

1976

# Development of an Evaluation Service for the Freshman Guidance and Counseling Program at Carl Sandburg High School in Orland Park, Illinois

Richard C. Wolford

*Eastern Illinois University*

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Psychology and Guidance](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

---

## Recommended Citation

Wolford, Richard C., "Development of an Evaluation Service for the Freshman Guidance and Counseling Program at Carl Sandburg High School in Orland Park, Illinois" (1976). *Masters Theses*. 3421.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3421>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

DEVELOPMENT OF AN EVALUATION SERVICE

FOR THE FRESHMAN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING PROGRAM

AT CARL SANDBURG HIGH SCHOOL IN ORLAND PARK, ILLINOIS

(TITLE)

BY

RICHARD C. WOLFORD

B. S. in Ed., Eastern Illinois University, 1968

M. S. in Ed., Eastern Illinois University, 1971

THESIS

FIELD STUDY

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

SPECIALIST IN EDUCATION

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1976

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING  
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

21 July 76  
DATE

July 21, 1976  
DATE

PAPER CERTIFICATE #2

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

7-21-76

Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Author

pdm

344699

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter  | Page |
|--|------|
| I. PRESENTING THE PROBLEM.....                 | 1    |
| Introduction.....                              | 1    |
| Background of Study.....                       | 3    |
| Purpose of the Study.....                      | 6    |
| Procedures.....                                | 6    |
| Limitations of the Study.....                  | 6    |
| Terms Defined.....                             | 7    |
| II. METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....                | 8    |
| The Evaluation Instrument.....                 | 8    |
| The Evaluation Program Model.....              | 12   |
| The Survey of Guidance Directors.....          | 16   |
| III. RELATED LITERATURE.....                   | 18   |
| The Evaluation of Guidance and Counseling..... | 18   |
| The Instruments Used in Evaluation.....        | 21   |
| IV. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS.....               | 26   |
| The Evaluation Instrument.....                 | 26   |
| The Evaluation Program Model.....              | 33   |
| The Survey of Guidance Directors.....          | 38   |
| V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....            | 43   |
| Summary.....                                   | 43   |
| Recommendations.....                           | 44   |
| Bibliography.....                              | 46   |

CHAPTER I  
PRESENTING THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

The need for continuous evaluation of guidance and counseling services is undeniable. It is impossible to prove the effectiveness of these services without evaluation. It is impossible to prove that guidance and counseling goals have been reached without evaluation. It is impossible to judge whether or not guidance and counseling services are meeting the needs of the students without evaluation. Indeed, the very existence of guidance and counseling services, in the future, may rest on the development of sound evaluation techniques.

The password in education today is "accountability." It is a complicated term in that there exist four relatively distinct concepts of accountability: (a) as performance reporting; (b) as a technical process; (c) as a political process; (d) as an institutional process.<sup>1</sup> On the practical level, however, all concepts of accountability rely heavily on the use of evaluation. Krumboltz describes an accountability system as a set of procedures that collates information about accomplishments and cost to facilitate decision making. It is assumed counselors do good things for people, but it is necessary to know exactly what good things are accomplished, the cost of each good deed, and how to do it better in the future. Local, state, and federal governments are moving closer to requiring some

---

<sup>1</sup>Henry M. Levin, "A Conceptual Framework for Accountability in Education," School Review, (May, 1974), pp. 363-395.

form of accountability in education. It would be much to counselors advantage to be prepared.<sup>1</sup> If counselors have a sound system for accountability, they can better prevent others from imposing their system on them. The system should incorporate the wealth of evaluation knowledge which already exists in the profession.

Evaluation of guidance and counseling services has been an important part of those services almost since their beginning. Every major book on guidance services devotes at least one chapter to the evaluation process. Even with all this attention on the evaluation process, many questions remain unanswered, and resistance to evaluation continues in many schools.<sup>2</sup>

The benefits of evaluating guidance and counseling services are many. Every individual associated with the services will gain from evaluation. The community and general public gains through development of more efficient and effective guidance practices. Society is strengthened by educational efforts which produce citizens who are goal oriented and aware of themselves and their responsibilities to others. Evaluation benefits the very counselors whose program is being evaluated. It provides tangible evidence which can be used as a means for promoting, developing, and extending guidance services. It is a means of building personal confidence among counselors, by giving them necessary information for improving their professional

---

<sup>1</sup>John D. Krumboltz, "An Accountability Model for Counselors," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 52, No. 10, (June, 1974), pp. 639-646.

<sup>2</sup>George E. Hill, Management and Improvement of Guidance, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974), pp. 312-313.

capabilities and expertise. Evaluation of guidance and counseling services benefits teachers and school administrators by the improvement of supportive services which helps the school to operate better. The student, rightfully so, is the big winner in guidance and counseling evaluation. The evaluation usually leads to more relevant services for students. It helps establish programs which help to meet the needs of students.<sup>1</sup>

#### BACKGROUND OF STUDY

It has become increasingly apparent to the writer, a high school counselor for three and one half years, that a real need exists for evaluating guidance and counseling services. This experience has been gained in a large Cook County suburban high school. Carl Sandburg High School in Orland Park, Illinois, has a student enrollment of 3600 students, and a counseling staff consisting of ten counselors and a guidance director. There has not been an effort on the part of the department, as a whole, to establish an evaluation service in the past three and one-half years.

The evaluation of individual counselors has always been carried out with extreme consistency and conscientiousness. The primary emphasis has been directed on self-improvement as a counselor. Usually a list of attributes the director thinks important to being a good counselor is used as a basis for evaluation. These attributes are studied by each counselor, then the director will set down

---

<sup>1</sup>Dean C. Andrew and Roy DeVerl Willey, Administration and Organization of the Guidance Program, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), pp. 268-269.

individually and discuss them as they applied to that counselor. The conference is usually no longer than an hour, and usually only positive attributes are discussed. Very little time has been spent outlining areas of possible improvement. Little effort has been made during these evaluation conferences to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the total guidance and counseling program.

The organization of the Sandburg guidance department creates certain barriers to an evaluation service. While all counselors are considered in one department, there are in fact two departments. In 1972, a "freshman program" was initiated with the opening of the new freshman wing of the building. A special curriculum was implemented, and special programs were developed to aid the student in his first year of high school. As a result, a small guidance office was built in closer proximity to the freshman wing. Two counselors were assigned as "freshman only" counselors in this office. The idea was that in the past, freshman students had not received proper counseling because a 9-12 counselor would spend most of his time on getting seniors ready for college and in working with juniors and sophomores. With specialized counselors, it was felt better services could be offered to freshman. This writer was also housed in the freshman office and counseled primarily freshman. Because of the one counselor to 350 student ratio at Sandburg, this writer usually has between 200 and 250 freshman, with the remaining portion of the ratio being upper classmen. The creation of two guidance areas, one of which was specialized, did create a problem in terms



of establishing an evaluation service for the entire department. Whether this was the main reason for not having an evaluation service cannot be determined by this writer.

