

Old Dominion University

ODU Digital Commons

Counseling & Human Services Theses &
Dissertations

Counseling & Human Services

Winter 2014

School Counseling Program Models Utilized By School Districts

Tracy L. Jackson
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/chs_etds



Part of the [Counselor Education Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jackson, Tracy L.. "School Counseling Program Models Utilized By School Districts" (2014). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Dissertation, Counseling & Human Services, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/5nxk-ex08
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/chs_etds/62

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Counseling & Human Services at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Counseling & Human Services Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM MODELS

UTILIZED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

by

Tracy L. Jackson

B.A. May 1993, University of Rhode Island

M.S. May 1998, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR IN PHILOSOPHY

COUNSELOR EDUCATION AND SUPERVISION

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

December 2014

Approved by:

Theodore P. Remley, Jr. (Chair)

Jeffrey Moe (Member)
JEFFREY MOE (MEMBER)

Garrett McAuliffe (Member)

ABSTRACT

SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM MODELS UTILIZED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Tracy L. Jackson
Old Dominion University, 2014
Dr. Theodore P. Remley

School counseling district supervisors find themselves at the center of selecting and implementing comprehensive school counseling program models for their school districts. It is important to examine the selection of models to determine if proper services are being extended to students. The purpose of this study was to explore district supervisors' selection of comprehensive school counseling program models. Model selection was assessed by examining district supervisors' ratings of the degree to which their school district's comprehensive school counseling program was associated with traits of the most popular models, and if school district and personal characteristics influenced the selection process. The characteristics listed in the instrument was based on existing literature and frameworks regarding comprehensive school counseling models. Results revealed that components from the three most popular frameworks, The ASCA National Model, the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling, and the New Vision for School Counselors were reported as being implemented in school districts. District supervisors reported implementing the ASCA National Model most often.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To the faculty, staff and fellow students of the counselor education program: This has been a memorable experience and I am grateful to have encountered you on this journey.

To my remarkable dissertation committee: Dr. Ted Remley, to whom I respect and am honored to have worked; Dr. Jeffrey Moe, whose dedication to helping create successful students speaks volumes and whose inquiries regarding my findings renewed my appreciation for my profession and my place within it, and; Dr. Garrett McAuliffe, for allowing me to bear witness to his love of writing.

To my family, friends and loved ones who helped me achieve this milestone and continuously encouraged me.

To my mother, Sharon Jennings, and my father, Maurice Jackson, whose unconditional love, pride, support and devotion never...ever goes unrecognized.

Lastly, I dedicate this to my late grandfather William E. Reels, who always encouraged my quest for higher education. And to my late step-father, Lummer Jennings, Ed.D., who exemplified courage and determination and taught me that all things are possible. I hope to accomplish all that you were unable to complete.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Purpose of this Study	2
Significance of the Study.....	3
Reporting Usage of Comprehensive School Counseling Models.....	3
Uncovering Differences Based on Supervisor and District Factors	4
Research Questions.....	4
Limitations and Delimitations	5
Assumptions of the Study.....	5
Definitions of Terms.....	6
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	8
Introduction.....	8
History of School Counseling.....	8
The Late 1800's through the 1930's.....	8
The 1940's through the 1970's	11
The 1980's through the Present	15
Roles and Functions of District School Counseling Supervisors	17
Comprehensive School Counseling Program Models	22
American School Counselor Association	23
National Center for Transforming School Counseling.....	24
National Office for School Counselor Advocacy.....	26
Emerging Issues and Trends in School Counseling	28

Implementation of Comprehensive School Counseling Program Models	28
Equity in Comprehensive School Counseling Programs.....	32
The Need for Policy.....	36
Preparation of School Counselors	40
Summary.....	41
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	43
Purpose Statement	43
Research Design	44
Research Questions.....	44
Participants	46
Instrumentation	47
Information about the Comprehensive School Counseling Program	47
Demographic and School District Information.....	48
Item Generations and Content Validation	49
Procedures.....	50
Data Analysis.....	51
Validity Threats	54
Strengths of Proposed Work.....	55
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS.....	56
Preliminary Data Screening and Provision of Variables	56
Demographic Information	57
Descriptive Data	59
Research Question 1	62
Research Question 2	70
Research Question 3	75
Section III: Comments.....	77
Summary.....	77

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	80
Summary of Findings	80
Implications School Counseling District Supervisors	87
Implications for School Counseling Practice	89
Implications for Counselor Educators	90
Limitations of Study	90
Suggestions for Future Research	93
Summary.....	94
CHAPTER SIX: MANUSCRIPT.....	96
Abstract.....	97
Introduction.....	98
Method.....	109
Results.....	112
Discussion.....	114
Limitations	117
Implications	119
Conclusion	121
References for Chapter Six.....	123
REFERENCES	127
APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	136
APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT	142
VITA	144

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Delivery of Services	60
Table 2	ASCA Variables	63
Table 3	NCTSC Variables	64
Table 4	NOSCA Variables	65
Table 5	Correlations of Comprehensive School Counseling Model Variances	68
Table 6	Results of MANOVA	74

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

School counseling can be traced back to the late 1880s and the Industrial Revolution, as members of society tried to create a skilled labor force. At that time school counseling was known as vocational guidance and became more popular during the early to mid-1900s (Gysbers, 2010).

Today, *school counseling* has become synonymous with a service that is provided to students in schools by master's level degreed personnel. This service is predicated in comprehensive school counseling models. Today's models are as varied and diverse as the students they serve and the school districts in which they find themselves.

What has emerged is a cadre of organizations that are leading the way in developing comprehensive school counseling models and have found their niche of students to assist via these models. Comprehensive school counseling models support student achievement. They are developmental, preventive, and wide-ranging. These models assist school counselors in using data and supporting their school's mission (The Education Trust, 2009c; National Office for School Counselor Advocacy, 2011; American School Counselor Association, 2012). Currently, there are three organizations which provide comprehensive K-12 school counseling models for school counselors: the American School Counselor Association (www.schoolcounselor.org); The Education Trust (www.edtrust.org); and the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy (nosca.collegeboard.org).

The American School Counselor Association's ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs (www.schoolcounselor.org) is the most popular and perhaps widely used modern comprehensive school counseling model (ASCA, 2012). The American School Counselor Association's focus is on "how are students different as a result of what school counselors do?", and using their model can assist in answering that question (ASCA, 2008). The Education Trust has created the National Center for Transforming School Counseling, under which their model, The New Vision for School Counselors derives (www.edtrust.org). It is The Education Trust's belief that school counselors should advocate for educational equity, access to a rigorous college and career-readiness curriculum, and academic success for all students. The mission of the Education Trust is to transform school counselors into powerful agents of change in schools to close the gaps in opportunity and achievement for low-income students and students of color (The Education Trust, 2009b); and the newest model, the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling has been created by the College Board's National Office of School Counselor Advocacy (nosca.collegeboard.org). NOSCA (2011) believes in a comprehensive, systemic approach for school counselors. The College Board desires that school counselors inspire all students and prepare them for college success and opportunities, especially students from underrepresented populations.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study is to determine the degree to which supervisors of school counseling programs within school districts utilize the most well-known comprehensive school counseling program models in delivering counseling services to their students. In addition, whether any demographic professional factors or

school district characteristics predict the use of specified school counseling models will be also explored. For purposes of this study, utilization of models will be assessed by examining district counseling supervisors' ratings of the degree to which their school district's comprehensive school counseling program is associated with particular characteristics from three well-known comprehensive school counseling program models.

