a vulnerable place with regards to career advancement. SCCT provides a helpful framework to consider their management of career related tasks and challenges. However, no empirical

investigations that consider the experience, from initiation through conclusion of interventions and beyond, of NTTTTF members involved in gatekeeping yet exist. This study will fill this needed gap in the literature and provide an understanding of the experience NTTTTF during the gatekeeping process.

III: Method

Description of CQR

This study was undertaken using consensual qualitative research (CQR; Hill, 2012; Hill et al., 1997; Hill et al., 2005). The primary reason for the employment of a qualitative methodology, and in particular CQR, is that CQR allows for the researcher to capture the lived and felt experience of the participant on the topic of focus (Hill, 2006, 2012; Hill et al., 1997). In this case, CQR allowed for an inductive approach to capturing the experience of NTTF members involved in gatekeeping interventions with a student for non-academic concerns.

First, an overview of CQR, beginning with its philosophical underpinnings. CRQ was created out of a desire to increase the rigor and specificity of qualitative methods, and a similar desire to investigate questions that quantitative methods were not in a position to answer (Hill, 2012). The inductive, constructivist approach of CQR allows the researcher to maintain an openness to unexpected information (Hill, 2006; Hill et al., 2005) and to learning from, and about, the participant. The “meaning of the phenomenon being studied emerges from words and text, the context of the participants’ words is taken into account, and interviewers interact with participants through the use of probes and clarification” (Hill, 2012, p.26). Furthermore, while looking for commonalities across the subject’s experiences, CQR simultaneously accepts the singularity and uniqueness of each individual experience (Stahl, Taylor & Hill, 2012). This open stance is particularly important as the experience of NTTF has not, to this researcher’s

knowledge, been studied before, and the investigation of new phenomena is a noted strength of CQR (Hill, 2006).

In addition to the constructivist components described above, CQR also has a post-positivist component, given that the researchers strive to minimize their biases and to faithfully render an account of how the participants experience the world (Hill et al., 2005). In addition, the use of a semi-structured interview protocol attempts to minimize the variation that may be created by the differences in the interviewers themselves (Hill et al., 2005). Researchers also work together to reach a consensus that constructs a “truth” (Stahl et al., 2012) of participants’ experiences. Third-person language is used to describe results, which further lends itself to the post-positive frame of reference, as the researcher attempts to limit interpretation and stay as close as possible to the words of the participants (Hill et al., 2005). This mixture of post-positivistic and constructivist frameworks underpins the various components of CQR. Additionally, results are presented based on the frequency with which a category (see below) occurs in the data.

The constructivist and post-positive epistemology of CQR facilitates access to the experiences under investigation in this study. There are a significant number of factors that could be at play in both the decision-making process and the emotional experiences of the faculty members as they encounter problematic students. Thus, to limit the expression and exploration of these factors by using a survey technique may have missed valuable information. CQR is “ideal for studying in-depth the inner experiences, attitudes, and beliefs of individuals because it allows researchers to gain a rich, detailed understanding that is not usually possible in quantitative methodologies” (Stahl et al., 2012, p.26). Such is the hope with this study, as the richness of the inner experience and

emotions of NTTTF was sought. In addition to creating a place for all of these factors to come to light, a qualitative approach allowed researchers to look at these data in context, and to consider the subjective meaning the participants created through their description of their internal world (Hill, 2006, 2012). The researcher recognizes that the phenomena in question, and the lived experience of the participants, do not take place in isolation. Every aspect of a participant's life could have had an effect on the phenomena in question, and as long as deemed relevant by the participant, the research methodology should be open to these aspects being considered in the analysis of the phenomena. The use of open-ended questions to stimulate discussion, as well as the ability to analyze the data in the context of the entire case, allowed for a richer and fuller examination of the experience of the faculty members, which was the core of this research endeavor (Hill, 2012).

While there are many advantages to this approach to research, as noted above, and particular advantages for its use in this study, there are also some weaknesses that need to be addressed. The first is that this study, as with all forms of qualitative research, will not be generalizable (Hill, 2006). By clearly describing the sample, as well as the research process, readers may be able to transfer the findings to their own experience, but generalizability (as understood in quantitative research) is not the goal of qualitative designs. Rather, qualitative methods seeks to deeply examine phenomena, especially those as yet unexamined, as is the case for this project.

A further limitation of this method is that, as is true for all research, whether quantitative or qualitative, the CQR approach possesses inherent biases. However, CQR does include steps to reduce such bias. The use of a research team, as well as the

inclusion of an auditor who ensures that the team is staying rooted in their data, are ways CQR attempts to control for bias (Hill, 2006; Hill et al., 2005; Stahl et al., 2012).

Furthermore, as part of the research process, CQR team members are to identify and share with one another any biases they hold that could be relevant to the topic under study (Hill et al., 1997; Stahl et al., 2012). The communication of such expectations is an additional check on the potential biases in data analysis, as it allows the other team members the opportunity to point out where these biases might be at play. By allowing other team members to serve as guards against the influence of biases that each member holds, the team as a whole can mitigate the influence that one person's biases can have on the study. Additionally, team members examine the data independently, and then come together to reach consensus (Hill et al., 1997; Stahl et al., 2012). The emphasis on consensus, while still valuing the individual experience of the research team members as they encounter the data (Hill et al., 2005) and the multiple perspectives they provide, further controls for bias. As long as the researchers continue to return to the data, multiple perspectives provide value in capturing the nuances of the data, as well as preventing the biases of one person from driving the data analysis process (Hill et al., 1997; Stahl et al., 2012).

The use of an auditor, who is not present during the initial team meetings, provides a further check against bias and group-think, and assists in ensuring that the team stays faithful to the original data in order to come closer to the "truth" of the phenomena (Stahl et al., 2012, p. 26).

Study Procedures

The following paragraphs describe the application of CQR to the research questions at hand, and the specifics of the process undertaken in conducting this project.

Project development. The primary investigator (PI), Meghan Butler, M.A. (30-year-old White American woman in her fifth year of a doctoral program in counseling psychology), conducted this project for her dissertation and therefore took the lead in project development and other tasks, which will be detailed below. The PI conducted a comprehensive literature review to inform the development process and to attempt to avoid stumbles that befell other research projects (Crook-Lyon, Goates-Jones, & Hill, 2012; Hill et al., 1997). The PI applied this information to create the initial research questions, identify the target population, and develop the interview protocol. The process by which these decision were made is described below.

Inclusion criteria. During the project creation, the inclusion criteria for target population was those who self-identified as key participants in a gatekeeping process of a student for non-academic concerns. At the time of the gatekeeping intervention, they were nontenured full-time faculty members in a tenure-track position at an APA-accredited clinical or counseling psychology program, or at a CACREP-accredited counseling or counselor education and supervision program within the United States. Counseling programs accredited by CACREP included the clinical mental health, couples and family, and school counseling programs, in addition to programs holding the older community counseling designation. The program must not have been an on-line only program.

The sample was limited to individuals in APA-accredited clinical or counseling psychology programs or CACREP-accredited counseling or counselor education and supervision programs as a way to provide some standardization as to the quality of the training program that these faculty participants represent. While the training programs themselves are different, all have met the most widely recognized accreditation standards for their respective fields. This standardization of training programs enhanced the homogeneity of the sample, a desired trait for CQR (Hill et al., 2005; Hill et al., 1997). For the same reason, the sample was limited to those teaching in non-online programs. Online only programs are a newer format for the training of mental health professionals, and it is unknown how their training compares to those programs that utilize traditional classroom-based education formats. Additionally, this researcher believes that the face-to-face interaction between the students and the faculty will prove to be important in the experience of the NTTTF.

Given that there is no reliable information as to how often gatekeeping interventions occur, yet alone gatekeeping conducted by NTTTF members, nor how often it occurs for non-academic concerns, no time limit was placed on when the participants could have experienced this phenomenon. This researcher believed that the sample would be heavily drawn from those who were now in a less vulnerable point in their careers (e.g., tenured), though this researcher also believed that the gatekeeping experience in question would be emotionally salient enough to provide thick and rich data regardless of how long ago the experience occurred. The initial aim for this study was to gather 12-15 participants, though recruitment difficulties, as described below, resulted in an actual sample of five participants.

The definition of “key player” was left purposefully vague to avoid unnecessarily limiting the sample. There is no one standard given in the literature as to how a gatekeeping process should be undertaken, and therefore there would be no way to describe exactly what role a faculty member would need to have in order to be involved closely enough in the process for it to have had an impact on them. Not all departments are organized the same way in order to deal with these gatekeeping processes. So, by describing the role as “key player,” each faculty member was given the opportunity to decide for her-/himself if s/he was emotionally impacted. S/He would decide if s/he was a key player and impacted by the event by reviewing the interview protocol that would be available before the interviews take place. If s/he felt that s/he had answers to the questions presented, then s/he would feel free to participate.

Protocol development and pilot interviews. As previously mentioned, the PI, having conducted the literature review and established a target population, created a semi-structured interview protocol (Appendix B) to be used during data collection. CQR method recommends consulting content experts about the protocol, and conducting pilot interview with 2-3 individuals who meet study criteria (Burkard, Knox, & Hill, 2012). The revision of the protocol after each of these steps helps ensure that the study, when conducted, will elicit responses from participants that yield rich data for analysis (Burkard et al., 2012). Additionally, biases can be addressed through the use of pilot interviews. Any biases that emerge, or any inadvertent influences that the team member is exerting on the interviewee or the interview process, can be addressed before interaction with actual participants (Sim, Huang, & Hill, 2012).

While pilot interviews are recommended, there are costs to conducting such interviews that may make such a step contraindicated. Such was the case in this study. The primary contraindication for pilot interviews in this case was the anticipated difficulty in recruiting a sample. Given that the protocol discusses a potentially sensitive experience for a participant, and given that the overall number of individuals who would qualify for the study is unknown, the team decided to forgo pilot interviews in order to avoid “burning” potential participants for this exploratory portion of the study. Content experts, however, were consulted, and the protocol underwent several revisions prior to beginning participant recruitment. Several of these content experts were themselves faculty members who had been involved with a gatekeeping intervention. Biases were addressed later on in the research process, and these steps are detailed below.

Research team. Following revisions to the protocol and approval of the project by the PI’s dissertation committee, the remainder of the research team was recruited. The assembly of the team following the formulation of the project is common in CQR research (Vivino, Thompson & Hill, 2012). For this project, the other two primary team members were Graham Knowlton, M.S. (30-year-old, White, American, man), and Philip Cook, M.A. (31-year-old, White, American, man), both of whom were third-year doctoral candidates in the same doctoral program as PI. The auditor, Sarah Knox, Ph.D., is a 55-year-old European American female professor of counseling psychology, also from the same doctoral program, and chairperson of the PI’s dissertation committee.

The initial three researchers (PI and Mr. Knowlton and Mr. Cook) formed the core of the research team, while the auditor (Dr. Knox) served as a mechanism of quality control to prevent the influence of “group think” from taking hold on the data analysis

process. All of the team members had previous training and experience conducting CQR projects, had been involved in training and supervision as both trainees and supervisors, were interested in the project, and had previous collegial relationships with one another that suggested they would make an effective working team. Thus, the team members satisfied the basic qualifications of a CQR team as identified by Vivino et al. (2012): Team members were a) knowledgeable of the subject area, b) had training in CQR, c) had a commitment to the project, d) and were individuals who enjoy working cooperatively with others and identifying the cores and themes of others' thoughts.

Addressing bias. Once the team was assembled, the team openly discussed biases and expectations they held that may impact the current research undertaking, and created a process by which biases and expectations that may emerge will be addressed by other team members (Sim et al., 2012). By making the other team members aware of the biases and expectations that exist, the team is better able to monitor the impact that these biases or expectations might have on the collection and analysis of data, as well as hold each other accountable to minimize the impact of these biases (Sim et al., 2012; Stahl et al., 2012). Team members shared biases that reflected the complicated nature of gatekeeping as a process. Multiple team members identified feeling that there are many occasions where gatekeeping interventions are needed, but do not happen, and each had personally encountered individuals they believe were gateslipped, both in their own training programs and in practice settings. Multiple team members also identified feeling that while faculty may be doing the best they can, and are responding to additional legal and institutional pressures, their interventions were seen in some of the researchers' experiences as perfunctory or procedural, if they occurred at all. Team members viewed

the external pressures around gatekeeping as likely to be increased when talking about NTTTTF members. Team members also identified multicultural concerns that may be at play in the perceptions of problematic students. Overall, team members agreed on a need to focus on the data as they pertained to the faculty member's experiences, and to attempt to put aside any bias about why or how the intervention was done. All team members were able to identify empathy for faculty members who found themselves in the position of needing to intervene with a student, and the potential added difficulties that being a NTTTTF member involved in a gatekeeping intervention for non-academic concerns may bring.

Team members agreed that biases, or indeed strong emotional reactions to the data, that presented themselves/were identified during the project would be discussed by the team members during team meetings. The implications of the bias or emotional response on the project would be discussed until a consensus was reached that the bias was satisfactorily addressed or neutralized in the analysis. While several strong emotional reactions were discussed within the analysis process, none were unable to be resolved to the team's satisfaction.

Addressing power dynamics. Additionally, given that PI was playing a lead role in project design and during points of analysis, the team members had multiple open conversations about the power dynamics present in the team. This was an attempt to address any outsized influence that the PI had in the interpretation of the data. As all primary team members shared student status and had previous collegial relationships, at no point did team members find this dynamic to impede consensus making on the data analysis. Additionally, while the faculty auditor is Director of Training for all three

students, audits were reviewed without the auditor present, which reduced the influence that that role held on data analysis, and team members agreed that they felt free to both accept, reject, and amend feedback.

Recruitment. Following the formation of the team and discussion of bias and team power dynamics, recruitment of subjects began. Participant recruitment, as indicated above, was anticipated to be difficult. For a CQR project, researchers are attempting to locate participants who have experience with the research topic in question and are able to provide enough detail to offer rich data for analysis. Participation rates are low overall in qualitative research because of the time commitment involved, and because participants are asked to share their own intimate experiences, so recruitment can be difficult (Hill & Williams, 2012). This researcher foresaw additional recruitment difficulties for this study because the overall number of potential participants is unknown, and even those who do qualify may be hesitant to speak about the events due to departmental or university policy, or fear of repercussions for having spoken about a student discipline issue. Nevertheless, in keeping with recommended guidelines, this researcher attempted to recruit between 12-15 participants in order to establish consistency between a homogeneous sample (Hill & Williams, 2012).

Initial recruitment efforts focused on snowball sampling through the researchers' professional networks and contacts, and requesting that the study recruitment materials (Email recruitment letter, Appendix E, which included a link to the informed consent [Appendix C] and demographic form [Appendix D], and the interview protocol [Appendix B]) be forwarded to anyone who might be able to assist with recruitment and/or participate. Additionally, recruitment materials were sent to several researchers

who have published in gatekeeping, hoping that their interest in the research would encourage them to forward the materials to others in their own networks. Furthermore, this researcher created a database of the e-mail addresses, gathered from program websites, of every APA- and CACREP- accredited program in the United States. Initial desire was to collect the contact information for the department chairs, whom this researcher believed would be best positioned to know if their faculty might have experienced the phenomenon in question, and be able to distribute the study materials to all faculty in their department (as was requested in recruitment materials). In places where a department chair was not identifiable, this researcher collected contact information for the training director, another person who would likely be aware of this phenomenon occurring in her/his department. In some cases, this meant multiple training directors or program coordinators' contact information was collected, as there may have been different individuals coordinating different accredited programs (school vs. clinical mental health counseling) or different levels of training (M.A. vs. Ph.D.). If neither the training director nor the department chair was discernable, the first faculty member, as determined by alphabetical order of their last name, was selected as the contact. In the rare cases where no faculty were listed, this researcher contacted the generic "contact this program" email listed on the website. Any returned e-mails were substituted following the same procedure listed above.