There was a constant attempt to coordinate activities between the two offices, but the differences in services was noticeable. The guidance director made himself readily available to the freshman office, and monitored the progress of it very closely. He did give the office almost complete freedom in developing and executing its program. As a result, the freshman office developed a set of objectives, a philosophy, and a program. These were informally reviewed by the freshman counselors at least twice a year and changes made accordingly.

As a group, the three freshman counselors discussed evaluation from time to time, but lacked the time and experience to implement an evaluation service. During the second semester of the third year (1974-75) of operation, the three freshman counselors reviewed, critiqued, revised, and agreed to use an evaluation instrument which appeared in the March, 1975, issue of The Guidance Clinic.<sup>1</sup> This instrument was a student survey. It was felt that measuring student feeling about the program was a logical point to start in developing an evaluation service. The survey was given near the end of the 1974-75 and 1975-76 school years. This paper will deal with efforts to establish a full evaluation service of the Sandburg freshman guidance and counseling program during the 1975-76 school year.

---

<sup>1</sup>Thomas L. Hansen, "Student Evaluation of Guidance and Counseling Services," The Guidance Clinic, (March, 1975), pp. 9-12.

### PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Recognizing the need for an evaluation service for the guidance and counseling program, the following statements explain the purpose of this study:

1. To develop an instrument for student evaluation of the Sandburg freshman guidance and counseling program.
2. To begin development of a more comprehensive evaluation service for the Sandburg freshman guidance and counseling program.
3. To analyze the results of the student instrument and use the results to implement changes in the freshman program.

### PROCEDURES

The procedures of this study followed three specific lines of action. Each line of action was intended to serve a specific purpose. First, was the development of an evaluation instrument that could be administered to students for feedback. Secondly, was the use of a recognized evaluation model to be followed for development of an evaluation service. Thirdly, was a survey to area guidance directors to solicit their opinions on evaluation of guidance and counseling services, and to aid in the search for useable evaluation instruments.

### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The major limitation of this study was in regards to the evaluation model used. The model was not introduced until the end of the study. Therefore, the study was conducted without

its assistance. Its application in the study will be explained in Chapter II.

TERMS DEFINED

No terms will be defined. It is felt that all terms used in this paper should be familiar to both educators and guidance personnel.

CHAPTER II  
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

The evaluation instrument was the most important aspect of this study. To be more exact, the evaluation instrument should be called a research instrument. Technically, evaluation involves a more subjective appraisal of information available. Much of that information comes from the research aspect of the guidance services, which uses instruments to collect data. For the purposes of this study, however, the evaluation service will develop its own instrument because the Sandburg guidance department has not developed a research service.

There are generally considered two techniques for evaluation. The experimental approach requires a considerable amount of knowledge of research design, as well as, a greater amount of time and effort. The major draw back in using this approach in schools is the necessity for a non-treatment group and the ethical questions this entails.<sup>1</sup>

More common in evaluation is the survey approach. The survey is used to obtain a reaction from interested groups, usually by having them rate services or answer questions about services. An attempt is then made to determine the extent to which guidance is meeting its objectives. The major outcome is usually that counselors "take stock" of the general operation of the program and make needed changes. The major draw back to the survey is that the respondents usually have no

---

<sup>1</sup>Duane Brown and David J. Srebalus, Contemporary Guidance Concepts and Practices, (Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1972), p. 232.

basis for making judgments, and thus their answers become very subjective. Also, a large number usually will not respond.<sup>1</sup>

This study utilized the survey approach because it seemed more realistic and practical for use at Sandburg. It was the easiest to institute in terms of soliciting help from persons involved. It also seemed more logical as a technique for counselors who were still novices at research and evaluation. The experimental techniques seemed like something that should wait until more experience was gained.

There are many populations available to survey. There was the possibility of internal evaluation, which would be limited to counselors. A survey of that type did not seem to be what was desired because the freshman counselors already met informally to evaluate the program. The desire was for external feedback. This could come from the administration, teachers, parents, students, or former students. It was decided that the students served should have a chance to evaluate the services. They were the ones that used the services, and were closest to the services. They seemed the most logical group from which to seek feedback.

There has been concern that educators spend a great deal of time "re-inventing the wheel." Primarily for that reason, but also because the freshman counselors would probably never make the time to develop one, it was decided to use a student survey that was developed by Thomas L. Hanson, Director of Pupil Personnel Services,

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 231.

at Elk Grove High School, in Elk Grove Village, Illinois.<sup>1</sup> This student survey was used with only a few minor changes. Following is what the survey looked like in its completed form:

SURVEY OF FRESHMAN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SERVICES

Please circle appropriate response:

1. Who is your counselor?            Dawson            Havenhill            Wolford
2. How many times this year have you seen your counselor individually?  
Never            Once            2 to 4 times            over 4 times
3. How many times this year have you had a group contact with your counselor?  
Never            Once            2 to 4 times            over 4 times
4. When meeting with you, did the counselor usually talk about things that were important to you?  
Yes            No
5. Did the counselor seem to be interested and enthusiastic when you had contact with him or her?  
Yes            No
6. Did the counselor give you sufficient time to express your views or concerns?  
Yes            No
7. How did you feel about meeting your counselor in a private conference the first time?  
Uncomfortable            Relaxed            Have had no private conference
8. Who initiated the conference?            I did            Counselor
9. How would you feel about meeting your counselor now?  
Uncomfortable            Relaxed
10. Do you feel your counselor is competent to help you in the areas of educational planning and career or vocational decision making?  
Yes            No            Not sure
11. If you had a personal problem, would you discuss it with your counselor?  
Yes            No            Not sure

---

<sup>1</sup>Hansen, op. cit., pp. 9-12.

12. If you had a personal problem, to whom would you go for help?
- |                           |                            |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Counselor              | e. Psychologist            |
| b. Teacher                | f. Student Services Bureau |
| c. Dean                   | g. None of the above       |
| d. Principal or Assistant |                            |
13. Have you experienced any difficulty getting in to see your counselor?  
Yes            No
14. What do you think accounts for the difficulty, if any?
- |  |
|--|
| a. Counselor lost, forgot, or did not get my request for an appointment; |
| b. Teacher did not release me from class;                                |
| c. Counselor was too busy, but called me in later on;                    |
| d. Other (explain) _____   |
15. What do you consider the most important reason for having a counselor?
- |  |
|--|
| a. As a source of information on careers and colleges; |
| b. Just someone to talk to;                            |
| c. To get me off the hook when I get into trouble;     |
| d. To help me in planning my future;                   |
| e. To tell me what to do when I am confused.           |
16. How do you feel the guidance and counseling services can be improved? (You may circle as many as you feel necessary.)
- |  |
|--|
| a. Counselors should be more available;  |
| b. Counselors should mix more with students--in library, classes, activities;                          |
| c. Counselors should lead more small group discussions;  |
| d. Counselors should visit homerooms more;   |
| e. Counselors should spend more time with students in educational planning and career decision-making; |
| f. Counselors should spend more time with students on personal problems;                               |
| g. Counselors should present special interest programs;  |
| h. A student should be free to select his own counselor;   |
| i. Other: _____  |
17. Please rate freshman guidance and counseling overall:
- |           |      |      |      |
|-----------|------|------|------|
| Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
|-----------|------|------|------|

This survey was administered first at the end of the 1974-75 school year, and then again at the end of the 1975-76 school year. Thus, there are results available from two freshman classes. In 1975, it was administered about three weeks before the close of school.