Significance of this Study

Reporting Usage of Comprehensive School Counseling Models

Empirical studies verify the importance of comprehensive school counseling models as they relate to student success (Cary & Dimmitt, 2012; Dimmit, Harrington, Martin, & Hoffman, 2012; Dimmit, Harrington, Martin, & Stevenson, 2012; Dimmit & Wilkerson, 2012; Lapan, Gysbers, Stanley, & Pierce, 2012). Yet, there is a gap in the professional literature related to state or school district level supervisors and the comprehensive school counseling program models they are utilizing (Beale, 2004; Borders & Drury, 1992; Gysbers, 2004; Henderson, 1999). Many studies in the literature were completed over a decade or more ago, thus leaving a large hole in the current literature (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Sink & MacDonald, 1998; Wilson & Remley, 1987). Current literature seems to explore comprehensive school counseling model selection by school counselors in buildings, comprehensive school counseling model implementation, and comprehensive school counseling model evaluation (Beale, 2004; Borders & Drury, 1992, Burkard, Gillen, Martinez, & Skytte, 2012; Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Hoffman, 2012; Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Stevenson, 2012; Dimmitt & Wilkerson, 2012; Lapan, 2012; Lapan, Whitcomb, & Alaman, 2012; Mason, 2006;

O'Dell, 1996; Olson & Perrine, 1991; Pyne, 2011; Sink & MacDonald, 1998; Steen & Rudd, 2009; Trevisan, 2001; Wingfield, Reese, & West-Olatunji, 2010).

It is important for the field of school counseling to receive feedback that can effectively assist district supervisors in selecting the best model for their school district based on the needs of the community and students. This is paramount due to the multiple roles school counselors serve and the unique and challenging needs of the student population.

Uncovering Differences Based on Supervisor and District Factors

The data collected for this study will include information about school counseling supervisors and school districts such as degree type and length of time in position of school counseling supervisors and size and location of school districts and the amount of students receiving free and reduced lunch. These characteristics may help shed light on how variables such as length of time in position and size of the school district have an impact on district supervisors' perceptions of school counseling models. Additionally, these observations may illuminate differences in the professional roles of district supervisors and student needs based on school district characteristics. Thus, findings from this study may provide motivation for future research that may better highlight these differences.

Research Questions

The primary research question of this study is: Which school counseling program models have district school counseling supervisors selected? This question will be explored by the subquestions: (1) To what degree do school districts utilize components of the three most prominent comprehensive school counseling program models? (2) Is

there a difference between comprehensive school counseling program model utilization, type of census defined area in which the school district is located, geographical location, number of students within the district, percentage of students on free and reduced lunch, and number of school counselors employed by the district based on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors? and (3) To what extent do the college credentials of the school counseling district supervisor, age of the district supervisor, the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations differ among participants regarding the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs?

Limitations and Delimitations

The sample used for this survey will be public school district school counseling supervisors in school districts located in the United States. Private, independent, parochial, and charter schools will be excluded based on the assumption that these types of schools are not part of a school district, but rather an entity onto themselves.

The instrument will collect data from school counseling district supervisors across the United States regarding their selection of comprehensive school counseling program models. Participants may respond in a socially desirable way and only districts that have a district level supervisor will be surveyed. Thus ratings may not be an accurate representation of school counseling comprehensive model selection.

Assumptions of Study

It is assumed that all participants will understand the instrument and rate items accurately and honestly with minimal influence from social desirability. Additionally, it

is assumed that there is a substantial correlation between the perception of the district supervisor's school counseling comprehensive model selection and whether the supervisor takes an active role in selecting a model.

Definitions of Terms

Comprehensive School Counseling Program	A developed plan delivered by a school counselor catering to students of all abilities.
Comprehensive School Counseling Program Model	A developed plan for school counselors created by a school counseling organization.
District Supervisor	A person who oversees or manages school counselors or school counseling programs within a school district.
School District	A geographical area for the local administration of schools.
School Counselor	A person with a minimum of a master's degree in school counseling making uniquely qualified to address all students' academic, personal/social and career development needs by designing, implementing, evaluating and enhancing a comprehensive school counseling program

that promotes and enhances student success, (www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/home/RoleStatement.pdf).

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter, existing literature regarding the history of school counseling, the roles and functions of district school counseling supervisors, and comprehensive school counseling models are discussed. Literature is reviewed on the content of the three major comprehensive school counseling models. Emerging trends and issues facing school counseling, including the need for policy, are also discussed.

History of School Counseling

Guidance or vocational counseling, known today as school counseling, began with the onset of the Industrial Revolution in the late 1880s because skilled laborers were needed for a newly created workforce (Gysbers, 2010). Over the next 130 years, K-12 education saw a progression of change to the field of vocational counseling through policy, regulations, social revolution, and advocacy (Schellenberg, 2013).

The Late 1800s through the 1930s

One of the first proponents of the vocational counseling movement was Lysander Richards. In 1881, he wrote *Vocophy: The New Profession*, to assist individuals with vocational training. His main goal was to have vocophers (vocational guidance counselors) in every state and town and he suggested creating a program to teach vocational guidance, a job that was normally rendered by charity workers (National Career Development Association, n.d.). Over the next decade several important events occurred that spurred an interest in vocational guidance (Gysbers, 2010).

In 1908, the Vocation Bureau was created as a part of the Civic Service House in Boston, Massachusetts. A lawyer and civil engineer turned social activist, Frank Parsons, wanted to educate the underprivileged and wanted to help the recent influx of immigrants escape the cycle of poverty by making better vocational choices; especially within the schools (Baker, 2009; Savickas, 2009). One of Frank Parsons' contributions to the field of school counseling was being the first person to implement district-wide vocational guidance in a public school system (Wright, 2012). One hundred elementary and secondary teachers were appointed by the superintendent of Boston schools as vocational counselors, and those appointments became known as the *Boston Plan*. Within the next few years, school systems across the country followed suit (Schmidt, 1983). Many elementary and secondary teachers performed these new vocational counseling duties without formal preparation, without relinquishing their duties as teachers, and without an increase in pay. In 1913, the National Vocational Guidance Association was created and in 1915, the Department of Vocational Guidance was established (Gysbers, 2010; Thompson, 2012; Wittmer, 2007). The first federal government act associated with guidance was the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917, which provided funds to hire counselors in the schools. During the 1920s more and more cities surrounding Boston, and as far away as Philadelphia, Grand Rapids, New York, Cincinnati, Lincoln, Minneapolis, Oakland, Chicago, and Seattle were developing and implementing vocational guidance in schools (Gysbers, 2010; The New England Vocational Guidance Association, 1925). Counselors were now charged with *fixing* what was wrong with students; otherwise known as providing personal/social counseling (Wright, 2012). While in some cities the arduous task of what to call this developing

profession at the district level ensued. In some districts the department was known as vocational guidance, while in other cities it was called attendance and guidance, educational research, information, and guidance, or research and guidance due to the lack of knowledge by school superintendents (Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998).

According to Gysbers (2010), vocational guidance in the 1920s changed in its purpose and vocabulary because it was being fused with other programs due to the competition to assist the developmental needs of students. Counseling terms such as clinical, educational, measurement, and social were emphasized and the focus on helping students with personal and social problems started to outweigh the practicality of vocational guidance. The school building became a common gathering place for those who were interested in psychometrics, mental hygiene, and child study and development. National organizations such as the National Education Association (NEA) and the Commission of the Reorganization of Secondary Education (CRSE) restructured education and phased out vocational education and replaced it with educational guidance, shifting to a holistic view of educating the student for life and not just for postsecondary job purposes (Gysbers, 2010).

Even during the philosophical change of vocational to educational guidance, important events took place in the field. In the mid-1920s there were a dozen titles associated with those who worked with vocational guidance; creating more ambiguity to an already divided arena. Also, job roles, functions, and duties were emphasized as the National Vocational Guidance Association began to outline methods for elementary and secondary schools; and the outline of a comprehensive school counseling program

became more apparent (Thompson, 2012). It was also difficult for building administrators to grasp the concept of what the vocational counselor function actually was and this resulted in many of them being used as quasi-administrators and being assigned related duties (Gysbers, 2010).

As the United States entered the Great Depression, vocational guidance programs that were present in the early teens and 1920s were either reduced or ceased to operate due to the reduction of the workforce. During the 1930s, proponents of vocational guidance wanted it to be seen as a process and not an event. Depending on the size of the school, principals, deans, homeroom advisors, and visiting teachers provided vocational guidance, making the term *counselor* to be used loosely. However, colleges were offering summer courses in vocational guidance and there seemed to be almost twice as many women as men employed as vocational counselors. As training of vocational counselors was being formalized, educators debated whether the positions should be filled only by classroom teachers or whether those without classroom experience would be acceptable (Gysbers, 2010; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998; Thompson, 2012).