Initial recruitment efforts, and indeed the initial intent of this project, were focused on NTTTF members who had terminated a student (student was asked to leave or would have been had they not left voluntarily) for non-academic concerns. Recruitment of this sample was more difficult than predicted. Initial emails to the department heads

yielded no participants, but interestingly, did identify some barriers around recruitment. Three programs indicated that the project would have to gain approval from the institutional review board of those universities before they could be distributed to the faculty there. This researcher did not feel that such additional efforts would be worth the potential recruitment access to a small number of faculty. Two other programs indicated that while they wished this researcher well in recruitment, they only distribute requests from students in their own departments, or within their own discipline. There were, of course, far more programs from which this researcher did not receive a response.

Two additional responses, however, warrant further discussion, as they were indicative of a rather hostile reaction to the topic at hand. Two emails, representing two different institutions, responded to the recruitment effort by indicating that they were uncertain of how this researcher had obtained their emails, and seemed offended at having been contacted about the subject of gatekeeping. One stated “I do not know how you came to include me in your list, but we have had 100% graduation rate and have not been involved in any gatekeeping” within their program. They went on to assert that this was true since their program began, and rather harshly requested that this researcher never contact them again.

While many of those contacted responded wishing this researcher well with the project, or wrote to inquire about their eligibility, and those emails were encouraging, the two negative responses received were concerning. This researcher was curious about why the mere invitation to participate in a research project around gatekeeping triggered such a defensive reaction in people that they would feel called to respond to the email with a defense of their program. Interesting, and further encouraging to this researcher’s interest

in the topic, these emails seemed almost aggressive in asserting that they had never had a gatekeeping intervention. Is the idea of having exercised this ethical responsibility somehow seen as shameful or to be defended against?

Encouraged by the question, but disheartened by the response rate for participants ($n = 0$), this researcher expanded the recruitment by gathering the emails of every faculty member listed on the websites for APA- and CACREP-accredited programs, and re-sent the previous invitation to all those who had not responded to the previous e-mail blast. When these further efforts again yielded no results, this researcher submitted an amendment to the IRB and re-framed the project to drop the termination as part of the inclusion criteria, and to shape project into its current form.

Following this amendment, this researcher submitted the revised recruitment materials to the same email listserv created from previous recruitment (less those who requested to be removed). Additionally, this researcher further solicited participation on this project through the Counselor Education and Supervision Network (CSNET) listserv, and the Teaching in Psychology (TIPS) listserv. These invitations were sent three times, less each time those who requested removal. All told, this researcher sent over 1,400 emails to faculty at accredited programs and to those in the research team's own network. An unknown number of people were reached through the listserve. Recruitment occurred over the course of two years.

Data collection. Over the course of the recruitment process, six participants completed the informed consent and were contacted by the PI to complete a semi-structured, audio-recorded, telephone interview. The interview protocol (Appendix B) had been sent to participants prior to the interview for their consideration, and follow-up

questions were offered by the PI during the interview. The interviews lasted between 58 and 75 minutes. During the course of one interview, it was determined that the participant did not meet study criteria, and s/he was removed from the project. This left five participants for the project, which is a reduction from this recommended 12-15 participants sought by the research team. However, given that recruitment efforts had been lengthy and current sources exhausted, that the actual number of the population who have experienced this phenomenon was unknown, and that investigation of this phenomenon with this population has previously not been investigated, the research team, in consultation with the PI's advisor, made a decision to move forward with a reduced sample size for this exploratory study. Other CQR bases studies have used similarly small sample sizes ($n = 6$; da Silva Cardoso, Philips, Thompson, Ruiz, Tansey, & Chan; 2016; $n = 5$; Franklin, Chen, N'cho, Capawana, & Hoogasian, 2015).

Data analysis and interpretation. The five participant tapes were transcribed verbatim by the PI, with the omission of minimal verbal responses (umm, ahh, hum, etc..) and identifying information (Burkard et al., 2012; Hill, 2012; Hill et al., 2005, Hill et al., 1997). These transcripts were then distributed to the team members for analysis. Data analysis began after the first interview was transcribed, and continued simultaneously with further data collection. For the first transcript, the three primary research team members individually created “a list of the meaningful and unique topics examined in the interview” from the transcripts that are called “domains” (Thompson, Vivino, & Hill, 2012, p. 104). The team then met via phone to consensually create one domain list that accounts for all the data in the transcript. This domain list was then applied to the second transcript, and altered as needed to accommodate all data from both transcripts, again,

with all team members working towards consensus. Following the finalizing of the domain list, data from each transcript were placed into the appropriate domains by each team member individually, and the team worked to consensus about any areas of disputed categorization, creating a consensus version for each case (Thompson et al., 2012).

From here, “core ideas” or summaries of the data are created to capture the participant’s information into fewer words that will allow for comparison across cases (Thompson et al., 2012). These core ideas continue to use participants’ words as much as possible, but also represent a higher level of abstraction about the meaning of these words than does the creation of domains. The PI created the core ideas from each participant’s domained transcript, and each of the other two primary research team members reviewed and critiqued the abstractions made by the PI. Again, the team worked to create a consensus version of the documents, with a range of 5-27 areas of disagreement or critique on each transcript that needed to be worked through. The number of critiques steadily declined as data analysis proceeded. Again, consensus was reached on the core ideas, and this consensus version, now including the domained and cored data, was sent to the auditor for review (Thompson et al., 2012). The primary team then discussed the auditor’s suggested revisions to the domains, domained data, and core ideas, and came to a consensus about which suggestions to adopt.

Once data from all participants have been cored and audited, in the cross-analysis, all core ideas from all cases for a given domain are gathered together and examined for common themes or categories within a domain and across cases. The cross analysis reflects an even higher level of abstraction from the core ideas, and this process is repeated for each domain (Ladany, Thompson & Hill, 2012). The domains were divided

among the primary team members for initial consideration, with each team member independently reviewing and commenting on the work of the other team members. Following initial independent work and review, the team met to work through to consensus on the categories and the cores of which they consist (Ladany et al., 2012). Once the list of categories has been created, and the data organized into the categories, the number of cases that appears in each category is counted, thus reflecting the representativeness of the category across participants. Using Elliott's (1989) method, the following descriptions of categories apply: If the category includes all or all but one of the cases, it is considered a "general;" if it includes more than half of the cases, it is considered "typical;" if it includes at least two and up to half of the cases, it is considered "variant" (Hill et al., 2005). For the purposes of this study, that meant that a category that included five participants was deemed "general," three or four participants included were categorized as "typical", and if a category was represented by two cases, it was deemed "variant". The complete cross analysis was then sent to the auditor for feedback. The primary team then reviewed the auditor's suggestions, and reached consensus regarding how to respond to the recommended changes (Ladany et al., 2012).

Following the write-up of the results, participants were invited (Appendix F) to offer their comments on the findings. Specifically, participants were asked for feedback regarding how well the results fit with their experiences, as well as to identify any area which they felt were potentially identifiable. Of those participants that responded to this request ($n = 4$), none required changes to prevent confidentiality from being breached, and all felt the results were consistent with their experiences. The results of the study are presented in the next chapter.

IV: Results

First, results pertaining to participants' experience of training in gatekeeping and suggestions for training of other faculty will be discussed. Next, results pertaining to the specific experience of NTTTF gatekeeping for non-academic concerns will be explored. Additionally, the closing reflections will provide more general thoughts related to gatekeeping, as well why the participants chose to engage in this research and what it was like for them to discuss these events. Finally, an illustrative case example is presented.

Prior to presenting the results, however, the demographics of both the participants (NTTTF members) and the students who were gatekept will be described. As CQR's utility lies partially in its ability to maintain context around a participant's experiences, these descriptive demographics serve to provide context for the findings.

Demographics

Participants. The five participants all self-identified as female. In open-ended responses in terms of racial/ethnic identity, four identified as White or Caucasian, and one identified as Asian. They ranged in age from 35-54 years old ($M = 44.4$; $SD = 7.02$), with four currently serving as faculty in CACREP-accredited programs and one in an APA-accredited program. Four participants held Ph.D.s and one held a Psy.D., with two holding degrees in Counselor Education and Supervision, one in Clinical Psychology, one in Counseling Psychology, and one in Educational Psychology. Currently, two were full professors, two were assistant professors, and one was an associate professor who had been in their positions for between 1-18 years. At the time of the gatekeeping intervention, four were assistant professors and two were associate professors, with one

participant having been promoted during the intervention. They had been in their positions, at the time of the intervention, from 1-3 years ($M = 2.6$, $SD = 1.62$) and had been full-time faculty in a mental health training program for 1.5 – 5 years ($M = 3.3$, $SD = 1.64$). Three had been involved in a gatekeeping intervention prior to the one discussed in this interview (Range: 1-5 interventions; $M = 2.25$, $SD = 1.89$); two had not. They had known the student involved in the intervention between 0 – 2 years prior to the intervention. All but one had been involved in gatekeeping interventions since the one they described for the study, with a range of 3-10 additional interventions ($M = 6.5$, $SD = 3.1$).

At the time of the interview, two had tenure and three did not. Both of the tenured faculty remained at the institution in which the gatekeeping event took place; two of the nontenured participants had changed institutions since the event. Additionally, one participant was not what would be traditionally thought of as “tenure-track.” This participant worked at a university that offers both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty appointments. However, the University operates under a collective bargaining agreement, and both tenure-track and non-tenure track positions apply for advancement on the same schedule, with the same contract length. The difference is primarily found in title and in starting salary. The expectations for advancement are the same, and indeed, in this individual’s program, no faculty held the tenure-track title, which appears to be reserved primarily for law and medical school faculty. This participant was in the first year of her first (one-year) contract, seeking re-appointment for a multi-year contract during the gatekeeping event. This researcher included the participant given that she faced the same re-appointment concerns as a tenure-track faculty member would have at

the institution. Additionally, one participant held a unique administrative role during the intervention: This faculty member had a course release for her administrative responsibilities, which meant that this participant served on a panel that addressed all student discipline concerns in the department and reviewed all department students annually. This participant had no advisees, to avoid conflict given her administrative role, but had all the same tenure requirements as other faculty at her institution.

Students. Per the report of the participating faculty, the four male and one female problematic students involved in the gatekeeping interventions were between the ages of 26-35 years old ($M = 30$, $SD = 4.35$). For the purposes of discussion, all students will be referred to as male to avoid potential identification of the female student. Three were believed by the faculty to identify as White, and one as Latino. Two students were asked to take a leave from the program to address concerns; neither returned. One was formally dismissed from the program, with no opportunity to return. One student is currently in a remediation process, with faculty recommending dismissal. One student successfully remediated. Two students contested their remediation, one with a formal appeal to the Dean and another who threatened legal action and refused to sign a remediation plan. The length of the gatekeeping intervention, from first awareness of concerns to resolution, ranged from two weeks to three years, with one process not yet concluded.

Gatekeeping Training

Participants were asked to describe the training that they had received in gatekeeping, and, after having spent significant time reflecting on their experience of having been involved in gatekeeping, to provide recommendations for training that should be provided to new faculty.

Received. Generally, participants reported having received little or no training in gatekeeping. Of those who could remember having talked about the gatekeeper role, none could remember having spoken about it with regard to faculty responsibility toward students. One recalled discussing it as a role that one might have to play for another faculty member, and even then this conversation was superficial. “There was a little bit of a blub in a textbook and I clearly remember my professor talking about it and giving the example of a colleague and needing to gatekeep for the profession. And then I know we were required to talk in small groups...and you had to talk about potential issues you might have that others might need to gatekeep. Which was not a conversation at all. Nobody said a word.” Another remembered learning about it within the context of grading equity and due process. Poignantly, one participant stated “I felt like the curtain was never pulled back into the inner workings of things like gatekeeping.”

More typically, faculty reported having learned about the role informally through mentors and colleagues. “There [were] a couple of situations where my dissertation chair and my ...mentor in the program had to gatekeep some students. So it was kind of vicarious learning from what they went through.” Informal training included watching a mentor navigate a difficult gatekeeping event, having been involved in research on gatekeeping policy with a colleague, and “on-the-job training” when concerns arose.

Suggested. The participants generally suggested that faculty be provided with a structured, fact-based, orientation/training to the role of gatekeeper. Faculty suggested that this training would be helpful, as doctoral students “hear a lot of scary stories about junior faculty who made bad choices and what happened to them,” and felt that this approach would provide accurate information about gatekeeping, record keeping, and

litigation. Within the training, participants noted that the specific policies and procedures for each university need to be addressed, as they change at each institution. So, having experienced gatekeeping procedures at one university does not necessarily mean that faculty are prepared to follow procedure at a new university. One participant stated that in on-boarding new faculty, the department needs to “orient them to this role and the importance of it. Why we need them, when they have a student to document, and give good notes about why you gave them the C.”

Furthermore, participants typically suggested that mentoring from other faculty be provided. One participant noted she wished she had had a mentor who could have said to the participant “this is how I walk it, whatever your values and beliefs, this is how I walk it, and let's work together to figure out how you are going to walk it given what you are gatekeeping.” Participants acknowledged that new faculty have a need for professional development in a number of areas, and that mentoring may be a way to provide this development with regard to gatekeeping. Findings pertaining to this section can be found in Table 1, below.

Table 1: Gatekeeping Training

Domain	<i>Frequency</i>
Subdomain	
Category	
Gatekeeping Training	
Received	
Little/No training	<i>General</i>
Informal training via mentors/colleagues	<i>Typical</i>
Suggested	
Provide faculty structured, fact-based, orientation/training	<i>General</i>
Provide mentoring from other faculty	<i>Typical</i>

Gatekeeping for Non-Academic Concerns

Beyond training-related reflections, participants described their experience of having been involved in the gatekeeping of a student for a non-academic concern. These results were broken down into five subdomains: 1) Nature of the non-academic concern, 2) How the concern was brought to participants' awareness, 3) Gatekeeping intervention process, 3) Impact of intervention on participants, and 4) Impact of intervention on other students. Several of these subdomains were further subdivided, as described below.

Nature of gatekeeping concern. Central to this study was a reflection on the non-academic concern that led the faculty member to engage in a gatekeeping intervention. Typically, the non-academic concern that necessitated a gatekeeping intervention was a multicultural/interpersonal/dispositional problem. This concern was evidenced by students making statements in class such as they “would not work with the coloreds,” or making racist, sexist, anti-GLBTQ or anti-semitic comments in their coursework. Furthermore, these students were unable to take and incorporate feedback, becoming defensive and guarded or holding “grandiose and narcissistic” beliefs about their own abilities. Additionally, a lack of boundaries was present, with the students making unreasonable demands of faculty via e-mail (e.g., sending three emails to a faculty member in one week, and during a holiday weekend “threatening that they were going to go to the dean if I did not respond immediately”), and even stalking another student and threatening faculty. Other emotional regulation issues surfaced, such as when a student demanded that faculty answer his questions because the student pays “you [faculty] a shit ton of money,” when a student became angry and “push(ed) a desk and

storm(ed) out of the classroom” or when a student made inappropriate comments on social media to vent frustration about clients.

Additionally, some faculty members also commented on the lack of clear distinction between academic and non-academic concerns. For example, one participant talked about how risk-averse administrators are, and therefore they will give a student a master’s degree in something other than counseling, or “hook it to something academic” so that the student “hopefully they won’t sue.” Additionally, as a result of the student’s dispositional concerns and narcissistic stance, one participant noted “I don’t know if he did not learn the material because he was unable to, or because he simply felt that it was beneath his contempt to learn it.” Another noted that in their program, clinical behaviors, such as taking feedback and being open in supervision, were considered academic behaviors.