It was administered by seven science teachers in their classes all on the same day. In 1976, it was administered during the last week of school. It was administered by seven math teachers, and they fit it into their schedules on whatever day was most convenient.

### THE EVALUATION PROGRAM MODEL

In order to organize and expedite the development of an evaluation program, it seemed logical to have a model to work from. In reviewing the literature, a model was adopted from the book Organizing For Effective Guidance.<sup>1</sup> It divides the operation of a guidance evaluation service into three main stages. These stages are (1) the formation of an organizational structure, (2) the execution of an evaluation study, and (3) the implementation of recommendations. By following the activities of this model, less chance of omitting some important procedure in the evaluation process is minimized. The model follows here:

#### Stage 1. Formation of an Organizational Structure

##### Activities To Perform:

- Define the purposes of the service.
- Designate a coordinator for the service.
- Specify personnel and their responsibilities.
- Determine the extent of readiness for change.
- Delimit scope of service.
- Determine evaluation schedule and priority list of future studies.
- Obtain support for the service and each study - money, time, and authority.
- Establish lines of communication within the service and for each study.
- Arrange for keeping records.

---

<sup>1</sup>Joseph William Hollis and Lucile Ussery Hollis, Organizing for Effective Guidance, (Illinois: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1965), p. 417.



## Stage 2. Execution of an Evaluation Study

### Activities To Perform:

Define the purposes of the study.  
 Develop the design of the study, including selection of criteria and techniques.  
 Determine evaluators and participants.  
 Obtain data from research service.  
 Collate data.  
 Apply criteria to data and make interpretations.  
 Draw conclusions and identify implications.  
 Make recommendations.  
 Disseminate findings.

## Stage 3. Implementation of Recommendations

### Activities To Perform:

Outline the procedure for implementations.  
 Obtain approval for implementing recommendations.  
 Have coordinator serve in a consultative role for implementation.  
 Have persons affected by changes assist in implementing recommendations.  
 Establish the priority list and timetable for implementing recommendations.  
 Identify changes necessary in postulates and action guidelines within the guidance program.  
 Maintain continuity in guidance services and activities during implementation.  
 Follow through to determine the effects of implemented recommendations.  
 Prepare reports on implementation.

What was accomplished during the 1975-76 school year will be described under the chapter on results and conclusions, using the formate of this model. While this model was not actually used in developing the evaluation program to date, it is valuable in that it offers a structure to view what was accomplished and what was not accomplished in the first effort by Sandburg freshman counselors to develop an evaluation process. It would serve two purposes here to expand on the objectives of the three stages of this model. First, it will provide more rationale for use of a model. Secondly, it will

better outline the necessary ingredients in an evaluation service.

The formation of an organizational structure for the evaluation service has as its primary goal, the "ordering" of the process. Just as a person would not start out on a journey without consulting maps, a counselor should not try to evaluate without a plan. Having a purpose, making goals, and establishing a procedure will greatly enhance the evaluation. These are the essentials of the organizational structure. They will allow for a more peaceful and settled environment for evaluation, and provide an atmosphere more conducive to change and modification. The organizational structure should allow for both short-range and long-range evaluation services. Every aspect of a guidance program may not need evaluation every year or at the the same time. There should be provisions for a timetable when various aspects of the program will be evaluated. All personnel involved in the program needs to take an active part in some aspect of the evaluation process. The ultimate goal is to make the evaluation service continuous and its studies comprehensive, systematic, and periodic.<sup>1</sup>

The execution of an evaluation study is the stage of motion. This is where the wheels begin to move and action is taken. The collection of data is very crucial to evaluation. Concrete information in the form of numbers and statistics allows for a new prospective, a new way of seeing a process or a program. It allows for more precise definition and deliniation of the program. The data collected

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 419-422.

can be useful or worthless depending upon the care and time put into the design of the evaluation. Whether examining the entire program or just a portion of it, the examination will be only as thorough as the instrument used to collect data. After the collection of the data comes the interpretation of the data in relation to established criteria. Then conclusions are drawn, recommendations are made, and the results are shared with other people.<sup>1</sup>

The implementation of recommendations is probably the most important stage. It is here that the "pay off" occurs. Every recommendation of the evaluation service should be implemented. If implementation does not occur, time has been wasted in the evaluation and frustration will surely arise among staff members. The recommendations should not be items that are "change for the sake of change." Indeed, that could do more harm than good. If the recommendations have been thought through and made on the basis of documented information, they should be good and useful. If there are several changes to be made, a priority should be placed on each. Procedures for implementing the recommendations should be placed on each. Procedures for implementing the recommendations should be established. With the implementation of a recommendation, the evaluation process is completed. Because evaluation is continuous, however, it then becomes time to set up evaluation techniques to monitor the progress of the implemented recommendations.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 422-424.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 424-426.

THE SURVEY OF GUIDANCE DIRECTORS

The availability of up to date information from the field can benefit most studies. Such information allows for comparison with other guidance departments, which in a way aids in the evaluation process. More importantly, a survey can be used as a barometer for a reading on how colleagues view certain aspects of education. It puts perspective on what concerns are worth pursuing, and helps to prevent wasted energy on useless enterprises. It certainly provides morale support to keep working on some of the less glamorous aspects of the guidance and counseling process. Each question of the following survey sought to gather information to accomplish the above named purposes:

## SURVEY

This survey will assume there is a certain amount of "informal" evaluation going on in your department constantly; that you evaluate individual counselors periodically; and that you have North Central Evaluations and Illinois State Office of Education Evaluations. Answer the following questions excluding reference to these methods. The terms "formal" and "formally" used below mean to use an actual paper and pencil type evaluation instrument.

1. Do you feel it is important to "formally" evaluate guidance and counseling services?      Yes \_\_\_\_\_      No \_\_\_\_\_
2. How often do you feel this should be done? (circle one)  
                     Yearly                      Every Two Years                      Every \_\_\_\_\_ Years
3. Which of the following groups do you feel provides the most accurate feedback in an evaluation? (Please rank in order from most accurate to least accurate)

|                 |       |
|-----------------|-------|
| Counselors      | _____ |
| Teachers        | _____ |
| Administrators  | _____ |
| Students        | _____ |
| Parents         | _____ |
| Former Students | _____ |

4. Do you have a "formal" system of evaluation of your guidance and counseling services? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
5. Which of the following people in your school are involved in using an evaluation instrument to evaluate your guidance and counseling services:

| <u>Group</u>    | <u>Check those Involved</u> | <u>% of Group Involved</u> | <u>Frequency of Evaluation</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Counselors      | _____                       | _____                      | _____                          |
| Teachers        | _____                       | _____                      | _____                          |
| Administrators  | _____                       | _____                      | _____                          |
| Students        | _____                       | _____                      | _____                          |
| Parents         | _____                       | _____                      | _____                          |
| Former Students | _____                       | _____                      | _____                          |

6. If you do not solicit student feedback to help evaluate your program, which of the following reasons best explains why? (check one)

Not enough time to do so \_\_\_\_\_

No adequate instrument available \_\_\_\_\_

Feel students don't know enough \_\_\_\_\_

Lack of counselor support \_\_\_\_\_

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Would you please attach a copy of your evaluation instrument(s) if you do not mind sharing it with me. Feel free to request a copy of the one used by Sandburg.