The 1940s through the 1970s

During the 1940s, World War II made the need for vocational testing an everyday occurrence as military personnel and veterans were provided guidance services to assist in career selection (Erford, 2011). A person-oriented humanistic style to counseling was replacing the clinical methods used in the prior centuries (Erford, 2011; Wright, 2012). The Vocational Education Act of 1946 allowed federal and state funds to be used to support guidance and counseling activities and training (Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2012). Historical data indicates the number of guidance counselors had

increased from the last decade; the majority of these professionals were employed part-time or as split-duty workers; and the debate on what to call vocational guidance, how to refer to those who provided it, and how to train and educate them continued. Also, the number of titles used by school divisions across the country still told a tale of inconsistency regarding the position and the emergence of a new term *school counselor*, became synonymous with a vocational guidance worker (Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2012).

In 1952 The American School Counselor Association (ASCA) was created and a year later in 1953 the association was established as a division of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, which later became the American Counseling Association (American Counseling Association (ACA), n.d.). Subsequently, the *School Counselor* became ASCA's professional journal (American School Counselor Association, n.d.; Erford, 2011) and became the impetus for guidance and counseling to become an interchangeable term, with the focus leaning more towards counseling (Thompson, 2012).

The need for more full-time secondary school counselors emerged as The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was created and America became involved in the *Cold War* with the Soviet Union after the launch of *Sputnik I* (Erford, 2011; Gysbers, 2010). American students needed to excel in science and mathematics. Federal monies began to be provided for statewide testing, with the hopes of identifying the best and the brightest to pursue careers in engineering and related areas. School counselors were needed to provide post-secondary planning for high school students to guide them toward careers in science (Erford, 2011; Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2012).

Many state departments of education were still unsure if vocational guidance workers should have a teaching certificate, but most subscribed to the philosophy that guidance counselors should have teaching experience before assuming that role (Thompson, 2012). In addition, the ratio of counselor to high school students of 400:1 was being implemented as well as providing adequate facilities to house guidance personnel and talking about the need for elementary school counseling (Gysbers, 2010). While guidance counselors were more inclined to see themselves separate from school administration, administrators preferred to have school counselors near them to assist in quasi-administrative duties when needed (Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2012).

The 1960s and 1970s brought role identity of school counselors to the forefront as a huge surge of counselors entered the workforce to assist with the changing social times. Erford (2011) and Gysbers (2010) stated that the Vietnam War, the Civil Rights Movement, the integration of schools, poverty, and gender equity issues plagued the American society at large. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, which reduced the federal funds for school divisions, resulted in administrators having to make difficult budgetary decisions; adding to the question of the purpose and role of school counselors. Among the choices for allocation of funds included deciding between supporting counselors' salaries, purchasing library books and materials, or acquiring instructional equipment for those schools with high poverty students, thus leaving it up to local school divisions to decide if school counselors were necessary (Erford, 2011; Gysbers, 2010; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998; Thompson 2012). The ESEA did however, acquire the Federal Impact Aid program, which provides per pupil funding

to school districts with students who reside on Indian lands, military bases, low-rent housing or other Federal properties (ESEA, n.d.).

During the political and social changes that were occurring, role identity as well as the debate concerning the purpose and need of school counselors invaded educational schools of thought. Individual and group work were now seen as important and the emphasis became developmental (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Wittmer, 2007).

According to Gysbers (2010) *developmental guidance*, is a process in which counselors assist in the emotional and educational growth of students. A developmental emphasis made school counseling programs more comprehensive in scope. Assessment, information, consultation, counseling referral, placement, follow-up and follow-through activities, and services were the interest of many in the early 1970s and in 1971. The U.S. Office of Education provided grants to allow each state to institute model school counseling programs (Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Wittmer, 2007).

According to Owens, Thomas, & Strong (2011), the Educational Act for All Handicapped Children of 1975 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 extended services that school counselors could provide to include a role in special education. School counselors would now collaborate with other stakeholders regarding students with disabilities. Providing consultation regarding appropriate placement services, working with Individual Education Plans, assisting with record-keeping management, and providing counseling services to students with disabilities became part of the school counselor's daily routine (Owens, et. al. 2011).

The 1980s through the present

The continuing change in social, economic, and political issues in the United States filtered down into education and resulted in the reform of curriculum and social programs in public schools. Drug abuse prevention, child abuse awareness, and dropout prevention became important concerns that had an impact on teaching and learning.

Affecting school counselors was the 1983 publication, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. It reported the declining achievement of students in the United States and the failure of schools to meet the needs of a future workforce. The report also stressed the need to assess the teaching and learning that occurred in schools. As a result, the commission recommended that all high school students graduate with (a) 4 years of English; (b) 3 years of mathematics; (c) 3 years of science; (d) 3 years of social studies; and (e) one-half year of computer science and 2 years of foreign language for the college-bound student. The report cautioned against grade inflation and recommended that four-year colleges raise admissions standards and standardized tests of achievement at "major transition points from one level of schooling to another and particularly from high school to college or work." In addition, the report recommended that salaries for teachers be "professionally competitive, market-sensitive, and performance-based," and that teachers demonstrate "competence in an academic discipline." The report stated that the Federal government plays an essential role in helping "meet the needs of key groups of students such as the gifted and talented, the socioeconomically disadvantaged, minority and language minority students, and the handicapped." The report also stated that the Federal government must help ensure compliance with "constitutional and civil rights," and "provide student financial assistance and research and graduate training." As

a result of this report, high-stakes testing and school district accountability became the main focus of the educational reform agenda in the United States (Gysbers, 2010; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

As the wave of accountability flowed throughout the country, accountability of school counselors came in the form of time-on-task. A representative sample of counselor time that is spent in carrying out a comprehensive guidance and counseling program and other duties were now added to the complexity of guidance and counseling programs (Gysbers, 2010). Comprehensive school counseling programs were gaining acceptance due to ASCA's position statements created in the 1970s (ASCA, n.d.) and states such as Missouri and Wisconsin began to publish new comprehensive state models (Gysbers, 2010).

As guidance and counseling continued to mature, more curricula, books, and articles were published about school counseling and comprehensive guidance models. Legislation for school counseling became a focus again with the passage of the Carl D. Perkins Act in 1990 and the School to Work Opportunities Act of 1994. These acts emphasized the importance of career guidance and post-secondary planning (Gysbers 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Herr, 2003; Thompson, 2012).

With the passing of the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Program (ESSCP) bill, funding to school districts to establish or expand elementary and secondary school counseling programs continued to be provided. This grant program gave special consideration to applicants who were able to (1) Demonstrate the greatest need for counseling services in the schools to be served; (2) Propose the most innovative and

promising approaches; and 3) Show the greatest potential for replication and dissemination (U.S. Department of Education, 2014).

Roles and Functions of District School Counseling Supervisors

While vocational guidance has been around since the 1900s, comprehensive school counseling programs are relatively new, having existed only for the past 50 years. The same issues that plagued school counseling decades ago are still being debated today: lack of centralized supervision; prior or no teacher experience; testing coordination duties; misuse by building principals; excessive counselor/student ratios; professional training of school counselors; professional identity terminology of what to call school counselors; the central office departments in which school counselors work (special education, curriculum, or instruction or pupil personnel); and overall roles, duties, and functions of school counselors (administrative, visiting teacher, or dean) (Gysbers, 2010).

In 1913 and 1915 the National Vocational Guidance Association, a professional association, and the Department of Vocational Guidance, a federal agency, were established respectively. For a period of 10 years, 1910 to 1920, training was being provided in vocational counseling and in certain school districts and central offices, departments of vocational guidance were being created (Gysbers, 2010; Thompson 2012; Wittmer, 2007).

During the 1930s the field of education began to see guidance split into two camps based on decisions made in school districts. School guidance was either centralized (one local authority) or decentralized (authority was vested in school building principals). School systems with centralized guidance employed a director who was

responsible for vocational counseling for the whole division. Decentralized guidance was site-based and varied among school buildings in a school district.