How brought to participant’s awareness. The participants generally witnessed the event/evidence of these concerns themselves. For example, “He would hijack conversations in the classroom. Always bring it back to him and his son. Make really, really discriminatory statements about certain populations, like people with developmental disabilities, which was the population that he wanted to work with.” Or “I receive[d] out of the blue, a three page email. The next day. And in that he talked about how I obviously didn’t know what I was doing, so he thought he should inform me.” Typically, these concerns were brought to the faculty member’s attention by others. This included e-mails from field supervisors, as well as concerns brought forth by other students and faculty. In several cases, the faculty members witnessed the behaviors in class or had written communications or submitted work from the student that illuminated

the concerns, and others brought their concerns to the faculty regarding their experiences in the various context and environments in which they interacted with the student. For example, one participant had been having significant concerns about the student, and issues with classroom governance, and then an “adjunct faculty who was teaching her e-mailed me a really long email about all the concerns that he had with her in the classroom.”

Gatekeeping intervention process. Participants were also asked to describe the gatekeeping process itself, with results delineated by eight subdomains: Participant’s role in intervention; Participant/Student’s interpersonal dynamic; Actions/Timeline; Supportive/Facilitative factors for participant’s on-going engagement in process; Hindering/discouraging factors for participant’s on-going engagement in process; Professional impact of the intervention on participants; Impact on other students; Impact on participant’s relationships. Each of these will be described below.

Participant’s role in intervention. This study asked only that participants be a “key participant” in a gatekeeping process, as roles in gatekeeping vary significantly from institution to institution. In responding to this question, faculty identified as having been the a) student’s advisor (variant), b) program administrator or department chair (variant), c) course instructor (variant), or d) someone who brought the concerns to others’ (e.g., other faculty, Dean) attention (variant). Multiple faculty held more than one of these roles in the process.

Participant/Student’s interpersonal dynamic. Regardless of their role(s) in the interventions, each of these faculty members had a relationship with the problematic student. Typically, the faculty members cared for the student’s wellbeing and saw the

student as “a good guy who obviously had a little problem,” or stated they wanted to convey to the student that “just because I did not think he was a fit for the profession, that I did not think he was a bad person.” Some faculty did this by explicitly telling the student about their care, and others did this through offers of support for the student, such as offering additional meetings with the faculty member or offers to assist the student in heading in a new professional direction. One faculty member described that once the gatekeeping process was underway, she began thinking of the student as a client, and this allowed her to find greater empathy and care for the student “whose life had crashed and burned around him.”

However, it was also typical for the student to reject a relationship with the faculty member. One participant described the student as embarrassed by the gatekeeping process and therefore avoided engagement with faculty, whom they saw as an authority figure. Additionally, faculty reported that the student “couldn’t accept anything from me, or believe that I had their best interest at heart” after the initiation of the gatekeeping process.

Variantly, faculty also reported that they felt threatened by the student. In one case, the participant felt that the student was “extremely unstable” and that confrontation with the faculty member over his behaviors had caused the student to “unravel.” The faculty member felt the need to “take off my faculty hat and put on my clinician hat and think, ‘how do I assess this person as a harm to self or others?’” In other cases, participants reported being stalked and requesting armed police outside their classroom for their safety and the safety of other students due to threats made by the problematic student. This fear had one participant leaving her family to head to campus for class,

“worried whether I was going to be coming home that night.” Faculty also reported altering schedules or seeking escorts on campus to avoid the student.

Actions/Timeline. While processes varied considerably based on the nature of the concern in question, and the policies and procedures of each individual institution, the NTTTTF members generally met with students to address concerns. These meetings sometimes involved other faculty or administrators, but in every case, a meeting occurred to assist the student in understanding what concerns the faculty members had, and their expectations for the student’s continuation in the program.

Typically, the student was placed on a remediation plan or a remediation plan was attempted. In one case, a student had multiple remediation plans in which he met the goals superficially, and was placed on an additional remediation plan, and ultimately did not complete the last plan. In another case, the student refused to sign the remediation plan, and then did so a week later after being informed that he would not be allowed to continue in the program if he did not sign. In another, a student “just did not see what the problem was,” and was unable to see the need for a remediation plan due to this blindspot. The faculty realized that the student was “going to leave kicking and screaming.”

Typically, the student was dismissed from the program. In two cases the student was offered the opportunity to return if he met certain re-admission criteria, and in another the student was formally dismissed following an appeal to the Dean. In one case, the student stated “I knew at some point you would know, and this meeting was going to happen,” and the student volunteered to leave.

Supportive/Facilitative factors for participant's engagement in process.

Generally, NTTTTF members reported that feeling supported by other faculty was a facilitative factor. This support ranged from other faculty sharing the participant's perception that the student's conduct was "unbelievable," and so the participant was "reassured that it wasn't just me," to having faculty stay late on campus to support the participant when she was going to be meeting with the student. Additionally, having the backing of faculty and knowing that the participant could "consult with on every step of the process lowered my anxiety."

Further support was garnered by participants typically seeking support from mentors. This support system included previous undergraduate and graduate school mentors who had experience with both gatekeeping and faculty roles with whom the participant could consult. "I had a mentor from my undergrad times, and I had consulted with her. I called and said, hey, first time I have to do this and I want to make sure that I am doing this well."

Faculty also typically reported feeling a sense of responsibility to protect future clients and the profession. The faculty were mindful "that this is not just about the impact on students, but on who the student will serve" and trying to ensure that "they are not going to harm anybody." Participants stated that they felt "emotionally invested in helping that student, or barricading that student from entering the profession" to ensure that "the profession, which takes enough hits, doesn't have people out there misrepresenting who we are and what we do" and preventing problematic students from having "access to vulnerable folks."

The faculty also typically felt confident in their own experience, competence, or evidence. Some participants noted previous clinical work that made them “comfortable with having hard conversations with people,” which was helpful in the gatekeeping role. Additionally, one participant felt her licensed status, “which says that I know what I am doing,” offered some protection and coverage for the participant in the actions she was taking. Furthermore, some participants noted that the paper-trail of data, the collateral information they had obtained from others who interacted with the student, and their own university policies and procedures made them confident in the case they were presenting about the student’s fitness in the profession.

Variantly, faculty also felt that concern for the student was a supportive factor for intervening. Faculty commented, “I want the best for everybody, including for the student who was gatekept,” and noted feeling an obligation to “not continue to take this student’s money and educating them [sic] in a profession I do not think they [sic] should be in.”

Hindering/Discouraging factors for participant’s engagement in process. In general, the NTTTTF member’s own experience of negative affect, self-doubt, and anxiety was a hindering or discouraging factor. Participants noted asking questions such as, “Am I doing everything I can? Am I biased? Am I protecting the department? Am I protecting myself?” They further questioned “being able to justify the actions and choices I made,” and noted that the anxiety they had about meeting with the student, and any possible appeal or litigation, was “brutal.” Additional fears were noted about wanting to make sure that they were following university policies and procedures. Faculty also noted other identities (i.e., being a second-year professor, woman of color) that they felt increased their insecurities and negative affect in their experience of intervening with the student.

Typically, a lack of support or engagement from other faculty further served as a hindering or discouraging factor. Disengagement took various forms, from faculty members who downplayed the seriousness of the concern, or who outright stated they did not think it was a concern, to faculty who “tried to save every student,” or who “had been at the program for more than 30 years and who felt no need to get involved” in a gatekeeping event, as they had never been involved in one before now. Some outright told the NTTTF member that “this is about you and your values,” which was discouraging to the participant.

Variantly, a lack of support from other university officials was also a discouraging/hindering factor. This lack of support ranged from a Dean who wanted to “let sleeping dogs lie,” as well as from a university legal counsel who, while the participant acknowledged was “just doing his job,” was discouraging with regard to “everything we had to have” in order to dismiss the student.

Faculty also variantly noted that department policies and procedures themselves were discouraging. In one case, the policies were not worded strongly enough to support faculty intervention. In another, the policies and procedures “are not fast,” and while “the systems are there to protect due process...if it was an emergency, I don’t know that gatekeeping is the effective approach.”

Impact of intervention on participant.

Professional roles/tasks. Engaging in the gatekeeping process typically resulted in lost time/energy for participants’ publications/professional responsibilities. Participants noted thinking of gatekeeping as a “self-expense that isn’t going to get you promoted” and that is “equivalent to the amount of time it takes to write up an article.” Others noted

having “still not published that dang dissertation” and having been late on several publication deadlines due to engagement in gatekeeping. Additionally, faculty stated that they spent time re-prepping courses to accommodate the problematic student’s behaviors while the process was underway, and others lost time they could have been using for course prep or learning university systems that were new to them. The “mental energy” that participants spent in these efforts was “exhausting.”

Following this intervention experience, faculty members typically were faster to intervene with students when there were concerns. Participants described wanting to be “on the primary prevention effort, not tertiary” with students, and to speak with them about concerns early, so as not to “blindsided” them if it becomes a remediation issue. Participants also described wanting to identify a plan of action “so students don’t drag on and not make it. But also, if they are going to make it, that we assess that quickly and we can figure out how to support them.”

Faculty typically also increased their conversations with students about gatekeeping policies prior to there being a problem. For various participants, this meant having a syllabus that “is now 14 pages long” because it details all the gatekeeping policies and procedures and quotes from the code of ethics regarding gatekeeping responsibilities. Another participant increased conversation around gatekeeping in her opening course, and knows this conversation has “scared some [students], but I think that is a good thing. This is serious stuff.” Other participants made changes to the student code of conduct, or now have their students sign a code of conduct and the code of ethics so that the program has “firmer footing” if “something happens down the road.”

Faculty were also typically seen as the “go-to” resource for future gatekeeping/departmental policy development. These incidents resulted in the faculty members being seen as someone who “lived through it” and “did it well.” It started the faculty “down a path of learning to do it, and learning to do it well” and potentially discovering a “strength” and that they were “meant for this role.” As such, they were sought out by other faculty to review remediation plans or write departmental policy on gatekeeping.

Relational. Generally, faculty reported increased trust/connection with other faculty members. Participants noted a “supportive coming together in a challenging situation” with other faculty, and that going through the experience “defined more clearly who I would and would not be consulting with, connecting with, trusting,” and to whom the participant would be “hitching my wagon.” Additionally, as junior faculty, it was also noted that going through a gatekeeping event increased the participant’s credibility with other faculty. One noted that after having removed a student without significant issues, her department chair thinks she “is the best thing since sliced bread.”

Participants also typically described increased communication and partnership with support staff. Participants noted having felt buoyed by support staff during the intervention, and seeking their feedback on students, since “the way a student behaves with [support staff] is a much better indicator of how a student behaves” than when they are with faculty. Others found that they were more descriptive about the gatekeeping process with support staff after realizing they may not have a clear picture as to why a student cannot be dismissed immediately. One participant noted coming to appreciate that support staff are “partners” in gatekeeping.

Faculty, however, also typically reported increased stress in family relationships. Participants noted that they were spending more time at work as a result of the intervention, or were “a little less focused at home or available to family, a little preoccupied” due to the stress. Participants also noted that their partners and children felt the stress that they were under, but the participants also could not share the full stories, and participant’s families did not understand why the students could not just be dismissed. One participant who felt physically threatened by a student’s behaviors also noted that she did not share this threat with her partner because “I was not sure I could reassure effectively.” Two participants, however, also noted that these events served as a “baptism” of sorts, for them and their partners to figure out how they would navigate the participant’s new role as a faculty member, in a similar way in which they learned to navigate confidentiality and stressors in the participant’s life as a clinician.

Impact on other students. Other students in the program were also affected by the problematic student and by the intervention process. Typically, the problematic student’s behaviors created questions from peers about the enforcement of training/professional standards. As faculty noted, “so much of it is this dual process where on one level it is out in the public eye, because... behaviors occur in front of other students...and students talk to other students, but anything you are doing as a professor, as a faculty member, is confidential.” And so, students had questions and concerns about how students were admitted and allowed to stay in a program. On the flip side, when a student was dismissed, students were “refreshed that we actually do gatekeep in this profession.”

In a variant category, problematic students were disruptive to learning. The problematic student was sometimes so disruptive to the group process that faculty were

receiving emails from other students who were “distraught” over how much this one student was impacting the cohort and their learning experience. Additionally, one problematic student was telling other students that the instructor was a “fascist” and that is why she kept “shutting down” the student’s ideas during class. The faculty member felt that the student’s characterization of her concerns prevented other students from knowing the boundaries of how far they could interrogate an idea, because they were unsure what exactly the student was doing that was creating problems and triggering a response from the faculty, and this overall sense of uncertainty dampened the learning atmosphere. Variantly, other students may not have known about the intervention. In one case, the student “made it entirely his own, his decision to leave” when he spoke with other students about his dismissal, and did not mention that faculty were involved, or that he was asked to leave. In another case, the student was embarrassed by the need for an intervention and did not share it with other students. In both cases, it was possible that no other students were aware of the intervention having taken place. These results are displayed in Table 2, below.

Table 2: Gatekeeping for Non-Academic Concern Event

Domain	<i>Frequency</i>
Subdomain	
<i>Category</i>	
Gatekeeping for Non-Academic Concern	
Nature of Gatekeeping Concern	
<i>MC/Interpersonal/Dispositional Concern</i>	<i>Typical</i>
How Brought to P’s awareness	
<i>P Witnessed Event/Evidence</i>	<i>General</i>
<i>P Contacted by Others</i>	<i>Typical</i>

Gatekeeping Intervention Process	
P's role in intervention	
<i>St's Advisor</i>	<i>Variant</i>
<i>Program Administrator/Department Chair</i>	<i>Variant</i>
<i>Course Instructor</i>	<i>Variant</i>
<i>Brought Concerns to Others' Attention</i>	<i>Variant</i>
P/St's Interpersonal Dynamic	
<i>P cared for st's wellbeing</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>St rejected relationship with P</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>P felt threatened by st</i>	<i>Variant</i>
Actions/Timeline	
<i>Met w/St to address concerns</i>	<i>General</i>
<i>St placed on remediation plan/remediation plan attempted</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>St dismissed from program</i>	<i>Typical</i>
Supportive/Facilitative factors for P's engagement in process	
<i>Supported by other faculty</i>	<i>General</i>
<i>Sought support from mentors</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>Sense of responsibility to protect future clients/profession</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>P confident in own experience/competence/evidence</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>Concern for student</i>	<i>Variant</i>
Hindering/Discouraging factors for P's engagement in process	
<i>P's experienced negative affect/self-doubt/anxiety</i>	<i>General</i>
<i>Lack of support/engagement from other faculty</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>Lack of support from other University officials</i>	<i>Variant</i>
<i>Departmental policies or process</i>	<i>Variant</i>
Impact of Intervention on P	
Professional Roles/Tasks	
<i>P lost time/energy for publishing/professional responsibilities</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>P faster to intervene with concerns</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>P increased conversations with students about gatekeeping policies prior to problems</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>P seen as "go-to" faculty for future gatekeeping/department policy development</i>	<i>Typical</i>
Relational	
<i>Increased trust/connection with other faculty</i>	<i>General</i>
<i>Increased communication/partnership with support staff</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>Increased stress in family relationships</i>	<i>Typical</i>

Impact on Other Students

<i>St's behaviors created questions from peers about enforcement of training/professional standards</i>	<i>Typical</i>
<i>St was disruptive to learning</i>	<i>Variant</i>
<i>Other students may not have known about intervention</i>	<i>Variant</i>

Closing Reflections

During the course of the interview, some participants offered information related to other gatekeeping events with which they had been involved, and general thoughts on gatekeeping. These statements were distinct from the specific gatekeeping events that were the focus of this study, and therefore were separated out from the data specific to the intervention discussed for this study. Such findings are described below.

General thoughts. In reflecting on their gatekeeping experiences, participants typically reported that they had also been involved in other distressing/litigious gatekeeping cases. All of the cases referenced occurred after the case shared for this study. However, participants noted that “litigation takes this to another whole level” and that those cases are “10x worse” than the ones they described. As an example, a participant described a student whom she did not discuss as “hostile, manipulative, and haunting,” and noted that the incident was distressing to the participant, as opposed to the one she shared for this project.