This survey was sent to fifty Cook County suburban guidance directors in high schools with enrollments between 3000 and 5500 students.

CHAPTER III  
RELATED LITERATURE

THE EVALUATION OF GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

Rothney and Farwell in 1960, reviewed the literature on guidance evaluation until that time. They discovered a general recognition of the need for evaluation, but little evidence that the need was being met. Only three books had been published on the subject. The literature did raise many issues that should be considered by evaluators. The biggest problem in guidance and counseling evaluation seemed to be with securing adequate measures of criteria against which the services can be assessed. Before-and-after studies was a common technique used in evaluation. This involved a "prior look" at a sample, the application of a particular guidance service or procedure, and then an attempt to assess the effectiveness of the procedure. These studies were considered pioneering efforts, but their methods, procedures, and designs had not yet produced their intended outcome. Few researchers in guidance were found to have used control-group studies. It was concluded by Rothney and Farwell that both quality and quantity of guidance evaluation research studies was greatly lacking.<sup>1</sup>

Three years later, Patterson indicated that there was a continuing scarcity of studies evaluating guidance and counseling services. He did

---

<sup>1</sup>John W. M. Rothney and Gail F. Farwell, "The Evaluation of Guidance and Personnel Services," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 30, No. 2, (April, 1960), pp. 168-175.

report an increase in controlled studies, but concluded these paid insufficient attention to methodological aspects of the research. He made several recommendations regarding future research. They centered around the development of goals and criteria relevant to attain them, more closely controlled research, and long-term follow-up. He admitted that such research would be difficult and expensive and probably out of the scope of a single investigator.<sup>1</sup>

In 1969, Thoresen stated that most guidance and counseling studies, as they are conceptualized, designed, executed, and analyzed, make no difference to counseling theory and practice. The primary reason for this state of being is that the service demands on counselors have often been so pressing that systematic investigation into the effectiveness and efficiency of processes and products has been ignored. He felt the greatest needs to be considered in research and evaluation were the need for disciplined inquiry, the need for new research models, and the need for a systems research orientation. In conclusion, he stated that guidance and counseling research and evaluation should evolve from the problems and concerns of counselors and their clients.<sup>2</sup>

Also, in 1969, Gelatt discussed guidance research, stating that research must be designed and conducted in the schools where the research questions are being ask. He felt guidance services and research need to involve students and guidance personnel more in

---

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Patterson, "Program Evaluation," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 33, No. 2, (April, 1963), pp. 214, 221-222.

<sup>2</sup>Carl E. Thoresen, "Relevance and Research in Counseling," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 39, No. 2, (April, 1969), pp. 263-281.

determining the kind of services to be offered. Furthermore, he felt that students should be more involved in setting their own guidance objectives. He challenged counselors to be involved in new, daring, and imaginative approaches. With the aid of research and evaluation, counselors can serve better as leaders in the development and improvement of the entire educational process.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the related literature points out that many problems and deficits remain to be corrected in guidance evaluation. Hill summarized in 1974, by stating that research, and thus evaluation, has not kept pace with the demand for guidance. And that research in guidance has been too scattered, too much centered upon production of acceptable thesis, dissertation, and research papers. He advocated more emphasis placed upon field studies in the schools and oriented to program realities. He felt the stress should be placed on action research designed to answer questions and to help make judgments that are close to the day-to-day functioning of the guidance program.<sup>2</sup>

Oetting and Hawkes discussed guidance evaluation along these same lines in their article on evaluative research. They stressed that evaluative research should not be confused with either laboratory research or field research for scientific purposes. Those types of research are aimed at the advancement of scientific knowledge, and the building of theory and general knowledge. A call was made for new attitudes and new kinds of training to make evaluation

---

<sup>1</sup>H. B. Gelatt, "School Guidance Programs," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 39, No. 2, (April, 1969), pp. 639-646.

<sup>2</sup>Hill, op. cit., pp. 301-305.



a viable part of field programming. They related the importance of counselors developing competencies in research design, instrument construction, effective consultation, and communication in order to carry on effective evaluation research.<sup>1</sup>

The overriding point seems to be that evaluative research is not necessarily complex, nor does it involve intricate statistical techniques. Essentially, it is a systematic, objective attempt to obtain valid answers to questions.<sup>2</sup> This was the guiding thought behind this field study.

#### THE INSTRUMENTS USED IN EVALUATION

Evaluation research is entirely dependent upon the collection of accurate data about a guidance and counseling program. This data can be collected by using a number of different instruments. Checklists, questionnaires, opinionnaires, and surveys are a few of the more commonly used instruments. These instruments can either be self-developed or one of the many published evaluation forms. Both types of instruments should be examined in order to determine what will be best for a specific study.

Any attempt here to critique, let alone list, all the instruments available would serve no great value. Rather it is the writers intention to briefly discuss several different

---

<sup>1</sup>Eugene R. Oetting and F. James Hawkes, "Training Professionals for Evaluative Research," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 52, No. 6, (February, 1974), pp. 434-438.

<sup>2</sup>Cecil H. Paterson, The Counselor in the School: Selected Readings, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), p. 409.

instruments available, in hopes of giving the reader a general understanding of what is available.

There is one instrument which should be familiar to almost every counselor in this country. The National Study of Secondary School Evaluation has the responsibility of evaluating the entire educational program of most of the nations schools. In Illinois, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, a branch of the National Study, conducts periodic evaluations of schools for the purpose of accreditation. The Guidance Services Section of this evaluation consists of a ten page evaluation instrument which uses a combination rating system checklist and summary evaluation, and written statements. Five parts are included in the document, each covering a certain aspect of a guidance program. These parts include the organization, staff, services, special characteristics, and general evaluation of guidance services. The first three sections have checklists on which various guidance aspects are rated on a four to one scale, with four being excellent and one being poor or missing. The fourth part provides for a written evaluation, and part five is a summary checklist to be rated. The instrument is self-administered to the members of a guidance department. It is intended to give a broad overview of the weak and strong areas of a guidance program.<sup>1</sup>

State offices of public instruction are another common source of evaluation instruments. Most states in this country have developed

---

<sup>1</sup>National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, Evaluative Criteria for the Evaluation of Secondary Schools, Forth Edition, (Washington, D. C., 1969), pp. 289-300.

some type of evaluation system for schools, which includes some means of guidance evaluation. The State of Illinois provides an Evaluation Criteria for Pupil Personnel Services checklist which provides for rating various aspects of the guidance services the state feels is important.<sup>1</sup>

Another source of evaluation instruments is the national and state professional organizations. A very thorough instrument was developed jointly by the American School Counselor Association and the National Association of College Admissions Counselors. Entitled the "Professional Audit for Secondary School Counselors," it was designed with four purposes in mind:

1. Provide an instrument for the neophyte counselor to conduct his own self-evaluation.
2. Provide the means for the experienced counselor to review himself periodically with a do-it-yourself appraisal.
3. Provide guidelines for the development and continuing improvement of a guidance department.
4. Aid in periodic self-examination, self-learning, self-improvement.