Many changes in and around vocational guidance occurred and the creation of pupil personnel services was one of them. *Pupil personnel services* was a term used to describe the “dominant organizational framework for all specialists in schools including counselors and other individuals responsible for guidance and other special services” (Gysbers, 2010, p. 55). Some districts employed full-time vocational counselors but were still unsure of their contribution and the majority of school systems were still using administrators, deans, and visiting teachers to serve in the role of vocational counselors (Gysbers, 2010; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998).

By the late 1930s the federal government stated that there was a place for vocational guidance and that each child was to receive educational, vocational, and personal guidance. Under the George Dean Act of 1936, states could be reimbursed for vocational guidance under a state guidance supervisor (Gysbers, 2010).

In 1946 the Vocational Educational Act, also known as the George-Barden Act, allowed federal funds to be used for school counseling. Two of the four purposes were particularly geared toward the areas of state and district guidance leaders: (1) The maintenance of a state program of supervision, (2) reimbursement of salaries for counselor-trainers, (3) research in the field of guidance, and (4) reimbursement of salaries of local guidance supervisors and counselors. As a result of this act, many regulated systematic policies associated with vocational guidance were created. The American School Counselor Association became a division of the American Personnel and Guidance Association in 1953 (American Counseling Association, n.d., Gysbers, 2010;

Gysbers & Henderson, 2012). Also, state leaders created their own organization in 1953, the National Association of Guidance Supervisors, later to become the Association of Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) when counselor educators and counselor trainers were added to the organization (American Counseling Association, n.d.; Gysbers, 2006).

Several decades later, the 1970s brought about a progressive movement with comprehensive guidance programs and models. States such as Arizona, California, Georgia, and Missouri quickly started to publish their own models of career development in order to regulate services (Gysbers 2010). Centralized supervision of counselors was still sporadic. Due to the lack of centralization, elementary counselors were placed under special education administrators, some districts placed the central office guidance supervisor under curriculum and instruction, and many principals were still controlling the work that school counselors did by defining their roles and responsibilities (Gysbers 2010; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998).

The American School Counselor Association (n.d.) defined the role of school counselor directors and coordinators as follows:

“School counselor directors/coordinators collaborate with professional school counselors to develop, implement and evaluate comprehensive school counseling programs. Comprehensive school counseling programs, aligned with school, district and state missions, promote academic achievement and success for all students as they prepare for the ever-changing world of the 21st century. The ASCA National Model® serves as a guide for today’s professional school counselor, who is uniquely trained to implement this program. Driven by student data and based on standards of academic, career and personal/social development, these programs lead to results measured by improvement in academics, attendance and behavior of all students.” [brochure]

The American School Counselor Association also supported the need for school counseling directors and coordinators with the following statement:

Why School Counseling Directors/Coordinators?

“The development and implementation of comprehensive school counseling programs requires a collaborative effort among well-trained, highly competent professional school counselors. School counselor directors/coordinators ensure that highly qualified school counselors are hired, professional development, consultation and supervision are provided and that school counselors are evaluated in relationship to the professional competencies as outlined by the ASCA National Model. School counselor directors/coordinators also provide leadership for the development and implementation of an effective comprehensive school counseling program. Their efforts include promoting or coordinating the design, delivery, evaluation and improvement of comprehensive school counseling programs in a systematic manner to improve the academics, attendance and behavior of all students.” [brochure]

In the 21st century, district school counseling supervisors can find themselves providing one or two managerial tasks; developmental and program supervision (overseeing the activities of the school counselor); or administrative supervision (evaluating the job performance of the school counselor). Roberts (1994) reported that out of 168 school counselors in North Carolina, 59% indicated that they would like to receive administrative supervision on a regular basis for their own professional development. In addition, 86% stated they too, would like to receive program or developmental supervision on a regular basis and believed it would aid in their professional development.

Developmental or program supervision occurs when district school counseling supervisors are responsible for the competence and commitment to the profession of school counselors. Supervisors focus on the knowledge base of the school counselor by goal setting, professional development activities, and monitoring growth and development of personnel. Program implementation and caseload management are also taken into consideration. Supervisors ensure that all aspects and facets of the model are being executed properly by school counselors to ascertain that services to students are

being offered (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998). By contrast, administrative supervision occurs when district school counseling supervisors monitor and evaluate the job performance of school counselors. In this capacity, the use of time, consultation, conferencing, collaborative relationships, outcome data of the school counseling program, and culturally responsive services provided to students by the school counselor are assessed (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Henderson, 2009; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998).

Administrative supervisors make sure school board policies are properly adhered to and that school counselors are practicing according to their ethical codes. Most school districts utilize building principals, who lack school counseling training, for administrative supervision and use teacher supervision models when working with school counselors (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Henderson, 2009; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Schmidt & Barret, 1983; Somody, Henderson, Cook, & Zambrano, 2008).

Although theoretically different, both types of supervision (developmental and administrative) have a direct impact on school counseling services. Without developmental supervision, students may not benefit from an effective comprehensive school counseling program (Henderson & Gysbers, 1998). Developmental supervision ensures that school counselors are continuously developing and honing their counseling skills in order to understand students and conceptualize their issues and strengths. Without administrative supervision, school counselors may wander away from legal and ethical decision making. Their decision making and professional judgment could become

clouded, increasing the opportunity to provide services that are not compliant with laws and policy (Henderson & Gysbers, 1998).

Comprehensive School Counseling Program Models

With the onset of the Comprehensive Developmental Guidance Program in the 1970s, school counseling shifted from an ancillary or *nice, but not needed* secondary support services to a primary educational program that focused on prevention as well as remediation in order to assist in student academic success (Beale, 2004; Gysbers, 2013; Gysbers & Henderson, 2012). Comprehensive Developmental Guidance Programs focus on all students by teaching classroom guidance lessons that are preventive in nature and can be used to promote student mastery of academic and life skills. Student competencies in the domains of Academic (strategies and activities to support and maximize each student's ability to learn), Career (acquisition of skills, attitudes and knowledge that enable students to make a successful transition from school to the world of work, and from job to job across the life span), and Personal/Social (the foundation for personal and social growth as students' progress through school and into adulthood) set the foundation for grade-specific learning outcomes (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Dahir, 2001; Gysbers & Lapan, 2001; McGannon, Carey & Dimmit 2005), thus providing clarity to role of the school counselor.

In the 21st century, three organizations, the American School Counselor Association (www.schoolcounselor.org), the Education Trust (www.edtrust.org), and the National Office for School Counselor Advocacy (nosca.collegeboard.org) advocate for the school counseling profession and shape the work that school counselors do to help the children they serve. Although varied, all are comprehensive developmental guidance

programs. All focus on meeting the academic, career, and personal/social needs of students. They equate the school counselor as a leader, consultant, and advocate who uses data, assists in closing achievement gaps, and addresses student needs through counseling and coordination. Each organization boasts its own version of a comprehensive school counseling program model: ASCA's *National Model* (2012); The Education Trust's *New Vision for School Counselors: Scope of Work* (2009a); and NOSCA's *Eight Components of College and Career Readiness* (2011). These models reinforce the basis of developmental supervision and stress that when comprehensive school counseling programs are delivered properly, students receive services and learn skills that have positive outcomes (Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Hoffman, 2012; Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Stevenson, 2012; Dimmitt & Wilkerson, 2012; Lapan, Gysbers, Stanley, & Pierce, 2012; Lapan, Whitcomb, & Aleman, 2012).

American School Counselor Association

As explained earlier, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) was established in 1953 as a new division of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, later to be known as the American Counseling Association. "ASCA promotes school counseling professionals and interest in activities that affect the personal, educational, and career development of students" (American Counseling Association, n.d.).

In 1997, Campbell and Dahir published *The National Standards for School Counseling Programs*. It was composed of nine standards, three within each of the following domains: academic, career, and personal/social development. The standards were the basis for systemic change of comprehensive and developmental guidance

programs and brought about changes to school counseling curricula. The standards reinforced and unified what students should know as a result of having a school counselor and comprehensive guidance program (Erford, 2012; McGannon, Carey, & Dimmit 2005).