Participants also variantly expressed that junior faculty should not have the lead role in gatekeeping. The participants noted that “even if it is their advisee, that a senior faculty member step-in and take the lead” and that “the role of the lead in gatekeeping does not belong to the junior faculty.” While both also noted that senior faculty leading would be a way of teaching gatekeeping, both were also explicit that while a learning

experience, the junior faculty should not lead the process, regardless of relationship to the student.

Participants also variably reinforced that boundaries are crucial to make gatekeeping possible. One participant noted that she is “very selective about who I let get close to me,” as it would make it harder to gatekeep a student later. Another participant noted, “you never know who is going to hit a bump,” and “we are not student’s friends. We are not colleagues, yet.”

Why participated. Generally, faculty chose to participate because they believe gatekeeping is an important/interesting area of study. Participants saw the study as a “service to the profession,” as gatekeeping is “an important subject.” Additionally, participants noted feeling that “I have had these experiences” and “I know I am not the only one” and “it was intense...someone needs to hear this story.”

Participants also typically wanted to help other researchers. Participants believed in “research karma” and hoped that participation in this project would help them recruit for their own studies. Another noted that she rarely meets all study criteria, and is excited to participate when she can.

Experience of interview. Typically, the interview experience was pleasant. One noted having chosen to share an event that was pleasant to think about. Others noted a history of learning how to talk about hard things, or had discussed their experience with others, and so were comfortable sharing again with this researcher. Still another expressed feeling “excited” because she enjoyed talking about gatekeeping. Results from this section are displayed in Table 3, below.

Table 3: Closing Reflections

Domain		
	Subdomain	
	Category	<i>Frequency</i>
Closing Reflections		
	General Thoughts	
	<i>P has experienced other distressing/litigious gatekeeping cases</i>	<i>Typical</i>
	<i>Junior faculty should not have lead role in gatekeeping</i>	<i>Variant</i>
	<i>Boundaries with st's are crucial to make gatekeeping possible</i>	<i>Variant</i>
	Why participated	
	<i>Believes gatekeeping is important/interesting area of study</i>	<i>General</i>
	<i>General desire to help other researchers when able</i>	<i>Typical</i>
	Experience of Interview	
	<i>Pleasant</i>	<i>Typical</i>

Illustrative Example

As a way to integrate these results and bring them to life, a composite example.

This example incorporates the general and typical themes in the data, and combines information from across participants in order to maintain anonymity of the participants.

Lucy is White, 44 years-old, female, and a second-year assistant professor in a tenure-track position at a CACREP-accredited program. She holds a Ph.D. She has a White, 30 year-old, male student, Jarod, who is her advisee and is also in her introductory theories class. In class, he has displayed some concerning behaviors: He is dominating in conversations with his peers, and does not seem aware of the impact he has on others in the class. He is aggressive in his challenges of Lucy while she is teaching, and resists Lucy's attempts to redirect him or temper his disruptions. Additionally, he has made anti-GLBTQ statements in class, and further expounded upon his beliefs in the written

assignments he has submitted to Lucy. Jarod has stated that he would refer a GLBTQ client because, “I don’t approve of that, so I would just refer.”

When Lucy has attempted to informally address her concerns with Jarod, in particular around the unethical nature of the referrals that he is considering, Jarod becomes defensive and does not seem to understand Lucy’s concerns, and at times, belittles her. Lucy is aware that she likely needs to begin a formal gatekeeping intervention, but is anxious about doing so. She is unsure of the university policies and procedures that apply here, and she is fearful that she will be sued. She has heard of other faculty who have experienced contested gatekeeping processes that have ended in litigation. Furthermore, Lucy is worried that she might be making a bigger deal of these events than needed, as she is inexperienced in her role.

Lucy has never been involved in a gatekeeping process before, and had no training in this responsibility during graduate school. She had seen a former faculty mentor go through a gatekeeping event, however, and decided to reach out to her to seek consultation before she brings her concerns to the full department faculty. This consultation proves helpful and assists Lucy in identifying her concern for future clients and the profession, and reassures her that her concerns are not related to her own transference. Similarly supportive of Lucy’s decision to act were data that came from two other sources: An adjunct faculty member emailed Lucy, in her role as Jarod’s advisor, about concerns the adjunct had with Jarod and his behaviors in his class. They were similar to the interpersonal and multicultural concerns that Lucy was seeing in her own interactions with Jarod. Additionally, a student came to see Lucy during office hours, and shared her concerns about the disruption that Jarod was having on her learning and the

group process of the cohort. She asked Lucy, hypothetically, about how a student is allowed to stay in the program. Lucy could not answer the subtext of the student's question (Why is Jarod still here?), but encouraged the student to "trust the process" and thanked her for sharing her concerns.

The e-mail from another faculty member, and the concerns from another student, in combination with the evidence that Lucy had from her own experience, along with the supportive consultation from her former mentor, led Lucy to decide to intervene with a formal gatekeeping process. Lucy approached her department chair about the concerns, and she was supportive, though cautious about ensuring that all appropriate policies and procedures were being followed. The chair advised Lucy to schedule a meeting with the student, Lucy, and the chair to discuss these concerns.

At the meeting, Jarod was defensive, and blamed Lucy for "just not liking me." Lucy's chair was supportive of her, and reinforced Lucy's concerns to Jarod. Jarod was asked to assist in developing a remediation plan that would address these concerns. A plan was created, and after some back-and-forth discussion over the next week, Jarod reluctantly signed a remediation plan and agreed to its conditions.

Over the course of the next three months, Lucy was charged with monitoring Jarod's progress on the plan. The two had bi-weekly advising meetings and progress reports, and Lucy was spending a significant time typing notes and summaries of the meetings and sharing those with Jarod so that she was protected from a "he said/she said" situation. She was falling behind on her publishing deadlines, and really would have preferred to be spending time preparing her courses for next semester. At home, Lucy's husband commented that she was often distracted, and at times tossed-and-turned in her

sleep. Lucy knew it was related to the stress over her on-going gatekeeping interventions with Jarod, but she also could not share her concerns with her husband due to confidentiality restrictions.

Six months after the remediation plan was initiated, Lucy presented Jarod's progress and her continued concerns to the full faculty. The faculty were supportive of Lucy meeting with Jarod and informing him that the faculty had decided that he should step-out of the program and address these concerns. Several faculty members offered support to Lucy, including offering to be present during the meeting, which Lucy appreciated. However, a few faculty kept their distance, and Lucy thought it was to avoid being entangled in litigation if Jarod contested the decision. This distancing only heightened her own concerns about a contested dismissal, and raised her anxiety before meeting with him. However, Lucy was confident in her professional judgement and the evidence she had of Jarod's inappropriate behaviors and dispositions.

During her meeting, Jarod initially contested his dismissal, and tried to defend that he had been making progress on his remediation plan. However, Jarod then decided it was not worth the fight, and accepted the dismissal, stating that he planned to return to the program in the future. Lucy tried to express care for Jarod, and offered to assist him with any new professional plans he might have, but Jarod rejected this support. He never returned to the program, and Lucy's fears of litigation or appeals within the university never materialized. Students in the cohort were relieved that Jarod was gone, and Lucy overheard them talking in class about how happy they were that "standards were upheld."

Since the intervention, Lucy has been more proactive about talking about gatekeeping with students before there is a problem. She talks about her responsibility as

a gatekeeper in the first class, and she includes the department policies on gatekeeping and the ethical code in her syllabi. Lucy hopes these steps will give her a stronger footing when she needs to intervene with a student in the future. Lucy is also quicker to speak with a student about concerns when they are present, as she wants to support the student so s/he can succeed. If s/he is not going to successfully remediate, Lucy wants to ensure that s/he does not drag on in the program.

Overall, Lucy feels closer to the faculty who supported her in during the intervention. She also feels that she has gained credibility with other faculty because she handled the dismissal of a student, and did it well. Since that time, other faculty have come to her to consult about the remediation plans they are developing. It has even increased her partnership with support staff in the program. Lucy feels more confident in her role as a gatekeeper and her ability to handle difficult student situations in the future, which she knows are likely to occur.

V: Discussion

This study sought to examine NTTTF members' experience of gatekeeping. Specifically, the study investigated the emotional and cognitive experience of gatekeeping, the factors that supported and facilitated and/or hindered and discouraged intervening, the impact of gatekeeping on the NTTTF member's relationships, the preparation that NTTTF members had for the gatekeeping role, and what they learned from the process. The results of this study will be discussed below.

First, a brief summary of the results. While participants had little to no training in gatekeeping themselves, other than informal training from mentors/colleagues, they suggested that faculty should receive a fact-based training/orientation and be provided with mentoring. The non-academic concern that they encountered was an interpersonal, dispositional, or multicultural concern, and it was witnessed by the participant as well as others who contacted the participant about their concerns. The participants played various roles in the process, including advisor, program administrator or department chair, course instructor, or the individual who brought the concerns to other faculty. The NTTTF cared for the student's wellbeing, but the student rejected a relationship with the participant. Some NTTTF also felt threatened by the student. In the process of gatekeeping, the faculty member met with the student to address the concerns, placed (or attempted to place) the student on a remediation plan, but ultimately, the student was dismissed from the program. Supportive or facilitative factors for intervening were a) support offered by other faculty; b) support sought from mentors; c) a sense of responsibility to protect future clients and the profession; d) confidence in their own experience, competence, and

evidence; and e) concern for the student. Hindering or discouraging factors were a) experience of negative affect, self-doubt, or anxiety; b) lack of support or engagement from other faculty members; c) lack of support from University officials; d) and departmental policies and procedures. Professionally, participants lost time and energy for publication and other professional responsibilities during the gatekeeping experience. After the intervention, they became faster to intervene with concerns, have more conversations with students about gatekeeping policies and procedures prior to problems, and are seen as the “go-to” faculty in their department for future gatekeeping and policy development. Participants felt that the intervention led to an increased trust and connection with other faculty, increased communication and partnership with support staff, and increased stress in their family relationships. Other students in participants’ programs had questions about enforcement of training/professional standards, found the problematic student disruptive to learning, or may not have known about the intervention at all. In closing reflections, participants noted that they had experienced other distressing or litigious gatekeeping cases, believed that boundaries with students are crucial to making gatekeeping possible, and asserted that junior faculty should not take the lead role in gatekeeping. They participated because they believed that gatekeeping is an important and interesting area of study, and they had a desire to help other researchers. They had a pleasant experience of the interview. The general and typical results will be discussed in more detail below.

Training

The limited training that faculty members reported, prior to engaging in gatekeeping, is consistent with the extant literature indicating that the majority of faculty

had no training in the identification of remediation concerns and gatekeeping processes (Brear & Dorrian, 2010; Jacobs et al., 2011). The training that they did receive often involved watching mentors manage an intervention process while the participant was a student. This informal training fits within the current literature, which suggests that a faculty member is socialized to the role of gatekeeper during her/his graduate training largely based on the challenges s/he encounters (e.g., a difficult student in a course for which s/he is a teaching assistant) than any formalized training (Golde, 2004; Reybold, 2003). One would assume that supervision training would provide information related to remediation and gatekeeping that would be applicable to the faculty gatekeeping experience. However, given that there is no standardized approach to teaching supervision (i.e., some programs have a course on the topic, others weave it into other courses, with varying levels of emphasis), and that some training programs may place less emphasis on supervision than others (e.g., counseling psychology v. educational psychology), this assumption does not hold. Indeed, even field supervisors have been identified as needing more training in remediation and gatekeeping (Freeman, Garner, Fairgrieve & Pitts, 2016), suggesting that training in remediation and gatekeeping is in need of improvement across the board. No study was located that addressed how to teach gatekeeping responsibilities to new supervisors, or explored how programs are currently teaching this responsibility.

Overall, faculty members in this study sought more specifics regarding what to do when gatekeeping, and wanted a mentor to serve as a guide on implementing an intervention. In short, they wondered “What do I do and how do I do it?” and wanted guidance from more experienced colleagues as they navigated the process. In other

words, the faculty members were seeking some supervision. These findings serve as a departure from previous literature indicating that while department administrators were likely to see value in additional training on “identification, remediation and termination” of problematic students, course instructors (the modal role endorsed by participants in this study) did not (Brear & Dorrian, 2010, p. 269). This departure may be because Brear & Dorrian sampled faculty involved in training of counselors, but did not specifically target those who have been involved in a gatekeeping intervention. These findings may represent recognition, on the part of the participants, of what they did not know. That is to say, faculty involved in gatekeeping may more readily recognize what they “should” have known about gatekeeping before they did it. Not surprisingly, in response to their own desire for information on what to do and how to do it, then, these faculty suggested mentoring and structured, fact-based training on gatekeeping as the training that should be provided to other NTTTF. They are attempting to provide for other faculty members what they wish they had had for themselves before going through a gatekeeping intervention.

Gatekeeping for Non-Academic Concern Event

Nature of gatekeeping concern. The non-academic concerns present for the student varied, but broadly consisted of interpersonal, dispositional, and multicultural concerns. The intersection of these multiple areas (i.e., most cases had multiple of these domains present) more broadly reflects the complexity in evaluating problematic students. Objectively measuring such interpersonal skills deficits, or a lack of multicultural competence, is difficult. Instead, faculty often must rely on their felt experience in their interactions with the student, or the student’s written work, to support

their interpretation. Thus, their criteria were “principally subjective” (Brear et. al., 2008), and “the actual reasons for dismissal may be multiple in nature, and hard for respondents to categorize (Forrest et. al., 1999, p. 63). Consistent with Wissel (2011), the faculty were aware of a distinction between academic concerns and non-academic concerns, but making a clean delineation between those domains was challenging, as also expressed in the literature (Lumadue & Duffy, 1999; Spurgeon et al., 2012; Wissel, 2011).

Despite these challenges, all participants identified concerns using behavioral descriptions, but without directly referencing a competency standard that they were using to evaluate the student. The movement towards competency-based approaches, which represents an attempt to define “the essential functions of the profession” (Forrest et. al., 1999), may be a way to cut through the ambiguity of the concerns as discussed above, and has been recently adopted by professional psychology (APA, 2011; 2012; Kaslow et al., 2004). However, these competency-based approaches do not define the dispositions needed for professional practice, and therefore may not offer definition of all ranges of behaviors that may be problematic. For example, the 2016 CACREP Standards for accreditation require that a program have a system for “identification of key professional dispositions” (p. 17), and that students regularly be evaluated on these dispositions. Similarly, APA’s Standards of Accreditation (2017) state that a program must have written policies and procedures that cover “identification and remediation of insufficient competence and/or problematic behaviors” (p. 25). These standards do not, however, specify what those dispositions or problematic behaviors are, and therefore variability across programs likely exists.

This variability raises questions about the subjectivity of gatekeeping across the profession. Without a firm foundation of standards across programs, a student who may be gatekept at one institution may not have been if s/he attended another program, based on what dispositions are evaluated, and according to what standard. While some variability between programs and student success is to be expected given other factors (e.g., student match to department culture, connection to peers), potential ethical questions arise if a student's behaviors might be seen as unfit for the profession by one training program, and not so by another, and yet this student may be barred from entry into the profession.

Yet, despite an inconsistent standard for evaluation of students across programs, the participants in this study sought to avoid some of the common pitfalls that have accompanied gatekeeping processes. Specifically, by focusing on behaviors, the faculty avoided the subjectivity of a he said/she said argument in disciplinary proceedings. They also avoided the concerns related to the ADA, as using "psychiatric diagnoses not only carr(ies) additional stigma for the student but require(s) extra procedures that protect student rights" (Forrest et. al., 1999, p. 63; see Chapter II for further discussion). So, while a consistent standard of behavioral competencies on which students are evaluated across programs does not exist, in their focus on student behaviors, participants are already employing objectively based evaluations.