The instrument is constructed as a checklist of activities on which the evaluator checks "yes," "no," or "needs change," to well over one-hundred statements about a guidance and counseling program.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>OSPI 33-47 (9/74) form, Evaluation Criteria for Pupil Personnel Services (SA-20) prepared by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois, Springfield, Illinois.

<sup>2</sup>American School Counselor Association and the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, Professional Audit for Secondary School Counselors, (ASCA-NACAC, 1974), pp. 1-43.

The instruments mentioned so far have been ones which are for counselor response. There are also a number of instruments available to be responded to by students, administrators, teachers, and parents. Some of these are developed by university and college guidance education departments, and others are developed by individual high schools.

Two student evaluation questionnaires were developed by Hill and Nitzschke for an Ohio University study.<sup>1</sup> The purpose was to determine what guidance services in the involved high schools needed more attention, and to see what could be done to improve those services. One part of the questionnaire ask the student to check "yes," "no," or "not sure," as to whether or not he had received a certain service, to show how he felt his counselor handled specific kinds of problems, or to answer other questions about the guidance services. Another section ask the student to rate whether he had received "none," "much," or "little" assistance in a number of school associated activities or problems. A portion of the questionnaire sought to find out who in the school helped the student most with various problems. It then ask their opinions on who in the school should be responsible to help them with those problems. It also ask who they would prefer to go to with those problems.

Questionnaires for rating school guidance programs by former students, current students, and teachers appear in Guidance: A Longitudinal Approach.<sup>2</sup> All use a multiple choice answer method to

---

<sup>1</sup>Hill, op. cit., pp. 577-582.

<sup>2</sup>Howard L. Blanchard and Laurence S. Flaum, Guidance: A Longitudinal Approach, (Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1968), pp. 307-314.

describe the respondents' feelings about a guidance service. McDaniel provides examples of questionnaires for guidance evaluation that are filled in by seniors, parents, principals, and superintendents.<sup>1</sup> Boy and Pine show two questionnaires for student evaluation. One is a short six question one with two of the questions being open-ended, so the students can write in an explanation. The other questionnaire introduces a seven point scale on which the students rate guidance services from being "helpful" to being "no help at all."<sup>2</sup>

All in all, the selection of an evaluation instrument can be made as easy or hard as the evaluator desires. The easy methods being to select one already made, or by constructing one from several instruments. The more difficult method would be to construct an entirely original instrument.

---

<sup>1</sup>Henry B. McDaniel, Guidance in the Modern School, (New York: The Dryden Press, 1956), pp. 423-428.

<sup>2</sup>Angelo V. Boy and Gerald J. Pine, The Counselor in the Schools: A Reconceptualization, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), pp. 276-279.

## CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

The 1975 survey results will follow. The question will be stated. The responses will then be given in both raw tallies and percentiles of students responding. Finally, a brief discussion of the results will follow.

1. Who is your counselor? Dawson Havenhill Wolford

This question was asked in order to identify respondents by counselor, so an individual counselor could examine his own students responses. A total of 855 students out of 950 responded, or 90%.

2. How many times this year have you seen your counselor individually?

|              |     |     |
|--------------|-----|-----|
| Never        | 25  | 03% |
| Once         | 326 | 38% |
| 2 to 4 times | 390 | 46% |
| Over 4 times | 100 | 12% |
| No response  |     | 01% |

It is interesting to note that 03% of the students indicated they had not seen their counselors individually. Counselor records indicate that every student in the class was seen at least once. A majority of the students, 46%, saw their counselor 2-4 times. This is an ideal or desired goal for each student. The 12% seen over 4 times seems to represent realistically that group of students with more severe problems needing more attention. The most distressing figure is the 38% that saw their counselor individually only once. It is assumed the one time was a thorough initial interview, and that

most of these students are self-motivated and can "take care of themselves" pretty well. It is still desirable to have more than one individual contact per year.

3. How many times this year have you had a group contact with your counselor?

|              |     |     |
|--------------|-----|-----|
| Never        | 456 | 53% |
| Once         | 274 | 32% |
| 2 to 4 times | 105 | 12% |
| Over 4 times | 5   | 00% |
| No response  |     | 03% |

This question caused a great deal of concern. The freshman counselors saw the entire class four times during the year in group situations, either in regular classes or in homerooms. It did not seem possible that the scheduling of such activities would preclude over one-half of the students from meeting with their own counselor at least once. It is possible that students interpreted "group contact" as something else. In any event, it was resolved to meet more often in groups the 1975-76 school year.

4. When meeting with you, did the counselor usually talk about things that were important to you?

|             |     |     |
|-------------|-----|-----|
| Yes         | 745 | 87% |
| No          | 95  | 11% |
| No response |     | 02% |

These results were generally gratifying. It shows the counselors were able to relate to the students' needs and concerns. It is assumed, rightly or wrongly, that the 11% answering "no," were students that had seen their counselor on such things as poor grades, discipline problems, or other negative situations.

5. Did the counselor seem to be interested and enthusiastic when you had contact with him or her?

|             |     |     |
|-------------|-----|-----|
| Yes         | 740 | 87% |
| No          | 95  | 11% |
| No response |     | 02% |

These results were also gratifying. The 11% answering "no" is significant, however, if only to remind counselors that being interested and enthusiastic should not be taken for granted.

There are days when it is difficult to master these qualities, and it might well be that if they cannot be mastered on a given day, then students should not be seen if at all possible.

6. Did the counselor give you sufficient time to express your views or concerns?

|             |     |     |
|-------------|-----|-----|
| Yes         | 750 | 88% |
| No          | 88  | 10% |
| No response |     | 02% |

Again, these results were taken as positive strokes. The 10% answering "no," serves as a reminder that counselors do an injustice to students by cutting them off when they try to talk, or by ending a conference too early. It also would indicate that a counselor's opinions sometimes cancels out a student's views or concerns.

7. How did you feel about meeting your counselor in a private conference the first time?

|                                |     |     |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|
| Uncomfortable                  | 371 | 43% |
| Relaxed                        | 438 | 51% |
| Have had no private conference | 31  | 04% |
| No response                    |     | 02% |

There was debate as to the usefulness of this question. It could be argued that most students are going to be a little nervous on at least the first visit. When compared with the answers from question nine, however, more prospective can be seen.

8. Who initiated the conference?



|             |     |     |
|-------------|-----|-----|
| I did       | 260 | 30% |
| Counselor   | 571 | 67% |
| No response |     | 03% |

A little cause for alarm in these answers, with well over half the students waiting to be called down by their counselor, rather than taking the initiative to ask to be called down. It raises the question, "why?"

9. How would you feel about meeting your counselor now?

|               |     |     |
|---------------|-----|-----|
| Uncomfortable | 87  | 10% |
| Comfortable   | 750 | 88% |
| No response   |     | 02% |

These results help to neutralize some of the negative feedback from question nine. In other words, when students get to know their counselors, there is less apprehension about seeing them. Thus, the main concern becomes trying to relax students on that first visit, either by different tactics during orientation group sessions or in some other way.