After the release of *The National Standards for School Counseling Programs*, the American School Counselor Association published *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* (2011). This publication has become the cornerstone of the organization and provides four components of a school counseling program: foundation, service delivery, management, and accountability. The principal belief published in these standards is that comprehensive school counseling programs should be student data driven and should encompass the academic, career, and personal/social domains (American School Counselor Association, n.d.). Because of its comprehensive nature, *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* serves to provide direct and indirect services to all students (ASCA, 2012). Above all, *The ASCA Model* provided tangible content from which building administrators and central office personnel can adequately evaluate a school counselor's performance (Henderson & Gysbers, 1998).

National Center for Transforming School Counseling

In the early 1990s a national agenda to improve school counseling was underway. If school counseling was to keep up with the ever changing K-12 environment, a new framework for how school counselors functioned and how they were trained needed to be instituted (Martin, 2002). The Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) was developed by MetLife and other sponsors in conjunction with the Education Trust to look

at the way school counselors were being trained by universities (Steen & Rudd, 2009; The Education Trust, 2009b; Wright, 2012). By the late 1990s, 16 universities were awarded grants to help lead the charge of improving school counseling. Out of the 16, six became Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) universities. This initiative stresses a social justice framework and the importance of school counselors as leaders within the school community and advocates for student academic success (Beale, 2004; Cook, 2013; The Education Trust, 2009a). *The New Vision for School Counseling* was a result of the Transforming School Counseling Initiative. According to Erford (2011), this vision focuses on the role of the school counselor and how their impact on student success by changing the way the school counselor is viewed in the educational system and as leaders, school counselors have the ability to change policy and practice in order to attain systemic interventions that help all students (Perusse & Colbert, 2007). This is captured in the *Scope of the Work*, a document which provides five directives in each of the following areas: leadership, advocacy, team and collaboration, counseling and coordination, and assessment and use of data (The Education Trust, 2009c).

In June of 2003, The Education Trust and MetLife again partnered and established the National Center for Transforming School Counseling. The center promoted *The New Vision for School Counseling* in which school counselors advocated for educational equity, access to a rigorous college and career-readiness curriculum, and academic success for all students. One of their first goals was to ensure that school counselors could be trained and ready to help all groups of students reach high academic standards as states and districts focused more on high stakes testing. The National Center for Transforming School Counseling wanted to confirm that school counselors played an

advocacy role as it related to the historical inequity of low income students and students of color in testing preparation, thus results (The Education Trust, 2009a).

Exposure of social justice frameworks by district school counseling supervisors can help develop a better learning environment for all students. School counselors can learn to use data to recognize achievement gaps due to injustices and systems of oppression. Cultural interventions can be created to empower students and families and help them gain access to resources for which they may not have knowledge. A social justice framework can teach school counselors about their own cultural awareness and possible biases (Griffin & Steen, 2011; Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007).

National Office for School Counselor Advocacy

During the mid-2000s the College Board formed the National Office for School Counselor Advocacy (NOSCA) as a part of the Advocacy & Policy Center. NOSCA's early work consisted mainly of lobbying efforts on Capitol Hill for educational reform and the inclusion of school counselors within it, and the training of school counselors as part of their outreach initiatives, such as their Advisory Committee, the Train-the-Trainer Institutes and the Urban School Counseling Initiative (NOSCA, 2014a). As NOSCA grew in popularity, so did its goal to ensure that school counselors could assist all students in college and career readiness by developing a college going culture (Steen & Rudd, 2009). NOSCA became a leader as it related to advocating for student achievement and school-wide reform (Cook, 2013).

In 2011, NOSCA published the *Eight Components for College and Career Readiness Counseling*. This model is a K-12 comprehensive, systemic approach for school counselors to inspire all students and prepare them for college success and

opportunity; especially students from underrepresented populations. The components of the model consist of (1) College Aspirations, (2) Academic Planning for College and Career Readiness, (3) Enrichment and Extracurricular Engagement, (4) College and Career Exploration and Selection Processes, (5) College and Career Assessments, (6) College Affordability Planning, (7) College and Career Admission Processes, and (8) Transition for High School Graduation to College Enrollment.

Each counselor uses these components in addition to thinking about the context, cultural competence, multilevel intervention, and data of their school or district; thus creating a *transformative process* for all involved. What results, is the equitable outcome of college and career readiness for all students (NOSCA, 2011).

NOSCA's advocacy efforts continued with their "*Own the Turf*" Campaign, which was created to ensure that school counselors become and be known as the K-12 experts in college and career readiness. They also collaborated with the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), ASCA and College Board to create a better understanding of the principal-counselor relationship (NOSCA 2014b; NOSCA 2014c).

District school counseling supervisors can provide a college and career readiness culture by teaching all students about the whole college and career readiness process, especially the hidden costs of college and technical training that extend beyond tuition (Virginia College Access Network, personal communication). Guaranteeing that school counselors teach students the knowledge and skills they will need to make the best decisions impact the students' overall development (Gysbers, 2013).

Emerging Issues and Trends in School Counseling

As comprehensive school counseling programs grow in usage and acceptability, so do the problems and trends associated with them. Four issues have surfaced as a result: (1) implementation of comprehensive school counseling programs, (2) equity in comprehensive school counseling programs, (3) the need for policy regarding school counseling, and (4) the preparation of school counselors.

Implementation of Comprehensive School Counseling Program Models

Research regarding implementation, usage, and outcomes of comprehensive school counseling programs has been widely published. Dahir, Burnham, and Stone (2009) surveyed school counselors in Alabama to assess attitudes, beliefs, and priorities of their recent state-wide implementation of the ASCA National Model. Among elementary, middle, and high school counselors, they found significant differences across the six subscales of School Counseling Priorities, School Setting Perceptions, Personal-Social Development, Career and Post-secondary Development, and Academic Development and Program Management, confirming that even within a comprehensive school counseling model, what school counselors deem important are different across levels.

Studer, Diambra, Breckner, and Heidel (2011), also found similar results in a study of graduates from school counselor programs accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Studer et al. reported the extent to which respondents were knowledgeable of how to implement a comprehensive School Counseling Program is less clear, but when employed in a state or by an administrator where Comprehensive School Counseling Programs are mandatory,

implementation was easier. However, there were no significant differences between elementary, middle, and high in perception of their program. Delivery systems showed a significant difference between levels. Elementary level school counselors were able to incorporate guidance lessons into their programs more so than middle and high school level counselors. While accountability was slightly better than average across all levels, management was least incorporated in Comprehensive School Counseling Programs. The foundation component was found to be less than average in implementation. Elementary school counselors seemed to adhere to their mission and state competencies more so than middle and high school levels.

Recently, Pyne (2011) surveyed Michigan school counselors regarding levels of job satisfaction and implementation of the *ASCA National Model*. He found and reported that school counselors who successfully implement a comprehensive school counseling program are likely to have higher levels of job satisfaction than those who do not successfully implement a program. In addition, Pyne also reported that those school counselors with administrative support also had higher levels of job satisfaction.

Using the School Counseling Implementation Survey (SCIPS), Carey, Harrington, Martin and Stevenson (2012) surveyed Utah school counselors regarding their state comprehensive school counseling model. The study found that schools using ASCA components found the ASCA National Model had higher ACT scores, higher math and reading scores on state tests, and higher graduations rates by students. The study also revealed that Utah school counselors spend 8 percent or less on non-counseling related duties. Unpublished results on Utah evaluations found that a more favorable student-to-

school counselor ratio was significantly associated with higher attendance and lower discipline rates.

In a similar study in Nebraska, Carey, Harrington, Martin, and Hoffman (2012) reported although Nebraska has a state comprehensive school counseling model, there were differences in the practices of delivery system component. For those school counselors who created a program that was able to deliver a comprehensive set of services, it was found to be related to a decrease in suspension and discipline rates and increased rates in reading and math on state standardized tests. Also 32 percent of school counselors spend their time on activities that do not provide direct services to students. Schools that offered career and technical education within a comprehensive school counseling program found significant correlations with reading and math proficiency.