How brought to participant's awareness. Regardless of the model of evaluation used, the behavioral manifestations of the non-academic concerns were evident, and were witnessed by faculty and others who brought their concerns to the participant. While it is unlikely that all faculty witnessed the problematic behaviors necessitating gatekeeping,

having witnessed the events themselves and having others confirm their concerns may have made participants more confident in their decision to intervene. Indeed, the “lack of clear evidence of problematic students with professional competency issues” (Brear & Dorian, 2010, p. 269) has been previously identified as a hindrance to intervention. In contrast, for the participants in this study, the evidence of their concern was often directly laid out in front of their own eyes.

The role that the faculty members played may also have contributed to their confidence in intervening. Extant literature has discussed the diffused responsibility that faculty sometimes feel with regards to intervening, because all faculty have similar responsibilities for the student, and any of them could intervene. Yet, several participants held multiple roles in the gatekeeping process (e.g., advisor and course instructor, administrative roles with responsibility for student discipline concerns). Perhaps the fact that the participants directly witnessed the events in question, and had a felt sense of responsibility due to their multiple roles, they felt empowered to intervene and not, as one participant noted, “pass the buck” on problematic students.

Gatekeeping intervention process.

Interpersonal dynamic Interpersonally, the faculty noted that they cared for the students and wanted to show that care for them throughout the intervention process. While these participants did not state that their care for the student prevented them from intervening (in fact, several noted that their care for the student and for the profession was the driving force behind their desire to intervene, as will be described below, in supportive factors), the students rejected that care.

Such findings may reflect what Austin (1996) described as the “gatekeeper or gardener” paradigm. In this paradigm, the faculty members who may prioritize their role as a developer of clinicians may prefer informal interventions (Foster & McAdams, 2009; McAdams et al., 2007) with students in the hopes of being able to assist them in growth and nurturing their “garden” of students. Alternatively, gatekeepers prioritize a guardianship role, in which they are tasked with regulating entry into the field. This is not to say that those who see themselves as gatekeepers do not wish to nurture students, but rather that they prioritize their role as gatekeepers above their relationships with students, and above being liked by students. Though this dynamic did not hold in Brear and Dorian’s (2010) study of mental health faculty and gatekeeping, perhaps these priorities are what the participants referred to when, during closing reflections, they described how crucial boundaries are in making gatekeeping possible. Had the participants been too close to the students, then perhaps the desire to garden would overwhelm the need to gatekeep. Indeed, as evidenced by the results in this study, the faculty members did lose any relationship they had with students, even when they were offering to assist students in transitioning out of their current training programs. Students rejected the faculty member’s attempts to “garden” after having been gatekept. It appears that when a faculty member assumes the mantle of gatekeeper, s/he is forced by students to abdicate her/his ability to assist students in their on-going growth. This dynamic held true for both participants whose interventions ended in dismissal, as well as for those who successfully remediated.

Actions/Timeline. Despite participants’ efforts to address/remediate the concerns, students were dismissed from the program. Comfortingly, the faculty members indicated

that they followed ethical decision-making in addressing conflict directly with the party with whom the ethical concern originated (ACA, 2005; APA, 2010). While there may not be any significantly larger meaning in these conversations, this aspect of due process was maintained, and students were given a chance to talk through the concerns.

There are two possible interpretations of these results. In terms of the remediation plans and outcomes, it may be that the problematic behaviors were significant enough that there was no real hope that remediation would be effective. That is to say, there are some concerns that are more amenable to change (e.g., softening delivery of difficult feedback or increasing comfort around emotional expression) and others that may be less so (e.g., ego-centricity or lack of empathy). Additionally, change also requires motivation by the party making the change (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1983). The behaviors demonstrated by the problematic students may not have been amenable to change, or the student's motivation to change the behaviors may be insufficient.

The second interpretation is that the remediation interventions themselves were not effective, for the students were eventually dismissed. Previous literature has explored the lack of empirical evidence about effective remediation interventions (Forrest et. al., 1999), and this lack of knowledge may have played a role in the lack of success in these students' remediation plans. The interventions selected to target the problematic behaviors may not have been effective, and therefore the problematic behaviors were not ameliorated.

Supportive/facilitative and hindering/discouraging factors. Overall, the direct support from other faculty members was an important factor encouraging NTTTTF to exercise their gatekeeping responsibility. By the same token, other faculty distancing

themselves from the NTTTF member, even when understood by the NTTTF member as a perceived attempt to shield themselves from potential future litigation, negatively affected NTTTF members when implementing an intervention. So, while a gatekeeping intervention may be led by the NTTTF member, the other faculty must consider the message their actions, or inactions, send during the intervention. For NTTTF, the experience of gatekeeping is not done in isolation, but rather as part of a system, and is heavily influenced by the support offered by other faculty.

As a grounding theoretical base for interpretation of these results, the analysis will turn here to career theory. The overarching context of these results is the participant's lived experience of being a NTTTF, which is a significant stage of career development. The transition from life as a student to the integrated professional identity as a faculty member requires growth and adjustment. To do justice to the context of the participant's experiences, which CQR allows, it is necessary to view the results of this study through the lens of career development. Specifically, the adaptive career behaviors associated with the "establishment worker" phase of career development in SCCT (Lent & Brown, 2013) offer a lens through which to consider these results, as the tasks undertaken in gatekeeping can be seen as ways of participants growing in their professional identity and adapting to their new roles as faculty members. Analysis will focus on the adaptive behaviors of refining interpersonal, political, and networking skills (Lent & Brown, 2013) first, followed by adaptive behaviors of adjusting to work requirements, managing work stresses and dissatisfactions, coping with negative events, and developing new interests and skills (Lent & Brown, 2013).

To start, consider that participants noted the substantial role that support, or lack thereof, from other faculty members played in their gatekeeping experience. These findings illuminate the role other faculty members play when a NTTTF member is involved in a gatekeeping intervention, and is consistent with previous empirical literature that has found (as already noted above) support from faculty to be an enabling factor when responding to gatekeeping concerns (Brear & Dorrian, 2010). In SCCT, this finding could be associated with refining the interpersonal, political, and networking skills (Lent & Brown, 2013) needed as a NTTTF in a department. In the political and competitive world of the academy (Reybold et al., 2011; Reybold & Corda, 2011; Sorcinelli, 2002), those faculty who more successfully navigate these relational challenges are more likely to obtain career goals (Lent & Brown, 2013). The support, or lack of support, from other faculty can be seen as a referendum on the integration of the NTTTF into the department. As a newer member in the department, building relationships with other faculty is important. The interpersonal connectedness of those relationships is more likely to increase the faculty's commitment towards a common task (e.g., gatekeeping intervention) (Mullen & Cooper, 1994). The presence of faculty support, then, may suggest that a NTTTF has navigated this task effectively, and has built the social capital needed to act in partnership on the tasks required in her/his role (i.e., as a gatekeeper). Such was the case for a couple of faculty members who noted close faculty relationships prior to the intervention, and an increase in closeness following the intervention. A lack of support may not mean that an NTTTF has not successfully navigated this task, and indeed going forward solo with an intervention may well be the best option to navigate the interpersonal, political, and networking challenges facing the

NTTTF. This dynamic could be particularly true, for example, if there is some element of dysfunction in the department or institution, or if other faculty are hesitant to exercise, or have abdicated, their role as gatekeepers (as was the case with one participant who was the first in her program to initiate a gatekeeping intervention in more than 30 years). In that case, while the NTTTF may have built relationships, the system may require that the NTTTF go forward without faculty support, as it is the best option available in a bad situation. Regardless, if going forward without support is the best way of navigating this task, the faculty member is likely to feel less connected to the other faculty (congruent with Mullen & Cooper, 1994), and that political and interpersonal isolation can feel destabilizing in an early part of one's career.

Beyond relationships with faculty, the NTTTF also reported that they found support from mentors helpful in intervening with the problematic student. When NTTTF find themselves in a vulnerable career space conducting a new and potentially difficult professional responsibility, the opportunity to seek support from those who have supported the NTTTF in the past, and who may be outside the department, could be invaluable. This support from mentors could also serve to a counterpoint to the interpersonal, political, and networking tasks (from SCCT, Lent & Brown, 2013) that the NTTTF faces. This relationship may be a place where the NTTTF does not need to worry about the complex interpersonal and political dynamics of her/his department/institution, nor being evaluated. The ability of the external mentor to offer support, without any stake in the intervention, may well position the mentor to be able to provide assistance for the NTTTF in managing the stress and dissatisfaction that can come from gatekeeping, and represent a positive and pro-social coping technique. In this case, the NTTTF are seeking

social support, and are doing so from someone who has expertise in an area (i.e., mental health training faculty) that is challenging for the NTTTF.

Reaching out to other mentors evidenced several adaptive career behaviors, including adjusting to work requirements, managing work stresses and dissatisfactions, coping with negative events, and developing new skills (Lent & Brown, 2013). As previously noted, the NTTTF have little previous training in gatekeeping, and are adjusting to this new role as part of their professional career. Reaching out to a mentor may be a proactive attempt by the NTTTF to adjust successfully to this new role. Connection with mentors who have navigated the role of gatekeeper and their own professional transition to faculty member may serve as a source for practical guidance on how to facilitate this process. This practical guidance could also be a source for assisting the NTTTF in developing new skills that s/he needs for the gatekeeping role, such as how to keep appropriate documentation, or how to write a remediation plan. Again, given the limited training that the NTTTF had, this reconnection with prior mentors for support and skill development seems logical.

In addition to the relationships with others (i.e., mentors, faculty), participants also noted that their sense of responsibility to protect future clients and the profession facilitated their intervening, echoing previous literature that found that “educators are predominantly motivated by a sense of responsibility towards the counseling profession when undertaking evaluative tasks” (Brear & Dorian, 2010, p. 270). These concerns are reflective of an integrated professional identity in which the participant not only has an internalized sense of responsibility for the training of new clinicians (Dollarhide, Gibson, & Moss, 2013), but extrapolated this responsibility to the collective profession. It is this

sense of guardianship that lies at the heart of the gatekeeping responsibility. There would be no purpose to gatekeeping if it were not to protect future clients and the reputation of the profession. Thus, despite a lack of training in gatekeeping, the core values for their role as guardians of the profession were transmitted. These participants understood why the intervention matters – to protect the public and the profession.

Also facilitative was participants' confidence in their own experience/competence/evidence. First, participants' actually witnessing the problematic behaviors likely increased their confidence in their need to intervene. This visible evidence, coupled with confirmation from others who shared the participant's concerns, may have provided the confidence needed to overcome diffusion of responsibility that can take place between faculty members in a department when a gatekeeping intervention is needed. The NTTTFs' confidence in their own competence or experience may also be linked to a sense of self-efficacy. These faculty members believed in their ability to meet challenges and expectations, either because they had done so before (experience) or because they had the necessary skills (competence). This finding leads to speculation that high self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997) may play an important role in engagement in a gatekeeping intervention. Whether a lower self-efficacy impedes engagement is uncertain, but a strong sense of self-efficacy seems helpful.

This is not to say that the experience of gatekeeping was without any negative elements, as participants experienced negative affect/self-doubt/anxiety, which hindered them in their intervention. Despite the negative affect, self-doubt, and anxiety surrounding the intervention, however, they still intervened and completed a gatekeeping process. The self-efficacy and confidence these participants had, their commitment to the

values of the profession, and the support and modeling from others may have been sufficient to help participants overcome any barriers that this negative affect may have created.

Overall, many of these supportive and hindering factors are consistent with previous empirical literature. However, the specific identification of mentor support and participants' own confidence in their experience/competence/evidence represent new themes with regards to supportive factors.

Impact of intervention on NTTTF.

Professional roles/tasks. Faculty were affected by the gatekeeping process both during and after the intervention. During the process, for instance, they lost time for other professional responsibilities (e.g., publishing). Returning again to adaptive career behaviors from SCCT (Lent & Brown, 2013), they had to navigate a change in work tasks and cope with negative events. Gatekeeping, while an ever-present responsibility for faculty, is not always a primary work task. Only when a student's behavior rises to the level of concern does gatekeeping become a primary work task. However, the other tasks that a faculty member undertakes on a more regular basis (e.g., teaching, grading, research, advising) do not disappear to accommodate the addition of the time-consuming gatekeeping task. As a result, the faculty members must find a way to incorporate the additional work into the same amount of time. While this schedule may be possible to some extent and for short periods of time (e.g., working harder or longer), eventually something has to give.

Through this lens, while the gatekeeping intervention may have cost the NTTTF time and energy for professional and publishing responsibilities, this loss might, in fact, demonstrate adaptive coping on the part of the NTTTF: They prioritized their time and

tasks, and shifted their focus away from normal duties (i.e., publishing, course preparation), and instead direct those resources towards the intervention itself. For example, a participant noted falling behind on some publication deadlines in order to complete required gatekeeping documentation.

Following the intervention, the NTTTF more frequently talked with students about gatekeeping policies prior to the emergence of any evident problems, depicting a desire to preemptively reduce the chances of further gatekeeping needs. Such a change represents the learning that occurred over the course of the intervention. While what faculty members learned varied based on specific factors related to their unique gatekeeping event, they applied that learning in the hopes of preventing future problems.

The NTTTF also became much faster to intervene when concerns about a student did arise. Having already engaged in a gatekeeping intervention before may reduce the doubt or anxiety that the faculty felt (identified hindering factor) prior to potentially engaging in a second gatekeeping. At the same time, previous gatekeeping experience may also increase the faculty member's confidence in her/his own competence/experience/evidence (identified supportive factor) and self-efficacy to handle an intervention.

These participants also became the "go-to" person for future gatekeeping and policy development, for they had evidently earned the respect of their colleagues based on their capable handling of the gatekeeping process. By managing the intervention competently, the NTTTF has established herself as a faculty member who can advise, and maybe even mentor, in this area. SCCCT would identify this display of competency as an

adaptive work skill in that the NTTTF was able to identify an additional skillset and potential area of leadership for herself within her department.

Collectively, the professional findings that occurred following the intervention appear to reinforce the power of experiential learning. It appears true that “experience is a brutal teacher. But you learn, my God, you learn” (Attenborough, 1993). The faculty members in this study took a difficult experience, and were able to learn from it and apply those lessons to their approach to gatekeeping in the future.

Relational. The gatekeeping also affected participants’ relationships, including increased trust and connection with colleagues. Given that a common goal is known to increase group cohesion (Mullen & Cooper, 1994), this result is unsurprising. When the faculty were working together on a gatekeeping intervention, a common task, they increased their connection with one another. At the same time, this increase in social cohesion also strengthens commitment to the common task. As a result, the commitment to the task likely also contributed to the support that faculty members offered the NTTTF (facilitative factor), as the connection between cohesion and task commitment is bidirectional (Mullen & Cooper, 1994).

The same dynamic likely also contributed to the increased communication and partnership with support staff. The common task of a smooth functioning educational department would create cohesion between faculty and support staff. In other words, in both relationships with faculty and support staff, the commitment to a common goal/task of gatekeeping increased cohesion.

The gatekeeping experience also led to less salutary effects, as well, as evidenced by participants’ increased stress in family relationships. In the paradigm of SCCT, the

adaptive work behavior at play here is the navigation of work, family, and life stress (Lent & Brown, 2013). Though gatekeeping is primarily a work stress, the increased demands for time and energy that the intervention placed on the faculty member spilled over into family life. Though work-related stress overflowing onto personal relationships is not a phenomenon unique to these participants, there was a particular quality to the stress related to FERPA privacy concerns preventing the faculty from sharing their concerns with their partners and family members. The faculty member is in some ways unable to use her/his social support system to assist in managing the increased stress. These results reinforce the need for understanding gatekeeping as a multi-faceted and stressful experience that has ripple effects across several domains of the life.