10. Do you feel your counselor is competent to help you in the areas of educational planning and career or vocational decision making?

|             |     |     |
|-------------|-----|-----|
| Yes         | 536 | 63% |
| No          | 32  | 04% |
| Not sure    | 237 | 28% |
| No response |     | 05% |

The 28% answering "Not sure" leaves many questions to be answered. Some teachers reported students asking what "competent" meant, which might account for part of this too high percent. There is a concern that perhaps counselors do not spend enough time with students working in the areas of educational planning and career planning.

11. If you had a personal problem, would you discuss it with your counselor?

|             |     |     |
|-------------|-----|-----|
| Yes         | 133 | 16% |
| No          | 299 | 35% |
| Not sure    | 408 | 48% |
| No response |     | 01% |

These were probably the most distressing results of the survey.

With one of the main goals being to help students with personal problems, it is a real eye opener to see that so many students would prefer other sources for help.

12. If you had a personal problem, to whom would you go for help?

|                         |     |     |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|
| Counselor               | 220 | 26% |
| Teacher                 | 31  | 04% |
| Dean                    | 15  | 02% |
| Principal or Assistant  | 3   | 00% |
| Psychologist            | 17  | 02% |
| Student Services Bureau | 15  | 02% |
| None of the above       | 552 | 65% |
| No response             |     | 00% |

The answers indicate that most students that would go to someone in the school for help with a personal problem, would go to their counselor. Still, 65% said they would not go to anyone on the school staff.

13. Have you experienced any difficulty getting in to see your counselor?

|             |     |     |
|-------------|-----|-----|
| Yes         | 177 | 21% |
| No          | 661 | 77% |
| No response |     | 02% |

The percent stating they had difficulty getting in to see their counselor was too high. Students have enough other hassles in the course of a school day, without having a difficult time seeing their counselor. The next question points out some places to start making changes.

## 14. What do you think accounts for the difficulty, if any?

|  |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|
| Counselor lost, forgot, or did not get my request for an appointment | 50  | 06% |
| Teacher did not release me from class                                | 97  | 11% |
| Counselor was too busy, but called me in later on                    | 191 | 22% |
| Other  | 47  | 05% |

Actually, the largest difficulty with getting to see their counselor is the hardest to change. If a counselor is "booked up" seeing other students, it is impossible to leave them to see another student. Good "PR" needs to insue, however, to inform the student why he cannot be seen immediately. The second biggest problem appears to be with the teachers not releasing students from classes. From a counselors point of view, the 11% figure is probably lower than what would be expected. How to correct the problem is hard to solve. Continued good relations with teachers still seems to be the best way to assure that teachers will release students from their classes when they are sent for.

## 15. What do you consider the most important reason for having a counselor?

|  |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|
| As a source of information on careers and colleges | 217 | 25% |
| Just someone to talk to                            | 94  | 11% |
| To get me off the hook when I get into trouble     | 50  | 06% |
| To help me in planning my future                   | 319 | 37% |
| To tell me what to do when I am confused           | 398 | 47% |

These answers offer some insight into how students feel counselors can best serve them. Luckily, only 06% of the students have the misconception that counselors are in school to help get them off the hook when they get into trouble. The 47% answering "to tell me what to do when I am confused," has both positive and

negative implications. Positive in that students see counselors as being around to help them if they are confused. Somewhat negative, however, if they feel counselors are to "tell" them what to do. The counselors job is to help the student understand his confusion, make decisions, and unconfuse himself. Possibly this statement needs reworded to be more effective at gathering information.

16. How do you feel the guidance and counseling services can be improved? (You may circle as many as you feel necessary.)

|   |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|
| a. Counselors should be more available  | 295 | 35% |
| b. Counselors should mix more with students   | 218 | 25% |
| c. Counselors should lead more small group discussions  | 173 | 20% |
| d. Counselors should visit homerooms more   | 186 | 22% |
| e. Counselors should spend more time with students in educational planning and and career decision-making | 375 | 44% |
| f. Counselors should spend more time with students on personal problems                                   | 199 | 23% |
| g. Counselors should present special interest programs  | 200 | 23% |
| h. A student should be free to select his own counselor   | 368 | 43% |
| i. Other  | 42  | 05% |

Students circled more than one answer to this question. The number of answers for statements a, b, c, f, and g indicated that students wanted more counselor contact in the school. It was resolved that counselors make themselves more visable in the building, and that they begin developing more group activities. The large number indicating counselors should spend more time with students in educational planning and career-decision-making speaks clearly for itself. The 23% desiring more time be spent with students on personal problems indicates a number of students really do want help with personal problems. It has always been policy

to assign students to a particular counselor for administrative purposes, but it is always made clear in orientation that on other matters they may see any counselor they desire. A large portion, 43%, seem to support that philosophy.

17. Please rate freshman guidance and counseling overall:

|           |     |     |
|-----------|-----|-----|
| Excellent | 182 | 21% |
| Good      | 521 | 61% |
| Fair      | 141 | 16% |
| Poor      | 26  | 03% |

The overall rating of the freshman guidance and counseling program appears high. Eighty-two percent of the students rated it good or excellent, and only three percent rated it poor. This was above the counselors' expectations.

#### THE EVALUATION PROGRAM MODEL

In order for a guidance and counseling evaluation service to become efficient and effective, the service must be given a definite form of organization. Without organization, an evaluation service will lack the structure necessary to support active evaluation. The Sandburg freshman counselors did not have a set organization when they embarked upon the task of evaluation. It was felt by this writer, however, that using a model as a guideline for explaining what was done, would be beneficial. Thus, borrowing the Hollis chart of evaluation stages as a model, an explanation of the progress of this field study will follow:

1. Formation of an organizational structure.

Define the purposes of the service: In discussing evaluation, three primary purposes emerged. First, there was an overriding

desire to satisfy a curiosity as to what the students really felt about the program. Secondly, it would be an attempt to discover what were the strong and weak parts of the program. Thirdly, the results were meant to be used to give some direction to changing or modifying the program.

Designate a coordinator for the service: The freshman guidance staff had operated as a team for three years. When the discussion on evaluation began, it was handled in a team manner. No official coordinator was appointed. Each counselor contributed according to his own skills, abilities, and time limits.

Specify personnel and their responsibilities: Again, the "share and share alike" philosophy was in force. No specific responsibilities were assigned to anyone. Each person contributed to whatever extent was possible.

Determine the extent of readiness for change: The director of guidance had always supported our efforts to improve the freshman guidance program, so the administrative support was there. The staff we dealt with was usually open to change if some aspect of the program affected them. Certainly, none of the counselors would admit reluctance or opposition to change.

Delimit scope of service: This was not done. Evaluation was approached with an all inclusive strategy. There were no limits placed on our project.

Determine evaluation schedule and priority list of future studies: Neither of these were ever established. Rather, evaluation was "sandwiched" in wherever possible between the day to day

counselor routine. It took a back seat to everything else. In place of a schedule was a "get it done when you have the time" attitude. As a result, the survey was given very near the end of the school year both years. No priority list of future studies was established.