In a 2013 study by Wilkerson, Perusse, and Hughes, 75 Indiana Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) schools were compared to 226 control schools regarding state English/Language Arts and Math test scores. The research found that RAMP schools scored three to six percent higher in test scores than the control schools. The positive correlation provides evidence of the benefit of implementing a comprehensive school counseling model. The Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) is a designation given to school counseling departments that have proven that they are delivering a comprehensive, data-driven school counseling program. School counselors must apply and submit an application to ASCA. The application is then peer reviewed and scored. The school counseling programs with the qualifying score are given the title of RAMP (ASCA, n.d.).

Data from the Education Trust concerning the implementation of the *New Vision for School Counseling* is unavailable. However, Alexander, Kruczek, Zagelbaum, and Ramirez (2003) found that a quarter or less of all school counseling professional journals addressed how school counselors could assist in educational achievement; thereby, solidifying the basis of the Education Trust Initiative. Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan & Jones (2004) found that most school counselors and administrators felt that the use of data to impact school-wide change and foster educational equity for all students was not part of the school counselor's role. Thus, contradicting the center of the Education Trust Initiative. Additionally, they also found that there were differences between elementary, middle, and high school counselors regarding this belief as well. This study reveals that administrators feel that a social justice framework is not the responsibility of the school counselor, nor is it the role of the school counselor to assist in systemic change and is contradictory to what school counselor educators are teaching in their programs (Griffin & Steen, 2011; Perusse et. al. 2004).

While NOSCA data regarding implementation of the *Eight Components for College and Career Readiness* counseling is not available, their collaborative data reports the outcome of two National School Counselor Surveys with middle and high school counselors to ascertain their knowledge and preparation as it related to college and career readiness counseling. In their 2011 survey, *Counseling at a Crossroads*, NOSCA surveyed over 5,300 middle and high school counselors and found that 75 percent of school counselors rate their role as student advocates who create pathways and support to ensure all students have opportunities to achieve postsecondary goals, while 42 percent say their schools take advantage of this contribution. Seventy-five percent of school

counselors would like to spend more time on activities that promote student success, including career counseling and exploration, 64 percent would include student academic planning, 56 percent would like to build a college-going culture, and 76 percent would like to spend less time on administrative tasks. Additionally 95 percent of school counselors are in favor of additional support, time and empowerment for leadership to give students what they need for college. More positive results were found in their 2012 survey, *True North: Charting the Course to College and Career Readiness*, which surveyed 2,890 middle and high school counselors and 439 middle and high school administrators. Results indicated that 92 percent of school counselors and 93 percent of administrators shared the vision of “ensuring that all students complete the 12th grade ready to succeed in college and careers and two-thirds of school administrators support school counselors incorporating the eight components as part of their school counselor’s practice.” Yet, 49 percent of school counselors struggle with knowing how to show accountability for their interventions. However, this number is higher at 54 percent when broken down with those who work at schools where there is a higher number of students on free and reduced lunch. Therefore, district school counseling supervisors can assist in this endeavor by stressing the importance of collecting data, especially at schools that serve students from lower social economic statuses.

Equity in Comprehensive School Counseling Programs

Within the five decades that comprehensive school counseling models have existed (Gysbers, 2010), there has been inconsistency in the rate of implementation of comprehensive school counseling models. At last count, there were 17 established state school counseling comprehensive models (Martin, Carey, & DeCoster, 2009), mostly due

to the low numbers of state-level school counseling supervisors (National Consortium of State Guidance Leadership, 2012). However, without state mandates, the benefits of implementing a comprehensive school counseling program are unlikely to reach all children in the United States. In states like Virginia where there is a progressive state model (Martin, Carey, & DeCoster, 2009) implementation varies and is scattered because it is left up to local school divisions to enact it and not all districts in Virginia have a central office school counseling supervisor (Virginia School Counselor Association, personal communication,). Still, even in states where there are state models, such as Connecticut and Massachusetts, implementation is not consistent (Lapan, et. al, 2012; Poynton, Schumacher & Wilczenski, 2008).

According to Gysbers (2006) state-level supervisors of guidance and counseling once held a position of strength across the nation, today tells a different story. The National Consortium of State Guidance Leadership's membership consists of 25 state supervisors of guidance because most states have made this position a shared responsibility or have eliminated the position completely (National Consortium of State Guidance Leadership, 2012).

Dimmitt and Wilkerson (2012) explored the relationships among school counseling practices, secondary school demographics, and student outcomes over a two year period in Rhode Island. Using archived data, the study found that higher poverty schools were less likely to be implementing comprehensive school counseling services and therefore students were less likely to receive needed college and career counseling as well as counseling for personal/social concerns. In Rhode Island schools where there were higher minorities and higher numbers of students on free and reduced lunch, school

counselors reported providing less counseling services to meet personal/social needs than was occurring in their more affluent counterparts. While, Rhode Island school counselors were providing students and their families with a wide variety of comprehensive school counseling services, due to limited funding, all did not have access to key resources.

In collaboration between the Center for School Counseling Outcome Research (CSCORE), the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the Missouri School Counselor Association, Lapan, Gysbers, Stanley, and Pierce (2012) examined the relationship between student-to-school counselor ratios and key outcome markers of student success. Archived data from schools housing grades 6 through 12 were used. The results found that schools with better student-to-school counselor ratios had higher percentage of seniors graduating from high school, fewer disciplinary incidences, and better attendance. In contrast, schools with larger percentages of students on free and reduced lunch experienced the opposite and had much lower ACT Composite scores. Schools with large student bodies yielded the same results as the schools with larger percentages of students on free and reduced lunch but had higher ACT Composite scores. When looking at high poverty schools, students also did better when there were lower student-to-school-counselor ratios; especially when the recommended ASCA ratio of 250:1 was followed (Lapan, Gysbers, Stanley, & Pierce, 2012).

In a study by Lapan, Whitcomb, and Aleman (2012), data were collected from both school counselors and administrators to examine the relationship between the implementation of Connecticut's comprehensive school counseling program model at the high school level and its role at improving key outcome indicators of student success. Results found that school counselors who had smaller amounts of students in their care

also had significantly lower rates of suspensions and fewer disciplinary incidents. Also, high schools that provided higher levels of college and career counseling also had lower suspension and discipline rates, as did schools where school counselors provided greater responsive services. Administrators also reported that greater levels of college and career counseling assisted in higher graduation and attendance rates. Connecticut schools that had spent less money for each student in attendance were likely to have higher student-to-school counselor ratios. When looking at how Connecticut school counselors spent their time, roughly half of the school counselors surveyed stated that their time was spent performing non-guidance related duties. Fifty percent also indicated that they did not use data to evaluate program effectiveness and 25 percent indicated that they had no intention of implementing or had just started to implement the Connecticut model.

This lack of implementing comprehensive school counseling models across a whole state or district is what Lapan (2012) referred to as an “implementation gap. Research has shown that when highly trained school counselors deliver comprehensive school counseling program services, students receive multiple benefits such as higher graduation rates, better school connectedness and attendance rates, and lower suspension rates and bullying incidences (Borders & Drury, 1992; Carey & Dimmit, 2012; Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Hoffman, 2012; Carey, Harrington, Martin & Stevenson, 2012; Dahir, Burnham & Stone, 2009; Dimmit & Wilkerson, 2012; Gysbers, 2000, 2004; 2013; Gysbers & Lapan, 2001; Lapan, 2012; Lapan, Gysbers, Stanley, & Pierce, 2012, Lapan, Whitcomb & Aleman, 2012; Wilkerson, Pérusse, & Hughes, 2013).