Impact on other students. Faculty were not the only ones to experience an impact from the gatekeeping intervention. Other students in the program were also affected in that they began to question the enforcement of training/professional standards. The behaviors of the problematic student were known to other students; however, because of FERPA regulations, the interventions directed toward the problematic student are usually not made public. This dichotomy between what a student is observing and the behind-the-scenes interventions may jeopardize confidence in the training faculty, as well as in the profession.

Closing Reflections

Though not asked during the interview to reflect on other gatekeeping events, several participants volunteered that they had experienced other more distressing or litigious gatekeeping incidents. Thus, despite substantial recruitment difficulties for this

study, the phenomenon of gatekeeping is not rare, and is likely to be encountered more than once in a professional's career.

The pleasant experience of the interview may be related to participants' reasons for participating. When asked why they participated in the study, participants asserted the importance of gatekeeping research and the desire to help other researchers. Participants believing that they were making a valuable professional contribution with their involvement in this research were likely to experience the event as pleasant. While these factors are relatively straightforward, it is worth considering that individuals who value gatekeeping research, or gatekeeping overall, may be more likely to engage in gatekeeping and therefore qualify for this study. Similarly, having witnessed behavioral evidence for the student's concerns likely increased participants' confidence in their actions and may have made them more willing to share their story than would those who were uncertain of the intervention in which they engaged. Again, given the lack of standardized competencies on which students are evaluated, a potential participant may have feared evaluation from the researcher with regards to his/her decision to intervene. Accordingly, s/he might have avoided the anxiety of that potential evaluation by not participating in the project. Furthermore, those individuals who feel that they were providing assistance to a researcher may have extrapolated a sense of purpose from sharing their own story about a difficult experience, fostering their positive experience of the interview.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The first, and primary limitation, is the sample size. While a small sample (12-15 participants) is recommended in CQR (Hill,

2012; Hill et al., 1997; Hill et al., 2005), the five participants in this study represent quite a small sample, even for this method. The stability of the categories would likely be enhanced with a greater number of participants. Other categories could also have emerged with additional cases.

Additionally, while homogeneity of the sample exceeded the recruitment criteria in some demographics (e.g., all participants were female), the same demographic homogeneity was not obtained across the board. For example, had there been a consistent outcome from the gatekeeping interventions (e.g., all ended in dismissal, all were successfully remediated), there may have been more consistency of experiences across the cases. Indeed, in this project, one of the interventions had not yet been completed, and therefore there may be additional data to that case yet to emerge.

Furthermore, the faculty members had varied relationships to the institutions in which they conducted the intervention. Exploring the specific impact of NTTTF status on the intervention experience would be a valuable contribution to the literature. Some participants noted that during the intervention, they were at institutions at which they did not want tenure, or where they never had any doubt that they would obtain it. The varied natures of the faculty members' relationships to their institution made it difficult to find consensus around any themes related specifically to nontenured status.

Additionally, the faculty played varied roles in the intervention in question. This variability is not likely something that could be controlled, given the wide variety of faculty configurations and gatekeeping processes that occur in institutions across the country. Yet, it is plausible that a department chair or a student's advisor experienced her/his gatekeeping event differently from the faculty whose administrative role was to be

in charge of such student concerns, and different still from a faculty member who played a more peripheral role in the intervention.

Overall, however, the limitations of this project are consistent with the limitations of previously published gatekeeping research. Without an understanding of the prevalence rates of gatekeeping within counselor education programs, it is impossible to know how many faculty would even be in the target population for this study. Furthermore, it is possible that non-academic gatekeeping concerns may be harder to locate if, as was suggested by a participant, faculty work to hook their concerns to an academic category in order to reduce perceived litigation risk to the university. As a further complication, some faculty may have been hesitant to participate for fear of violating FERPA during the interview, or may have worked at an institution that had its own policies and procedures that prohibited their participation in a project of this nature.

Implications for Training and Practice

Training. Several potential implications emerge from this project, the first of which focuses on the training of (future) faculty around gatekeeping. Regardless of individual program's policies and procedures, there are common elements to gatekeeping, such as meeting with students and remediation plans. This is an area where the training for faculty, as was suggested by participants, could be targeted. For example, in meeting with students about gatekeeping concerns, what information is important to document about the conversation? How best can that documentation be created (formal letter mailed to student/Email/Need it be signed)? Additionally, regardless of policies and procedures specific to an institution, most participants created remediation plans. Training within graduate programs, perhaps within a supervision course, about how to write a

remediation plan, including information about what can and cannot be included in a plan, and a review of the literature (the little that exists) about what interventions have been found effective, could be helpful. If not included in graduate training, this type of information, along with orientation to department-specific policies and procedures, should be provided as part of new faculty orientation. Such training may preemptively prepare a faculty member for playing this gatekeeping role and may increase confidence in her/his actions.

Additionally, the opportunity to consider department policies and procedures in light of what others have learned from their experiences of gatekeeping would also be helpful. Perhaps a national accrediting body, such as APA or CACREP, could have a working group to establish best practices around gatekeeping, beginning with admissions screening. While some literature has identified various ways that programs screen students (McCaughan & Hill, 2015; Swank & Smith-Adcock, 2014), no literature was located that evaluated how effective the various screening methods were in identifying potentially problematic students. In consultation with specialists in mental health and educational law, faculty could work to identify and test various ways of addressing admissions screening, due process during gatekeeping processes, as well as empirically driven interventions related to remediation. Identifying supportive programs or interventions that can prevent the need to gatekeep for a student, and increase student success, would also be helpful. Cross-disciplinary collaboration with other professional programs who may face similar gatekeeping issues (nursing, medical school) could also prove illuminating, and offer additional knowledge bases about what has worked for training in other professional programs. At a local level, such collaboration and

standardization (to the extent reasonable) between programs across the same university, and the university's general counsel, could be helpful. The additional benefit of this collaboration would be the enhanced relationship and interdisciplinary understanding between parties (e.g., general counsel understanding the perspective of faculty) that could be leveraged during a stressful intervention process.

Furthermore, it is worth discussion of the role that faculty members or other professional mentors play for a NTTTF member engaging in gatekeeping. Outside of the potentially political world of faculty interpersonal dynamics, the mentors could serve as neutral advisors, rather than specifically educators, for the NTTTF. That is to say, while some mentees may need "brass-tacks" training (as described in the previous paragraph), others may need guidance from a mentor on concerns such as navigating a gatekeeping intervention without support from other faculty. Furthermore, as the NTTTF may be cut off from traditional familial social support due to FERPA privacy concerns, the mentor or faculty colleagues can partially fill that gap. As such, perhaps faculty members (both colleagues of NTTTF, and those who have trained future faculty) need to see their service to the profession as not just through their formal roles (i.e., formal education of NTTTF, or colleagues), but in also remaining available as supports, and as troves of professional experience that goes beyond what could be taught (or currently may not be taught) to a student during her/his limited time in graduate school. Faculty members maintaining an openness to being a support person for previous students, as well as offering explicit support of colleagues undertaking a gatekeeping intervention, is advised.

Again, this support from faculty and mentors, as well as potential implementation of the training that faculty suggested, may increase participants' confidence in their own

experience/competence/evidence, and may reduce the anxiety/self-doubt/negative affect arising from participants' intervention. This reduction in discouraging factors and increase in facilitative factors may assist faculty in intervening more often when needed to prevent gateslippage, or it may simply serve to make the intervention process less arduous for those who must engage in the process.

The potential wrinkle with relation to faculty and mentor support and training, however, is how much training in gatekeeping the other faculty members and mentors have in the first place. While presumably many have learned from previous experience, this may not always be the case. In fact, one result of this study was that NTTTF who engaged in gatekeeping were seen as "go-to" faculty when concerns arose around gatekeeping. It is unclear if the interventions that the participants were later asked to consult upon were with other junior faculty, with faculty who joined the department after the participant's gatekeeping event, or even with faculty more senior than the participant. This "go-to" status might then reflect a more general lack of confidence by faculty (regardless of tenure status) in gatekeeping interventions. Could senior faculty be seeking support from the junior members because the senior faculty themselves have not had training in gatekeeping and are unsure of themselves? One participant noted that faculty who had been in their program for over 30 years had never been involved in even an informal intervention. It would make sense that if they found themselves in need of making an intervention that they would seek someone in the department who had done so, even if that person was the junior faculty member. Before other faculty or mentors could provide the training and support as indicated above, then, they may well also benefit from gatekeeping training and education.

Another implication focuses on what, if any, responsibility a faculty member has to a student who has been gatekept, or to the profession if the student wants to go to another training program? FERPA may prevent the faculty member from commenting on the student's performance if the student does not ask for a letter of recommendation or attempt to transfer previously earned credits. But is there a responsibility owed to a new program who may consider admitting this student? It seems reasonable that in some cases, a student could do well in a different environment, particularly if s/he has taken steps to address previous problematic behaviors. Additionally, a student with significant non-academic concerns that were not addressed would likely come to the attention of faculty in a new program, as s/he is unlikely to be able to keep his/her their behaviors hidden when faced with the same tasks (i.e., graduate training in clinical mental health) that brought the behaviors to light in the first place. However, do faculty have an ethical responsibility to inform new programs about a student's behaviors in a former program?

Professional practice. Gatekeeping is always going to demand substantial faculty time and energy. However, such demands have specific implications for the NTTTF. The cost for a NTTTF member on a tenure clock who, because of time devoted to gatekeeping, is not meeting publishing deadlines or is not able to do course preparation to her/his best abilities, is potentially high. Publications and student course reviews are key criteria for promotion and tenure, and the "self-expense" of gatekeeping does not advance an NTTTF member during a particularly time-sensitive portion of her/his career. The closer to tenure review that this delay takes place, the more detrimental it could be for the NTTTF.

Notably, the only participant who did not speak about the time and emotional energy spent on these interventions was a participant who has an administrative role and a course release to be a part of these interventions. While such a structure (focused administrative position on problematic students) may not work in all departments, perhaps departments could consider a “pause” button on the tenure clock when a NTTTF must lead a gatekeeping process, for such accommodation could help support faculty to initiate an intervention when warranted. In fact, one of the participants stated, “I think when faculty don’t want to deal with this, partly it is that it takes so much time that it has to be taken away from other things.”

Other students’ experience of the gatekeeping process also demands attention. Faculty members spoke to the difficult dynamic in which students might hear about, or witness, the behaviors of the problematic student. However, the interventions that the faculty members undertake are largely hidden from other students, potentially making them wonder if gateslippage is occurring. The literature reflects the negative impact (e.g., significant anger, distrust of professional standards) that gateslippage can have on the other students (see Chapter II; Evans et al., 2013; Oliver et al., 2004; Rosenberg, et al., 2005; Shen-Miller et al., 2009; 2011). In fact, unless a student is dismissed from the program, and students do not see the problematic student completing the program, even a successful remediation could appear like a gateslippage to other students in the program, who may not witness the improvements.

While the need for privacy for problematic students is understandable, there is also a need for dialogue with other students in the program. Addressing the potential for other students to perceive a problematic student as being gateslipped could be discussed

during initial orientation conversations about gatekeeping policy and procedures, prior to there being a presenting concern. While such a conversation is unlikely to eliminate the negative experience that other students may have, it may provide a point of reference when students ask questions or share frustrations.

Implications for Research

Looking forward, there are several places in which this research could be extended. However, research around faculty experience of gatekeeping will not advance without an exploratory investigation of faculty attitudes toward, and concerns about, gatekeeping. What questions would they be willing to answer, and what questions would discourage them from participation in a research project? Given the visceral defensive response from some programs while recruiting (as discussed in Chapter IV, recruitment), in addition to the overall challenge of recruitment, until there is greater understanding of the barriers to participation in gatekeeping research, it will not significantly advance. All of the following suggested projects would be enhanced with the understanding that this proposed project could provide. .

Additionally, exploring faculty training in gatekeeping, and suggestions for training, could be a valuable dataset in service of the profession. Beyond NTTTF, all faculty may have reflections around, “I wish I had known then what I know now” that could be helpful in shaping how future faculty are trained or oriented to their role as gatekeepers.

Furthermore, could recruitment challenges be overcome, a study comparing the experience of a gatekeeping intervention by a faculty member new to the role of gatekeeping (e.g., involved in 1-2 interventions) to a faculty member who has been

involved in several (e.g., involved in greater than 10 interventions) could be helpful in ascertaining what elements are common to the experience of gatekeeping interventions, and what might be attributable to in/experience.

Likewise, while this study investigated the experience of faculty members who did intervene, an important contribution to the literature could be obtained by investigating the experience of those faculty members who did not intervene with a problematic student . . . in other words, faculty who identified students whom they allowed to gateslip. While this study would likely present with similar, if not intensified, recruitment difficulties as the current study, such a study would be positioned to offer a better understanding of the factors that prevent a faculty member from intervening.

Finally, while the current study examined factors that hindered and facilitated intervention, all of these cases eventually resulted in an intervention. Looking at cases that do not result in an intervention could provide additional context to the challenge of gatekeeping in the lives of faculty members.

Conclusions

Intriguingly, internal factors (e.g., confidence, anxiety, care for student and profession) and external factors (e.g., relationships with other faculty members, university policies and procedures) served both to support and hinder NTTTF members' engagement in gatekeeping and colored their experience of the process. SCCT provides a helpful model of adaptive career behaviors that were evidenced in the experience of the NTTTF as they undertook a gatekeeping intervention. The intervention came with professional and relational costs and benefits, and was implemented with very little previous training for the role of gatekeeper. However, participants changed the way they

approach gatekeeping based on their experiences, and provided suggestions for fact-based training for other faculty to prepare them to undertake this important responsibility.

REFERENCES

- American Civil Liberties Union. (2011). Ward v. Wilbanks et al. - Case profile. Retrieved May 5, 2013 from <http://www.aclu.org/lgbt-rights/ward-v-wilbanks-et-al-case-profile>
- American Counseling Association (2005). ACA Code of Ethics. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American Psychological Association. (2010). Code of ethics. Retrieved April 26, 2013, from <http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx?item=10>
- American Psychological Association. (2011). Revised Competency Benchmarks for Professional Psychology. Retrieved September 11, 2014 from <http://www.apa.org/ed/graduate/competency.aspx>
- American Psychological Association. (2012). A Practical Guidebook for Competency Benchmarks. Retrieved September 11, 2014 from <http://www.apa.org/ed/graduate/competency.aspx>
- American Psychological Association (2016). Standards of Accreditation for Health Service Psychology. Retrieved June 7, 2017 from <http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/about/policies/standards-of-accreditation.pdf>. 1-47.
- Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-336, 104 Stat. 328 (1990).
- Attenborough, R. (Director) (1993). *Shadowlands* [Streaming Video]. United Kingdom: Focus Productions. Retrieved May 31, 2017 from <https://www.amazon.com/>
- Austin, P. (1996). Gatekeeper or Gardener? In Search of a Metaphor for Teacher Education. *The Clearing House*, (2). 101-102.
- Baldo, T. D., Softas-Nall, B.C., & Shaw, S.F., (1997). Student review and retention in counselor education: An alternative to Frame and Stevens-Smith. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 36(3), 245 -53.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Insights. Self-efficacy. *Harvard Mental Health Letter*, 13(9), 4 -6.
- Behnke, S. H. (2012). Constitutional claims in the context of mental health training: Religion, sexual orientation, and tensions between the first amendment and professional ethics. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 6(4), 189-195. doi:10.1037/a0030809

- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (1998). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision*. (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bernstein, B. L., & Lecomte, C. (1976). An integrative competency-based counselor education model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 16(1), 26-34.
- Bodner, K. E. (2012). Ethical principles and standards that inform educational gatekeeping practices in psychology. *Ethics & Behavior*, 22(1), 60-74. doi:10.1080/10508422.2012.638827
- Borders, L. D., Young, J. S., Wester, K. L., Murray, C. E., Villalba, J. A., Lewis, T. F., & Mobley, A. K. (2011). Mentoring Promotion/Tenure-seeking faculty: Principles of good practice within a counselor education program. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 50(3), 171-188.
- Boxley, R., Drew, C. R., & Rangel, D. M. (1986). Clinical trainee impairment in APA approved internship programs. *Clinical Psychologist*, 39(2), 49-52.
- Bradey, J., & Post, P. (1991). Impaired students: Do we eliminate them from counselor education programs? *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 31(2), 100-108. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.1991.tb00148.x
- Breare, P., Dorrian, J., & Luscri, G. (2008). Preparing our future counselling professionals: Gatekeeping and the implications for research. *Counselling & Psychotherapy Research*, 8(2), 93-101.
- Breare, P., & Dorrian, J. (2010). Gatekeeping or gate slippage? A national survey of counseling educators in Australian undergraduate and postgraduate academic training programs. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 4(4), 264-273. doi:10.1037/a0020714
- Burkard, A. W., Johnson, A. J., Hess, S. A., Madson, M. B., Pruitt, N. T., Contreras-Tadych, D., ... & Knox, S. (2006). Supervisor cultural responsiveness and unresponsiveness in cross-cultural supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 53(3), 288-301. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.53.3.288
- Burkard, A.W., Knox, S., & Hill, C.E. (2012). Data Collection. In Hill, C. E. (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 83-102). Washington, DC: APA.
- Chiko, C. H., (1980). A model to systematize competencies in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 19(4), 283-292.
- Chopra, T. (2013). All supervision is multicultural: A review of literature on the need for multicultural supervision in counseling. *Psychological Studies*, 58(3), 335-338.