Obtain support for the service and each study - money, time, authority: Again, money and authority were no problem. With the guidance director's support, neither of these items interfered with the evaluation. Time was the biggest problem. The freshman counselors failed to budget specific time for the evaluation and follow-up conferences. Time was taken whenever all three counselors could get together. As a result, time devoted to the evaluation was inconsistent and insufficient.

Establish lines of communication within the service and for each study: The prior established team lines of communication operated for the service.

Arrange for keeping records: The only records kept were the results of the two surveys.

## 2. Execution of an evaluation study.

Define the purposes of the study: The purposes of the study were the same as the purposes for the service outlined before.

Develop the design of the study, including selection of criteria and techniques: A formal written design was not established. Criteria were not selected or established. The technique consisted of a survey of the student population served.

Determine evaluators and participants: Again, all three

counselors were the evaluators. It was decided that all freshman students should participate in the survey.

Obtain data from research service: There was no research service in operation, therefore, the evaluation service collected its own data.

Collate data: This work was done by the counselors individually and in groups.

Apply criteria to data and make interpretations: Without established criteria, this step was not carried out. There was an attempt to interpret results in light of the philosophy and objectives of the freshman guidance and counseling program.

Draw conclusions and identify implications: The attempt to accomplish these objectives was constantly dominated and harmed by the time element. After the 1975 survey was administered, the freshman counselors tried repeatedly to set down and discuss the results. It was the end of the school year, however, and time was never found. It was vowed that it would be done at the beginning of the next school year. In the fall, meetings were held to draw up the following conclusions based on the results of the survey:

1. The freshman guidance and counseling service was pretty good in the eyes of most students.
2. The survey indicated students seemed to want more group contact with counselors. Thus, it was resolved to develop more group activities during the 1975-76 school year.
3. The survey also indicated that students desired more



counselor visibility, such as in the hallways, media center, or visiting classrooms. Thus, it was resolved that each counselor would attempt to be more visible during the 1975-76 school year. The drawing of conclusions and identifying of implications has not been completed on the 1976 survey. It was administered too late in the year, so this will have to be done in the fall.

Make recommendations: As stated above, the two major recommendations from the 1975 survey were that counselors make themselves more visible, and develop more group activities.

Disseminate findings: Findings were not released out of the department. This was the result of not getting the results written up in a presentable form.

### 3. Implementation of recommendations.

Outline the procedure for implementation: This was never put into writing. There was just a vague understanding of what was to be accomplished. Again, this consisted of more counselor visibility and more student group activities.

Obtain approval for implementing recommendations: This was not necessary as there was a "blanket ticket" to do what was felt necessary. The only obligation was to keep the guidance director informed about the activities.

Have coordinator serve in a consultative role for implementation: This step was not possible as there was no coordinator. The freshman counselors did not as a team act in a consultative role.

Have persons affected by changes assist in implementing recommendations: The main persons affected were the three

freshman counselors. Where other staff was involved in changes, they were consulted and their help received.

Establish the priority list and timetable for implementing recommendations: No priority list or timetable was established. Implementation rested upon the availability of time found between the normal operation of the office.

Identify changes necessary in postulates and action guidelines within the guidance program: This was not done.

Maintain continuity in guidance services and activities during implementation: This was done too well, actually at the expense of proper implementation of the recommendations.

Follow through to determine the effects of implemented recommendations: No special efforts were made to follow through. It was hoped the 1976 survey would give some indication as to the success of implemented recommendations.

Prepare reports on implementation: No reports were prepared.

#### THE SURVEY OF GUIDANCE DIRECTORS

The survey of guidance directors provided some interesting information about guidance and counseling evaluation from the field. A total of fifty Cook County suburban directors were mailed the surveys. Thirty-five responded, with the following results:

1. Do you feel it is important to "formally" evaluate guidance and counseling services?

|     |    |     |
|-----|----|-----|
| Yes | 33 | 94% |
| No  | 2  | 06% |

It seems fairly well agreed that some type of formal evaluation

is necessary. The two directors responding "no" did not explain the reason for their answers.

2. How often do you feel this should be done?

|                 |    |     |
|-----------------|----|-----|
| Yearly          | 19 | 54% |
| Every two years | 10 | 29% |
| Every ___ years | 6  | 17% |

Over half the directors indicated that formal evaluations should take place yearly. Another 29% felt every two years was often enough. The remaining directors gave answers falling from every 3-6 years. Thus, a majority of directors appear to be in favor of frequent evaluation.

3. Which of the following groups do you feel provides the most accurate feedback in an evaluation? (Please rank in order from most accurate to least accurate)

| Rank Order      | 1       | 2      | 3      | 4       | 5       | 6       |
|-----------------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|
| Counselors      | 14(40%) | 5(14%) | 4(11%) | 5(14%)  | 2(06%)  | 4(11%)  |
| Teachers        | 0(00%)  | 6(17%) | 9(23%) | 8(23%)  | 7(20%)  | 2(06%)  |
| Administrators  | 0(00%)  | 4(11%) | 6(17%) | 10(29%) | 8(23%)  | 5(14%)  |
| Students        | 14(40%) | 8(23%) | 4(11%) | 4(11%)  | 2(06%)  | 1(03%)  |
| Parents         | 1(03%)  | 2(06%) | 4(11%) | 4(11%)  | 11(31%) | 11(31%) |
| Former Students | 4(11%)  | 8(23%) | 5(14%) | 3(09%)  | 3(09%)  | 10(29%) |

Both counselors and students rate high as being able to provide the most accurate feedback in evaluation. Students received the highest ratings, with counselors not far behind. Thus, there appears to be a feeling that persons closest to the program can provide the best feedback. Former students seemed to provide the greatest amount of disagreement among directors. Almost an equal number ranked them first and second as ranked them fifth and sixth. When only the first

and sixth ranks are shown, however, the only conclusion to be drawn is that directors have grave reservations about former student's responses. This reaction could be due to a feeling that only former students with complaints return questionnaires.

Parents clearly finished last in the rating. This raises some serious questions. If counselors expect support from parents, it appears a higher level of trust and understanding needs to be developed. The results almost show a "fear" of what the parents might have to say. It seems that parents should be well informed about the services available. Their opinions, it would appear, would have some importance to the operation of a guidance and counseling service.

Neither teachers nor administrators received a first place ranking. Both these groups are very close to the guidance and counseling process. It is amazing that directors did not have a great deal of faith in feedback from these groups. Administrators seemed to rank lowest of the two. Teachers fared better in that they received most of their rankings in the middle.

4. Do you have a "formal" system of evaluation of your guidance and counseling services?

|     |    |     |
|-----|----|-----|
| Yes | 21 | 60% |
| No  | 14 | 40% |

A majority, 60%, of the directors claimed to have a formal evaluation system. This left a very high percent of Cook County high schools with no formal guidance and counseling evaluation process. This question did not solicate responses concerning informal types of evaluation.