To date, there is very limited information regarding comprehensive school counseling programs and students of school districts that receive Impact Aid. However,

in a 2004 study, Budden, Gill & Zimmer examined the Impact Aid Program to determine if expenditures per pupil were being affected in school districts with parcels of land owned by the Federal Government for military installations. According to the United States Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (n.d.), many school districts contain Federal Government owned parcels, which may affect the local tax roll. These districts are held to the same academic standards, while receiving less of their city's money. In order to compensate for this loss, the United States Congress created the Impact Aid Program in 1950. This program provides funding to school districts with students who reside on Indian lands, military bases, low-rent housing or other Federal properties. In addition, the Department of Defense Impact Aid Program for Military Connected School Districts (DODEA, n.d.) provides funding to school districts whose population has had 20% average daily attendance of military personnel dependent students. Budden, Gill, & Zimmer (2004) discovered that there is no evidence that Impact Aid is not providing sufficient funding to school districts. They also learned that students residing in off-base housing strain school district resources, for the district does not receive funding for that population of students; making it more challenging to meet the needs of the whole student.

The Need for Policy

While the numerous studies of evidence-based research shows the benefits of schools and school divisions implementing comprehensive school counseling programs, policies are loose and varied and remain unplicated. There also seems to be a lack of universal policies for the certification and hiring of school counselors. State school counseling mandates and legislation vary across the country. ASCA (2013) stated that out

of the 50 states, 25 have state or district mandates for K-8 and 31 for 9-12 school counselors. This absence of consistency reinforces the inequity of comprehensive school counseling programs, but also contributes to inequities in the social welfare of all children and highlights the need for social justice frameworks.

When one looks at state licensure requirements for school counselors, policies also drastically differ. While all states require graduate education in school counseling as an entry-level prerequisite for state credentialing as a professional school counselor,

“forty-four (44) states, require attainment of a master’s degree in school counseling or a related field; seven (16) states require applicants to complete a specific minimum number of credit hours of graduate study in school counseling before they can be credentialed; an additional six (6) states require this only if the master’s degree earned is in a field other than school counseling. The number of required hours ranges from 24-48 semester hours. Most states require completion of 30 credit hours or more; eleven (11) states require applicants to supplement their graduate education in school counseling with training or coursework in one or more additional subject areas. These areas include: Education of children with disabilities, multicultural issues, substance abuse counseling, state and/or Federal laws and constitutions, the use and applications of technology in education/computer competency, identification and reporting of child abuse, school violence intervention and prevention, history and culture; twenty-six (26) states require completion of a supervised, school-based internship and/or practicum. An additional four (4) states require this only if the master’s degree earned is in a field other than school counseling. The prescribed duration of the internship/practicum ranges from 100-700 clock hours; fifteen (15) states require applicants to have previous counseling or teaching experience (1-3 years). Five (5) of these states require applicants to have previous counseling or teaching experience, but permit this requirement to be satisfied by completion of a supervised, school-based internship or practicum; two (2) states require applicants to have previous school counseling or related experience only if their master’s degree was in a field other than school counseling; four (4) states require a teaching certificate/license in order to be certified/licensed as a school counselor; thirty-nine (39) states use one or more standardized examinations as part of the credentialing process; twenty-four (24) states use examinations that measure professional knowledge of the practice of school counseling (Praxis II: School Guidance & Counseling or equivalent); fourteen (14) states use examinations that measure basic proficiency in reading, mathematics, and writing (Praxis I or equivalent); four (4) states use examinations that measure professional knowledge of teaching and learning (Praxis II: Principles of Learning & Teaching or equivalent); four (4) states require examinations in additional areas: computer

competency if no coursework has been completed in this area; courses in School Law and the U.S. and State Constitutions if no coursework has been completed in these areas; and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and state and federal statutes prohibiting discrimination; and thirty-eight (38) states recognize school counseling credentials from other states” (pp. 2-3, ACA, 2012).

Certification requirements should support the school counselors’ ability to work one-on-one with students and to perform comprehensive school wide work (Bruce, Bridgeland, & College Board Advocacy & Policy, 2012).

In addition, studies have proven that prior teaching experience has no relation to the effectiveness of school counselors (Baker, 1994; Williamson, 1998). A 2008 study by Bringman and Lee revealed that although teaching experience may be beneficial, it is not needed for school counselors to feel competent. In fact, school counseling experience equates to self-perceived confidence; and according to Stein and DeBerard (2010), school counselors without teaching experience learn how to maneuver through the process of school culture just as well as those school counselors who were prior teachers.

In a 2000 study of state school board associations, Gysbers examined 32 out of 50 of the associations’ policies. When analyzed, seven reported they did not have policies for guidance or school counseling. Of the boards with policies, several had no dates on their policies to indicate creation or revisions. Most were last revised in 1997. While 24 of the policies addressed the content of guidance and counseling, 23 failed to describe a program orientation to guidance and counseling. There was no mention of needing a developmental comprehensive program for schools or students. Gysbers (2000) stated that this lack of description causes school boards to see guidance and counseling as marginalized and therefore, reducing the impact it can have on students. Conversely, in a

1983 article, Wehmeyer reported that the effectiveness of role and functions of the school counselor was so significant that a California school board expanded the position of elementary counselors to include more schools.

Eilers (2004) examined the state policies of five states where the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) has partnered with state universities. She found that states had varying language in their state statutes regarding school counseling. While some states explicitly called services “school counseling,” and indicated those services were to be provided by a “school counselor,” others had policies that entitled students to the benefits of school counseling without needing a “school counselor” to provide it. One had no reference to the specialization at all.

For the profession of school counseling, the need for policy is essential, but the need for more consistent language throughout the nation is necessary. School counselors must be included in education policy. “Policies at the school, district, state and federal levels should recognize school counselors as educators and include counselors as key players in education reform” (p. 9, Bruce, Bridgeland, & College Board Advocacy & Policy, 2012) and comprehensive school counseling programs can assist in that transformation.

Hines, Lemons and The Education Trust (2011) provided five steps for change that states, districts, and schools can take to create fairness for the profession of school counseling:

- 1) Revise the job descriptions for school counselors so they focus on squarely on equitable education and preparing all students for college and career, 2) Shift university training programs, 3) Align and tighten state credentialing requirements, 4) Provide support to existing school counselors; and 5) Align school counselor evaluations to academic outcomes. (p. 1)

Preparation of School Counselors

Training of school counselors became a priority in 1957 with the launching of Sputnik and the passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958 (Coy, 1999). The training of school counselors begins at the graduate level. Coursework, practicums, and internships round out the school counseling student's experience, regardless of the university's accrediting body. School counselors should be properly trained to implement a school counseling program while meeting the individual needs of students (ASCA, 2010; CACREP, 2009) Counselor educators can lead the charge of ensuring that school counseling students are taught content that will assist with their unique needs and distinctive roles within school districts (Kozlowski & Huss, 2013). Bridgeland, Bruce, and College Board Advocacy & Policy Center (2012) recommend that counselor education and training requirements should be updated to encompass the reality of school counseling, including mandatory coursework on college and career readiness. Their survey revealed that most school counselors felt they lacked adequate preparation when they began their careers. There also appears to be a misalignment with programs that are designed to meet state certification or university accreditation requirements and what actually happens within 21st century education.

When considering training to implement comprehensive school counseling programs, Burkhard, Gillen, Martinez, and Skytte (2012) found no significant results in counselors who participated in the training and those who did not as it related to implementation levels of the various components of comprehensive school counseling programs and found the training ineffective as it related to promoting implementation in

high schools. Researchers believe that the method of training needs to be considered as well as the content of the training.

In addition to a school district supervisor, the building administrator can provide training and resources to help school counselors bridge the gap between what was learned in their graduate program and what is needed in a school building. As stakeholders in education, administrators and school counselors can work in concert to ensure that the administrator's vision of success for their students occurs. The specialty training held by school counselors as it relates to the national standards for school counseling programs can aid in that vision (Dahir, 2000). Overall, administrators look for educators who can contribute to a student's overall learning and build school connectedness. Those are the school counselors who tend to secure employment (Kaplan & Evans, 1999).

Summary

According to Lambie and Williamson (2004) the early 1900s focused on vocational guidance, assessment, and academic placement; while personal and social counseling, as well as treating the student holistically occurred in the middle of the century. Professional organizations, such as the National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA), the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA), the National Association of Guidance Supervisors, and the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) were created and shaped the growing and transformational profession of vocational guidance to school counseling.