- Conley, V. M. (2005). Career paths for women faculty: Evidence from NSOPF:99. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 130, 25-39.
- Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2009). 2009 Standards. Retrieved April 3, 2013 from <http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/2009-Standards.pdf>. 1-62.
- Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2015). 2016 CACREP Standards. Retrieved June 7, 2017 from <http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/2016-CACREP-Standards.pdf>. 1-37.
- Crook-Lyon, R.E., Goates-Jones, M.K., & Hill, C.E. (2012). Getting Started. In Hill, C. E. (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 35-48). Washington, DC: APA.
- Custer, G. (1994). Can universities be liable for incompetent grads? *APA Monitor*, 25(11), 7.
- da Silva Cardoso, E., Philips, B. N., Thompson, K., Ruiz, D., Tansey, T. N., & Chan, F. (2016). Experiences of Minority College Students with Disabilities in STEM. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 29(4), 375-388.
- de Vries, S. R., & Valadez, A. A. (2006). Counseling students' mental health status and attitudes toward counseling. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory & Research*, 34(1), 77-87.
- Dollarhide, C. T., Gibson, D. M., & Moss, J. M. (2013). Professional Identity Development of Counselor Education Doctoral Students. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 52(2), 137-150.
- Elliott, R. (1989). Comprehensive process analysis: Understanding the change process in significant therapy events. In M. J. Packer & R. B. Addison (Eds.), *Entering the circle: Hermeneutic investigation in psychology*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Evans, A. M., Carney, J. S., Lakin, J., & Stafford, E. (2013). Assessing peer problematic behavior and related training experiences. *Ideas and Research You can use: VISTAS 2013*, Retrieved April 4, 2013.
- Falender, C. A., Collins, C. J., & Shafranske, E. P. (2009). "Impairment" and performance issues in clinical supervision: After the 2008 ADA amendments act. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 3(4), 240-249. doi:10.1037/a0017153
- Franklin, A. J., Chen, M., N'cho, H. S., Capawana, M. R., & Hoogasian, R. O. (2015). Consensual Qualitative Research analysis of a therapeutic support group session for African American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 16(3), 264-273.

- Freeman, B. J., Garner, C. M., Fairgrieve, L. A., & Pitts, M. E. (2016). Gatekeeping in the Field: Strategies and Practices. *Journal of Professional Counseling Practice, Theory & Research*, 42(2), 28-41.
- Forrest, L. (2012). Educators' and trainers' responsibilities when trainees' personal beliefs collide with competent practice. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 6(4), 187-188. doi:10.1037/a0030799
- Forrest, L., Elman, N., Gizara, S., & Vacha-Haase, T. (1999). Trainee impairment: A review of identification, remediation, dismissal, and legal issues. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 27(5), 627-686. doi:10.1177/0011000099275001
- Foster, V. A., & McAdams III, C. R. (2009). A framework for creating a climate of transparency for professional performance assessment: Fostering student investment in gatekeeping. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 48(4), 271-284.
- Frame, M. W., & Stevens-Smith, P. (1995). Out of harm's way: Enhancing monitoring and dismissal processes in counselor education programs. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 35(2), 118-130.
- Gaubatz, M. D., & Vera, E. M. (2002). Do formalized gatekeeping procedures increase programs' follow-up with deficient trainees? *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 41(4), 294-306.
- Gaubatz, M. D., Vera, E. M. (2006). Trainee competence in master's-level counseling programs: A comparison of counselor educators' and students' views. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 46(1), 32-43.
- Gizara, S. S., & Forrest, L. (2004). Supervisors' experiences of trainee impairment and incompetence at APA-accredited internship sites. *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice*, 35(2), 131-140. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.35.2.131
- Golde, C. M. (2004). The responsibility of doctoral programs for the career preparation of future faculty. *Peer Review*, 6(3), 26-29.
- Goodrich, K. M., & Shin, R. Q. (2013). A culturally responsive intervention for addressing problematic behaviors in counseling students. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 52(1), 43-55.
- Grimmer, A., & Tribe, R. (2001). Counselling psychologists' perceptions of the impact of mandatory personal therapy on professional development -- an exploratory study. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 14(4), 287-301.
- Hackett, G., & Betz, N. E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 18, 326-336.

- Herlihy, B., & Remley, T. P. (1995). Unified ethical standards: A challenge for professionalism. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74*(2), 130-133.
- Hill, C. E. (2006). Qualitative research. In J. C. Norcross, L. E. Beutler, & R. F. Levant (Eds.), *Evidence-based practices in mental health* (pp. 74-81). Washington, DC: APA.
- Hill, C. E. (2012). Introduction to consensual qualitative research. In Hill, C. E. (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 3-20). Washington, DC: APA.
- Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Thompson, B. J., Williams, E. N., Hess, S. A., & Ladany, N. (2005). Consensual Qualitative Research: An update. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 196-205.
- Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 25*, 517-572.
- Hill, C.E. & William, E.N. (2012). The Sample. In Hill, C. E. (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 71-82). Washington, DC: APA.
- Inman, A. G., & DeBoer-Kreider, E. (2013). Multicultural competence: Psychotherapy practice and supervision. *Psychotherapy, 50*(3), 346-350. doi:10.1037/a0032029
- Jacobs, S. C., Huprich, S. K., Grus, C. L., Cage, E. A., Elman, N. S., Forrest, L., ... & Kaslow, N. J. (2011). Trainees with professional competency problems: Preparing trainers for difficult but necessary conversations. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 5*(3), 175-184. doi:10.1037/a0024656
- Kaslow, N.J., Borden, K.A., Collins, F.L. Jr, Forrest, L, Illfelder-Kaye, J., Nelson, P.D., ... & Willmuth, M.E. (2004). Competencies conference: future directions in education and credentialing in professional psychology. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 60*(7). 699-712.
- Kaslow, N.J., Grus, C.L., Campbell, L.F., Fouad, N.A., Hatcher, R.L., Rodolfa, E.R. (2009). Competency assessment toolkit for professional psychology. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 3*(4), S27-S45. doi: 10.1037/a0015833
- Krumboltz, J. D. (1979). A social learning theory of career decision making. In A. M. Mitchell, G. B. Jones, & J. D. Krumboltz (Eds.), *Social learning and career decision making* (pp. 19-49). Cranston, RI: Carroll.
- Kumari, N. (2011). Personal therapy as a mandatory requirement for counselling psychologists in training: A qualitative study of the impact of therapy on trainees' personal and professional development. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 24*(3), 211-232. doi:10.1080/09515070903335000

- Ladany, N., Thompson, B.J., Hill, C.E. (2012). Cross Analysis. In Hill, C. E. (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 117-134). Washington, DC: APA.
- Layman, M. J., & McNamara, J. R. (1997). Remediation for ethics violations: Focus on psychotherapists' sexual contact with clients. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 28(3), 281-292. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.28.3.281
- Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2013). Social cognitive model of career self-management: Towards a unifying view of adaptive career behavior across the life span. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60(4), 557-568. doi:10.1037/a0033446
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 45(1), 79-122.
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (2002). Social cognitive career theory. In Brown, D., (Ed.), *Career choice and development*, 4, (pp. 255-311). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lumadue, C. A., & Duffey, T. H. (1999). The role of graduate programs as gatekeepers: A model for evaluating student counselor competence. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 39(2), 101-110.
- Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Lonneman-Doroff, T. (2009). The 2000 cohort of new assistant professors of counselor education: Reflecting at the culmination of six years. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 49(1), 54-71.
- McAdams III, C. R., Foster, V. A., & Ward, T. J. (2007). Remediation and dismissal policies in counselor education: Lessons learned from a challenge in federal court. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 46(3), 212-229.
- McAdams III, C. R., & Foster, V. A. (2007). A guide to just and fair remediation of counseling students with professional performance deficiencies. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 47(1), 2-13.
- McCaughan, A. M., & Hill, N. R. (2015). The Gatekeeping Imperative in Counselor Education Admission Protocols: The Criticality of Personal Qualities. *International Journal for the Advancement Of Counseling*. 37(1). 28-40. Mearns, J., & Allen, G. J. (1991). Graduate students' experiences in dealing with impaired peer, compared with faculty predictions: An exploratory study. *Ethics & Behavior*, 1(3), 191-203.
- Middleman, R. R. (1984). How Competent Is Social Work's Approach to the Assessment of Competence? *Social Work*, 29(2). 146-53.

- Mullen, B., & Cooper, C., (1994). The relation between group cohesiveness and performance: An integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, *115*(2), 210 -227.
- Nelson, T. S. and Graves, T. (2011). Core Competencies in Advanced Training: What Supervisors Say About Graduate Training. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *37*(4), 429–451. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.2010.00216.x
- Norton, R., & Coleman, H. (2003). Multicultural supervision: The influence of race-related issues in supervision process and outcome. In Pope-Davis, D.B., Coleman, H., Liu, W. M., Toporek, R. (Eds.) *Handbook of Multicultural Competencies in Counseling and Psychology* (pp.114-134). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Oliver, M. N. I., Bernstein, J. H., Anderson, K. G., Blashfield, R. K., & Roberts, M. C. (2004). An exploratory examination of student attitudes toward "impaired" peers in clinical psychology training programs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *35*(2), 141-147. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.35.2.141
- Orlinsky, D. E., Schofield, M. J., Schroder, T., & Kazantzis, N. (2011). Utilization of personal therapy by psychotherapists: A practice-friendly review and a new study. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *67*(8), 828-842. doi:10.1002/jclp.20821
- Pope, K. S. (1994). Sexual involvement between therapists and patients. *Harvard Mental Health Letter*, *11*(2), 5-7.
- Pope, K. S., & Tabachnick, B. G. (1994). Therapists as patients: A national survey of psychologists' experiences, problems, and beliefs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *25*(3), 247-258. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.25.3.247
- Prochaska, J. O., & DiClemente, C. C. (1984). *The transtheoretical approach: crossing traditional boundaries of therapy*. Homewood, Ill. Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Reybold, E. L., & Alamia, J. J. (2008). Academic transitions in education: A developmental perspective of women faculty experiences. *Journal of Career Development*, *35*(2), 107-128. doi:10.1177/0894845308325644
- Reybold, L. E. (2008). The social and political structuring of faculty ethicality in education. *Innovative Higher Education*, *32*(5), 279-295.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-007-9053-9>
- Reybold, L., Brazer, S., Schrum, L., & Corda, K. (2012). The politics of dissertation advising: How early career women faculty negotiate access and participation. *Innovative Higher Education*, *37*(3), 227-242. doi:10.1007/s10755-011-9200-1
- Reybold, L. E. (2003). Pathways to the professorate: The development of faculty identity in education. *Innovative Higher Education*, *27*(4), 235-253

- Reybold, L. E., & Corda, K. W. (2011). Faculty identity and the 'lesser role': Service to the academy *Journal of the Professoriate*, 5(1), 121-148.
- Reybold, L. E. (2005). Surrendering the dream: Early career conflict and faculty dissatisfaction thresholds. *Journal of Career Development*, 32(2), 107-121. doi:10.1177/0894845305279163
- Ridley, C. R., Mollen, D., & Kelly, S. M. (2011a). Beyond microskills: Toward a model of counseling competence. *Counseling Psychologist*, 39(6), 825-864.
- Ridley, C. R., Mollen, D., & Kelly, S. M. (2011b). Counseling competence: Application and implications of a model. *Counseling Psychologist*, 39(6), 865-886. doi:10.1177/0011000010378443
- Rosenberg, J. I., Getzelman, M. A., Arcinue, F., & Oren, C. Z. (2005). An exploratory look at students' experiences of problematic peers in academic professional psychology programs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 36(6), 665-673. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.36.6.665
- Sampson, J., M., Kelly-Trombley, H., Zubatsky, J., M., & Harris, S., M. (2013). Breaking up is hard to do: Dismissing students from MFT training programs. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 41(1), 26-33. doi:10.1080/01926187.2011.628205
- Schwartz, H. L. (2012). Reflection and intention: Interpersonal boundaries in teaching and learning. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 131, 99-102. doi:10.1002/tl.20030
- Shen Miller, D. S., Forrest, L., & Elman, N. S. (2009). Training directors' conceptualizations of the intersections of diversity and trainee competence problems: A preliminary analysis. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37(4), 482-518. doi:10.1177/0011000008316656
- Shen-Miller, D., Grus, C. L., Van Sickle, K. S., Schwartz-Mette, R., Cage, E. A., Elman, N. S., ... & Kaslow, N. J. (2011). Trainees' experiences with peers having competence problems: A national survey. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 5(2), 112-121. doi:10.1037/a0023824
- Shen-Miller, D. S., Forrest, L., & Burt, M. (2012). Contextual influences on faculty diversity conceptualizations when working with trainee competence problems. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 40(8), 1181-1219. doi:10.1177/0011000011431832
- Sim, W., Huang, T.C., & Hill, C.E. (2012). Biases and Expectations. In Hill, C. E. (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 59-70). Washington, DC: APA.