5. Which of the following people in your school are involved in using an evaluation instrument to evaluate your guidance and counseling services:

| <u>Group Involved</u> | <u>Number indicating this group</u> | <u>Range of % of Group Involved</u> | <u>Range of Evaluation Frequency</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Counselors            | 19                                  | 50% - 100%                          | 1 - 5 years                          |
| Teachers              | 11                                  | 01% - 100%                          | 1 - 5 years                          |
| Administrators        | 16                                  | 10% - 100%                          | 1 - 5 years                          |
| Students              | 19                                  | 10% - 100%                          | 1 - 5 years                          |
| Parents               | 4                                   | 10% - 33%                           | 1 - 2 years                          |
| Former Students       | 11                                  | 01% - 100%                          | 1 - 4 years                          |

A great deal of variation occurred in these answers. It appears that each school developed guidelines to meet its purposes and resources. There probably is no "magical" formula for selecting the evaluators, the number to evaluate, or the frequency of evaluation. The fact that evaluation is taking place at all, is probably the most significant fact. It is interesting to note that the evaluation groups reported here follow closely to the results reported in question number three. Again, parents were at the bottom of the list.

6. If you do not solicit student feedback to help evaluate your program, which of the following reasons best explains why?

|                                 |   |     |
|---------------------------------|---|-----|
| Not enough time                 | 5 | 27% |
| No adequate instrument          | 7 | 39% |
| Feel students don't know enough | 2 | 11% |
| Lack of counselor support       | 2 | 11% |
| Other:                          |   |     |
| No administrative support       | 1 | 06% |
| Not a high priority             | 1 | 06% |

Thus, the largest number of directors not evaluating by students

feel there is no adequate instrument available. The second largest reason is the reoccurring problem in education of a lack of time.

7. Would you please attach a copy of your evaluation instrument(s) if you do not mind sharing it with me.

This question was one of the primary purposes of the survey. It was hoped that a number of useful instruments could be collected. Nineteen directors reported using instruments to evaluate by students, and a total of eleven returned a copy of their instrument. Most of these instruments appeared to be similiar to those reviewed in the related literature. They all appeared to be developed or re-worked from other instruments for use in the particular school using it. They all have the potential for helping in further development of a Sandburg instrument.

CHAPTER V  
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

In summarizing the general findings of this field study, the following points need to be mentioned:

1. There exists a need for continuous evaluation of guidance and counseling services in high schools. It is necessary in order to provide a full and meaningful program.
2. Field studies and evaluative research should be emphasized over "scientific" or "pure" research. Evaluation must first serve the purpose of providing answers to questions close to the day-to-day functioning of the guidance program.
3. Evaluative research need not be complicated, but it must be systematic and objective. To obtain this combination, it is suggested that a formal evaluation model be adopted.
4. In developing an instrument to collect data, the goals and objectives of the specific guidance department being evaluated, should be the greatest consideration.
5. Most guidance directors in the Cook County suburbs feel that formal evaluation of guidance and counseling is necessary and desirable. They also feel that students and counselors provide the most accurate feedback for evaluation.

In summarizing the results of this field study as they relate to the Sandburg freshman guidance and counseling evaluation, the

following points need to be mentioned:

1. The Sandburg freshman counselors have a good start toward developing an evaluation service. Much work remains to be done.
2. The failure to adopt an evaluation model in the early stages of the project resulted in many problems. The absence of a formal written plan of evaluation denied a much needed organizational form and structure to the project.
3. The failure to establish a set timetable of events resulted in too little time being devoted to the evaluation process.
4. The evaluation instrument provided a wealth of information. Some questions appeared to be ambiguous or vague in light of the results.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made by this writer in view of the results of the field study:

1. That future evaluation attempts by the Sandburg freshman counselors make use of the evaluation model in order that no important aspects of evaluation be disregarded. Of special importance are the establishment of timetables, and the allocation of specific time for evaluation purposes only.
2. That further efforts be made to develop an instrument that better collects information reflecting student feelings of the current goals and objectives of the freshman guidance program.
3. That efforts be made to solicit feedback from other important groups, such as teachers, administrators, parents, and former students.



4. That studies be instituted to evaluate in depth certain aspects of the current freshman guidance program. Questions were raised by the survey which could better be answered by a special study in that particular area.
5. That the evaluation service be expanded to include the entire Sandburg guidance department.
6. That an effort be made to continue reviewing the literature on evaluation, with the expressed purpose of incorporating the results of new studies, research, or techniques into the Sandburg evaluation service.

## Bibliography

Books:

1. Andrew, Dean C. and Roy DeVerl Willey, Administration and Organization of the Guidance Program, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1958.
2. Blanchard, Howard L., Organization and Administration of Pupil Personnel Services, Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Illinois, 1974.
3. Blanchard, Howard L. and Laurence S. Flaum, Guidance: A Longitudinal Approach, Burgess Publishing Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1968.
4. Boy, Angelo V. and Gerald J. Pine, The Counselor in the Schools: A Reconceptualization, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1968.
5. Brown, Duane and David J. Srebalus, Contemporary Guidance Concepts and Practices, Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, Dubuque, Iowa, 1972.
6. Froehlich, Clifford P., Guidance Services in Schools, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1958.
7. Hatch, Raymond N. and Buford Steffle, Administration of Guidance Services, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1965.
8. Hill, George E., Management and Improvement of Guidance, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1974.
9. Hollis, Joseph William and Lucile Ussery Hollis, Organizing for Effective Guidance, Science Research Associates, Inc., Chicago, Illinois, 1965.
10. McDaniel, Henry B., Guidance in the Modern School, The Dryden Press, New York, 1956.
11. Ohlsen, Merle M., Guidance Services in the Modern School, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., New York, 1974.
12. Patterson, Cecil H., The Counselor in the School: Selected Readings, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1967.
13. Ryan, T. Antoinette and Franklin R. Zeran, Organization and Administration of Guidance Services, The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc., Danville, Illinois, 1972.

14. Shaw, Merville C., School Guidance Systems - Objectives, Functions, Evaluation, and Change, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1973.
15. Shertzer, Bruce and Shelley C. Stone, Fundamentals of Guidance, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966.

Periodicals:

1. Gelatt, H. B., "School Guidance Programs," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 39, No. 2, (April, 1969), pp. 142-153.
2. Krumboltz, John D., "An Accountability Model for Counselors," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 52, No. 10, (June, 1974), pp. 639-646.
3. Levin, Henry M., "A Conceptual Framework for Accountability in Education," School Review, (May, 1974), pp. 363-395.
4. Oetting, Eugene R. and F. James Hawkes, "Training Professionals for Evaluative Research," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 52, No. 6, (February, 1974), pp. 434-438.
5. Patterson, C. H., "Program Evaluation," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 33, No. 2, (April, 1963), pp. 214-224.
6. Rothney, John W. M., and Gail F. Farwell, "The Evaluation of Guidance and Personnel Services," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 30, No. 2, (April, 1960), pp. 168-175.
7. Thoresen, Carl E., "Relevance and Research in Counseling," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 39, No. 2, (April, 1969), pp. 263-281.

Other Materials:

1. American School Counselor Association and the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, Professional Audit for Secondary School Counselors, ASCA-NACAC, 1974.
2. National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, Evaluative Criteria for the Evaluation of Secondary Schools, Forth Edition, Washington, D. C., 1969.
3. OSPI 33-47 (9/74) form, Evaluation Criteria for Pupil Personnel Services (SA-20) prepared by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois, Springfield, Illinois.