- Sofronoff, K., Helmes, E., & Pachana, N. (2011). Fitness to practice in the profession of psychology: Should we assess this during clinical training? *Australian Psychologist*, *46*(2), 126-132. doi:10.1111/j.1742-9544.2011.00031.x
- Sorcinelli, M. D., & Jung, Y. (2007). From mentor to mentoring networks: Mentoring in the new academy. *Change*, *39*(6), 58-61.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (2002). New conceptions of scholarship for a new generation of faculty members. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (90), 41-49.
- Spurgeon, S. L., Gibbons, M. M., Cochran, J. L. (2012). Creating personal dispositions for a professional counseling program. *Counseling & Values*, *57*(1), 96-108. doi:10.1002/j.2161-007X.2012.00011.x
- Stahl, J. V., Taylor, N. E., Hill, C. E. (2012). Philosophical and Historical Background of Consensual Qualitative Research. In Hill, C. E. (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 21-32). Washington, DC: APA.
- Swank, J. M., Lambie, G. W., & Witta, E. L., (2012). An exploratory Investigation of the Counseling Competencies Scale: A Measure of Counseling Skill, Dispositions, and Behaviors. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *51*(3). 189-206.
- Swank, J. M., & Smith-Adcock, S. (2014). Gatekeeping during Admissions: A Survey of Counselor Education Programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *53*(1). 47-61. Swann, C. R. (2003). *Students' perceptions of due process: Policies, procedures and trainee problematic functioning*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (305315637).
- Tedesco, J. F. (1982). Premature termination of psychology interns. *Professional Psychology*, *13*(5), 695-698. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.13.5.695
- Thompson, B.J., Vivino, B.L., & Hill, C.E. (2012). Coding the Data: Domains and Core Ideas. In Hill, C. E. (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 103-116). Washington, DC: APA.
- Vacha-Haase, T., Davenport, D. S., & Kerewsky, S. D. (2004). Problematic students: Gatekeeping practices of academic professional psychology programs. *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice*, *35*(2), 115-122. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.35.2.115
- Veilleux, J. C., January, A. M., VanderVeen, J. W., Reddy, L. F., & Klonoff, E. A. (2012). Differentiating amongst characteristics associated with problems of professional competence: Perceptions of graduate student peers. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *6*(2), 113-121. doi:10.1037/a0028337

- Vivno, B.L., Thompson, B.J., & Hill, C.E. (2012). The Research Team. In Hill, C. E. (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 47-58). Washington, DC: APA.
- White, P. E., & Franzoni, J. B. (1990). A multidimensional analysis of the mental health of graduate counselors in training. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 29*(4), 258-268.
- Wise, R. A., King, A. R., Miller, J. C., & Pearce, M. W. (2011). When HIPAA and FERPA apply to university training clinics. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 5*(1), 48-56. doi:10.1037/a0022857
- Williams, J. C. (2005). The glass ceiling and the maternal wall in academia. *New Directions for Higher Education, 130*, 91-105.
- Wissel, A. M. (2011). *Gatekeeping in counselor education: Experiences of terminating students for nonacademic concerns*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (866167272).
- Ziomek-Daigle, J., & Christensen, T. M. (2010). An emergent theory of gatekeeping practices in counselor education. *Journal of Counseling and Development: JCD, 88*(4), 407-415.

APPENDIX A: Letter to Potential Participants

Dear Potential Participant,

My name is Meghan Butler, and I am a counseling psychology doctoral student at Marquette University. I am currently seeking volunteers to participate in my doctoral dissertation research looking at the experience of faculty members involved in a gatekeeping intervention with a student (regardless of outcome) for non-academic concerns (personality/disposition concerns, interpersonal conflicts, concerns over clinical competence, concerns regarding students' ability to receive and incorporate feedback in supervision, etc.). This is not an exhaustive list of non-academic concerns, but one provided simply to give you a sense of the range of such concerns. If you experienced this type of event, but are unsure as to whether it would qualify for the project, please do not hesitate to contact me. I would be happy to speak with you to determine if the event you experienced fits the study's parameters. The event must have occurred when you were a non-tenured, tenure-track faculty (NTTT), and you will need to be able to recall the details of the event.

The experience of NTTT faculty members executing their responsibility as a gatekeeper is underrepresented in the existent literature, and I am hoping that you will be able to give about an hour of your time to share your experience in this area. The study has been approved by Marquette University's Institutional Review Board. Participation in this study involves completion of a demographic form, and an audiorecorded telephone interview which will take about 45 to 60 minutes.

The focus of the interview will be on your experiences as a NTTT faculty member involved in a gatekeeping intervention with a student for non-academic concerns, including your thoughts and feelings during the process, what factors were supportive/facilitative or discouraging/hindering of your decision to intervene, the impact this process had on your relationships with other students as well as faculty/administrators, and what you learned from the event. Recordings, as well as the resulting transcripts and data, will be assigned a code number. Recordings will be erased at the conclusion of the study.

Participants for this study must identify as individuals who were key participants in a gatekeeping intervention with of a student for non-academic concerns. We allow potential participants to define "key" in this context. At the time of the termination (regardless of their current position), they must have been nontenured, full-time faculty members in a tenure-track position at an APA-accredited clinical or counseling psychology program, or at a CACREP-accredited counseling or counselor education and supervision program within the United States. Counseling programs accredited by CACREP will include the clinical mental health, marriage and family, and school counseling programs, in addition to programs holding the older community counseling designation. The program must not have been an on-line only program. Non-academic concerns can be broadly defined as personal factors that are likely to make a student unfit for the profession, and necessitate a gatekeeping intervention.

I recognize that talking about your experiences of gatekeeping may be uncomfortable for you, or you may fear being asked to divulge confidential information about the intervention. Participation in this project is strictly voluntary, and you may withdraw your consent at any time without penalty. In addition, how much information you share regarding the specifics of the gatekeeping events themselves is entirely up to you. The purpose of this research is not to evaluate you, your student, your program, or your experience; instead, my goal is to understand how NTTT faculty navigate the process of gatekeeping as they adjust to the academy. Thus, I am grateful for the experience and expertise you will share should you participate in this study.

If you choose to participate, please click [HERE](#) to complete the Consent and Demographic forms. I will then contact you to set up a time for an initial interview. I have also included the interview protocol so that you may make fully informed consent. Please review these questions prior to your first interview so that you have had a chance to think about your responses. If you do not meet the criteria for participation, I would be grateful if you would pass this information along to a colleague who might be interested in participating.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions, comments, or feedback that you may have. I appreciate your consideration of this request.

Regards,

Meghan Butler, MA
Doctoral Student
Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Psychology Doctoral Program
College of Education
Education and Counseling Psychology
Marquette University
Complex 168 H
Milwaukee, WI 53201
Phone: 313-303-0994
Meghan.c.butler@mu.edu

Sarah Knox, PhD
Dissertation Advisor
Director of Training, Counseling
Department of Counselor
College of Education, Schroeder
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53201 – 1881
414-288-5942
414-288-6100 (fax)
Sarah.knox@mu.edu

APPENDIX B: Protocol

1. What training did you receive regarding gatekeeping?
2. To the extent that you are comfortable, and certainly without any identifying information, please describe the gatekeeping incident you have chosen to discuss for this interview.
 - What was the non-academic concern, and how did it come to your attention?
3. Please describe your role in the gatekeeping process.
4. Describe what was happening for you (emotionally, cognitively) during this process.
 - When you were considering intervening?
 - During the intervention process?
 - After the intervention was completed?
5. What/Whom did you consider supportive/facilitative of your intervening in this incident?
6. What/Whom did you consider discouraging/hindering of your intervening in this incident?
7. What impact did your status as a NTTT faculty member have on your experience of this process?
8. What impact did this incident have on the relationships/interactions you have with students?
 - The student being gatekept?
 - Other students in the program at the time of the intervention?
 - Students with whom you have interacted since the intervention?
9. What impact did this incident have on the relationships/interactions you have with other faculty?
 - During the time of the intervention?
 - Since/After the intervention?
10. What impact did this event have on the relationships/interactions you have with others? (e.g., staff, administrators, supervisors)
 - During the time of the intervention?

- Since/After the intervention?
11. How did this incident affect your other professional responsibilities?
 12. How did this incident affect your personal life?
 13. How has this incident influenced your thinking when deciding whether to intervene with other students?
 14. What do you wish you had known about gatekeeping before you were involved in it?
 15. Overall, what did you learn from this gatekeeping experience?
 16. What training would you suggest for new faculty?
 17. Why did you choose to participate in this research?
 18. Is there anything you wish to add that we did not talk about?
 19. How was it for you to discuss this incident?

APPENDIX C: Informed Consent

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

AGREEMENT OF CONSENT FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Experience of Nontenured, tenure track faculty Members involved in Gatekeeping Interventions with Students for Non-Academic Concerns

Meghan Butler, MA

Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology, College of Education, Marquette University

You have been invited to participate in this research study. Before you agree to participate, it is important that you read and understand the following information. Participation is completely voluntary. Please feel free to contact me to ask questions about anything you do not understand before deciding whether or not to participate.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this research study is to gain an understanding of the experience of nontenured, tenure-track (NTTT) faculty members involved in gatekeeping interventions for non-academic concerns with students from clinical/counseling and counselor education programs. You will be one of approximately 12-15 participants in this research study.

PROCEDURES: I understand that participation in this project will involve the submission of a demographic form, and one, approximately 45-60 minute, semi-structured telephone interview, to be scheduled at the mutual convenience of the participant and the interviewer. This interview will generally follow the questions as laid out in the protocol, with some deviation for follow-up or clarification as needed. I will be audio taped during the interview to ensure accuracy, the tapes will be transcribed, and then the tapes destroyed upon the completion of the data analysis. For confidentiality purposes, code numbers will be used, my name will not be recorded, and any identifiers will be removed.

DURATION: I understand that my participation will consist of completion of a demographic form, and one, approximately 45-60 minute interview.

RISKS: I understand that the risks associated with participation in this study are minimal, but could involve the triggering of certain distressing emotions or thoughts when describing my involvement in a gatekeeping intervention earlier in my career. Furthermore, in the event of a data breach, it may be possible that my interview data could be linked to my name. I understand that I may discontinue my participation in this study at any time, for any reason, without penalty.

BENEFITS: I understand that while there are no direct benefits to my participation in this study, other than the opportunity to share my experience, indirect benefits may include helping to improve our understanding of the experience NTTF members involved in a gatekeeping intervention.

CONFIDENTIALITY: I understand that all information I reveal in this study will be kept confidential. Storage of all study-related materials will be on a HIPPA- and FERPA-compliant storage system. All of my data will be assigned a code number rather than using my name or other information that could identify me as an individual. When the results of the study are published, I will not be identified by name. I understand that the data will be destroyed by deleting electronic files within three years of the completion of the study. There is no anticipated use of this data beyond the completion of this project. The researcher's records may be inspected by the Marquette University Institutional Review Board or its designees, and (as allowable by law) state and federal agencies.

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF PARTICIPATION: I understand that participating in this study is completely voluntary, and I may withdraw from the study and stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. To withdraw from this study, I simply need to inform a member of the research team that I would like to end my participation, and all of my data will be destroyed. I understand that I may also receive a copy of the study results (i.e., a draft of the manuscript) in which no identifying information will be used.

CONTACT INFORMATION: If I have any questions about this research project, I can contact Meghan Butler, MA, at 313.303.0994 or at meghan.c.butler@mu.edu. If I have questions or concerns about my rights as a research participant, I can contact Marquette University's Office of Research Compliance at (414) 288-7570 or orc@mu.edu.

BY TYPING MY NAME HERE, I CERTIFY THAT I HAVE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO READ THIS CONSENT FORM, ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RESEARCH PROJECT, AND AM PREPARED TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS PROJECT.

(Typed Name of Participant)

APPENDIX D: Demographic Form

Name: _____

Telephone Number: _____

Email address: _____

Best Days/Times to try to schedule an interview:

Age: _____

Gender: _____

Race/Ethnicity: _____

Highest educational degree _____ in (field)

Professional license (e.g., LMHC, LPC, LP, LCSW etc.): _____

Current professional position:

Years in current position: _____

Current percentage of professional time spent on academic faculty responsibilities: _____

Current percentage of professional time spent in delivery of mental health services: _____

Current percentage of professional time spent providing supervision: _____

Position at time of gatekeeping intervention:

Years in this position at time of the gatekeeping intervention:

At time of intervention, percentage of professional time spent on academic faculty responsibilities: _____

At time of intervention, percentage of professional time spent in delivery of mental health services: _____

At time of intervention, percentage of professional time spent providing supervision: _____

Total number of years spent as full-time faculty in a mental health discipline:

Number of years spent as full-time faculty in a mental health discipline at time of gatekeeping intervention: _____

Total number of gatekeeping processes, to date, in which you have been involved?

Was the incident that you described for this study the first time you were a key participant in a gatekeeping process? Yes _____ No _____

If not, in how many (total) such incidents had you been a key participant up to that point: _____

As a student: _____

As a faculty member: _____

In how many gatekeeping processes have you been involved since the incident discussed for this interview: _____

To be answered about the student with whom you made the gatekeeping intervention:

Gender: _____

Age (approximate): _____

Race/Ethnicity (to the best of your knowledge): _____

Number of years you had known the student: _____

In what capacity you knew the student (e.g., advisee, student in class, supervisee):

How long, from initial intervention to conclusion, did the gatekeeping process take: _____

What was the outcome of the intervention (successful remediation, dismissal, voluntary withdrawal from training, etc.) _____

Was this intervention contested by the student: Yes _____ No _____

If yes, how did the student contest the intervention (e.g., appeal within the university, legal action): _____

How long after initial intervention were any challenges from the student settled:

APPENDIX E: Recruitment E-mail
Description for E-mail distribution
******REVISED INCLUSION CRITERIA******

Hello –

If you have seen this request before, please note inclusion criteria has been expanded

My name is Meghan Butler, and I am a counseling psychology doctoral student at Marquette University. I am currently seeking volunteers to participate in my IRB-approved doctoral dissertation research looking at the experience of nontenured, tenure-track faculty members involved in gatekeeping interventions with students for non-academic concerns (e.g., personality/disposition concerns, interpersonal conflicts, concerns over clinical competence, concerns regarding students' ability to incorporate feedback in supervision). This is not an exhaustive list of non-academic concerns, but one provided simply to give you a sense of the range of such concerns. If you experienced this type of event, but are unsure as to whether it would qualify for the project, please do not hesitate to contact me. I would be happy to speak with you to determine if the event you experienced fits the study's parameters. The event must have occurred when you were a non-tenured, tenure-track faculty (NTTT), and you will need to be able to recall the details of the event. I would be very grateful if you would consider participating in my dissertation project.

Participants for this study must:

- Identify as key participants (as defined by the participant) in a gatekeeping process of a student for non-academic concerns. Non-academic concerns can be broadly defined as personal factors that are likely to make a student unfit for the profession, and necessitate a gate-keeping intervention.)
- **At the time of the intervention** have been nontenured, full-time faculty members in a tenure-track position
- Have been faculty in an APA-accredited clinical or counseling psychology program, or a CACREP-accredited counseling (mental health, MFT, school or community) or counselor education and supervision program within the United States.
- The program must not have been an on-line only program

Further information regarding this study can be found in the attached Letter and Interview Protocol. The Consent Form and Demographics form are also attached here, but will be completed electronically [HERE](#). Please feel free to call me if you have any questions. If you do not meet the criteria for participation, I would appreciate you forwarding this information to any colleagues you think might be good candidates for the study.

Thank you for your consideration,

Meghan Butler, MA
 Doctoral Student
 Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
 Marquette University

Milwaukee, WI 53201
Phone: 313.303.0994
meghan.c.butler@mu.edu

Sarah Knox, PhD
Dissertation Advisor
Director of Training, Counseling Psychology Doctoral Program
Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53201-1881
414.288.5942
sarah.knox@marquette.edu

APPENDIX F: Feedback Letter
Letter for Participants to provide feedback on draft of MS
<MU Letterhead>

Dear <Name>,

Thank you so much for your willingness to explore your experience as a non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member involved in gatekeeping. Your time and thoughtful responses are appreciated by all of the team members, and contributed meaningfully to this research.

Enclosed you will find a draft of the results of the study that emerged from the analysis of all participant interviews. We are particularly interested in how well these collective results match your experiences, though please feel free to make any comments that you deem appropriate. We also want to ensure that your confidentiality has been maintained, and appreciate your feedback in this regard. Please note any comments on the attached form. You may keep the draft, but please return the completed comments form as soon as possible, ideally within two weeks.

Thank you again for your participation in this project. Your contribution has been invaluable. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Regards,

Meghan Butler, MA
Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
College of Education
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53201
313.303.0994
414.288.6100 [fax]
Meghan.c.butler@mu.edu

Sarah Knox, PhD
Dissertation Advisor
Director of Training, Counseling Psychology Doctoral Program
Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
College of Education, Schroeder Complex 168 H
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53201-1881
414.288.5942
414.288.6100 (fax)
sarah.knox@marquette.edu