As the century drew to a close, special education services, collaboration, consultation, and increased accountability were added to the school counselor's role without anything being removed. Once a powerful force in the 1950s, school counseling

supervisors were being phased out in decentralized districts while the supervision of school counselors turned to developmental or administrative depending on the type of structure the school district had. Vocational guidance has morphed into modern day college and career counseling.

The early version of a developmental comprehensive guidance program has fused into three distinct school counseling models: The *ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* (2012), *The New Vision for School Counseling* by The Education Trust (2009a), and NOSCA's *Eight Components for College and Career Readiness Counseling* (2010), sponsored by the College Board's Advocacy and Policy Center. While all different, all strive to make school counselors better and students more successful. Implementation of these models has occurred across school districts throughout the country with varying degrees of application and success, adding another layer to an already complex K-12 educational system.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This research study involved the use of survey methods. The survey method involved identifying a target sample and sending a request to participate. This chapter is organized in the following order: purpose of the study, description of the research design, research questions, participant selection, instrumentation, data collection procedures, methods of data analysis, validity threats, and strengths of the design.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the degree to which supervisors of school counseling programs within school districts utilized the most well-known comprehensive school counseling program models in delivering counseling services to their students. In addition, whether any demographic professional factors or school district characteristics predicted the use of specified school counseling models was also explored. For purposes of this study, utilization of models was assessed by examining district counseling supervisors' ratings of the degree to which their school district's comprehensive school counseling program is associated with particular characteristics from three well-known comprehensive school counseling program models.

The highest score from ratings of the school counseling model characteristics was the dependent variable in this study. Five independent variables were related to school districts: size; geographical location; number of students; percentage of students on free and reduced lunch; and number of school counselors employed by the district. Six other independent variables were related to the school district supervisors' personal/professional characteristics: the education and professional credentials of the

district supervisor; age of the district supervisor; the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor; the number of years of experience in the position; and membership in professional organizations.

Research Design

A survey was used to collect information from school counseling district supervisors across the United States regarding their utilization of comprehensive school counseling program models. A survey was selected because it is a rapid and cost effective and way to collect information from numerous individuals at one time. It also provides a numeric description of the trends, attitudes and opinions of a sample of school counseling district supervisors. This data allows inferences to be drawn to the population at large.

Research Questions

The following were the research questions in this study:

1. Research Question #1: To what degree do school districts utilize components of the three most prominent comprehensive school counseling program models?
 - a. H_0 : School district school counseling supervisors will report no intentional use of any specific school counseling model as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument.
 - b. H_1 : School districts will score between a four and a six on the Likert Scale indicating use of the three most prominent school counseling models as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument.
2. Research Question #2: Is there a difference between comprehensive school counseling program model utilization, type of census defined area in which the school

- district is located, geographical location, number of students within the district, percentage of students on free and reduced lunch, and number of school counselors employed by the district based on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors?
- a. H_0 : The difference between model utilization and school district characteristics is not based on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.
 - b. H_1 : The association between model utilization and school district characteristics does vary by the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.
3. Research Question #3: To what extent do the college credentials of the school counseling district supervisor, age of the district supervisor, the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations predict selection of comprehensive school counseling programs?
- a. H_0 : There is no difference between participants regarding the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs as evidenced by the college credentials of the district supervisor, age of the district supervisor, the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor, the years of

experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.

- b. H_1 : There is a difference between the personal and professional characteristics of the school counseling district supervisors as evidenced by the selection of a particular school counseling model as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.

Participants

The population used for this study was public school district counseling supervisors located in the United States. Private, independent, parochial, and charter schools were not included in this study. It is important for the field of school counseling to receive feedback that can effectively assist district supervisors in selecting the best model for their school district based on the needs of the community and students. This is paramount due to the multiple roles school counselors serve and the unique and challenging needs of the student population.

A list of school counseling district supervisors in the United States were obtained by accessing member online databases of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), the Virginia School Counselor Association (VSCA), the National Association for College Admissions Counselors (NACAC), the Potomac and Chesapeake Association for College Admission Counselors (PCACAC), and lists obtained by state departments of education. Email addresses were obtained for each supervisor and were used to contact participants. Geographic cluster sampling (a sampling technique where the entire

population is divided into groups, or geographical clusters, and a random sample of these clusters are selected) was used for this study. All observations in the selected clusters were included in the sample and was used to obtain data from this population. Assuming a medium effect size and $p = .8$, at an alpha level of significance at .05, a minimum of 100 participants was necessary for a full survey (Cohen, 1992; Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner & Lang, 2009). Given an anticipated return rate of 10%, the minimum participants solicited would be 1,000.

Instrumentation

The survey consisted of four sections. The first section contained informed consent information and approval by the Old Dominion University Darden College of Education Human Subjects Committee (Appendix B). The second section collected information about the comprehensive school counseling program used by participants (Appendix A). The third section collected demographic information about the district supervisor and school district. The fourth and optional section provided a place for participants to provide additional feedback in essay form regarding their comprehensive school counseling program.

Information about the Comprehensive School Counseling Program

To assess the selection of school counseling model by participants, the ASCA National Model, the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling Model, and the New Vision for School Counseling Model were analyzed and the major components of each model were identified. These components were gathered from the internet, in which information was downloaded from the respective organization's websites. In an effort to establish validity of this instrument, the initial list of items was

sent to two counselor educators, one school counselor organization professional and four retired school counselor district supervisors with theoretical and practical expertise in implementing a comprehensive school counseling program.

These experts were asked to what extent the list of items were relevant to the characteristics of comprehensive school counseling programs. Specifically, experts were asked to indicate for each item whether it is a characteristic of one or more of the three comprehensive school counseling models being used in this study. Additionally, experts were asked to provide any additional items that they believed should be included in the instrument. Based on review of the feedback, no changes were made because of the unanimous approval of the instrument construction. Each reviewer identified seven items belonging to the Educational Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling model, seven items from the College Board's National Office of School Counselor Advocacy model and six items from the American School Counselor Association's ASCA National Model. After the review process, a list was made of all of the components. Similar statements were discarded from the lists and narrowed down so that only distinct statements pertinent to each model remained, leaving a total of 20 items. Two ambiguous items were discarded to achieve an instrument with 18 items or 6 items per model.

Demographic and School District Information

Participants were asked to provide information about themselves and the school district for which they were employed. Demographic information included the supervisor's gender; age in years; racial, ethnic and/or cultural identity; highest degree attained; highest counseling degree held; length of employment as a school counselor;

length of employment as a school counselor supervisor; and membership in the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and College Board. Information collected about the school district included geographical location; the type of census defined area in which the school district is located; number of students in school district; number of school counselors employed by the district, and the percentage of free and reduced lunch students.

Item Generation and Content Validation

Currently, no instrument exists that assessed the selection of school counseling program models utilized by school districts. Therefore, the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument with a Cronbach's Alpha (α) of .938, was created to investigate to what degree components of comprehensive school counseling programs were utilized by school district supervisors. Peer-reviewed literature was used to uncover the distinctive characteristics of the three most prominent models: The ASCA National Model, created by the American School Counselor Association (ASCA, 2012); the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling Model, created by the National Office for School Counselor Advocacy (NOSCA, 2010) and the New Vision for School Counseling Model, created by the Education Trust (2009a). Based on findings in the professional literature and discussions with identified research professionals, I created an initial list of items.

The instrument contained 18 items on a 6-point Likert scale asking participants to indicate to what degree the comprehensive school counseling model characteristic matched what was being used in their school district. The instrument contained one scale, delivery of services. The response options for each item ranged from 1 – 'not at all' to 6 –

'to the maximum extent' in which higher scores indicated more extensive use of comprehensive school counseling programs within a school district. Six items were created by identifying the major components of each comprehensive school counseling model developed by the American School Counselor Association, the Education Trust and the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy. The total scores from each group of school counseling model component items were summed to obtain the highest score. This determined which of the three models was being selected by the district supervisor.

Procedures

All procedures and instrumentation were reviewed and approved by the Old Dominion University Darden College of Education Human Subjects Committee. An exemption for the research was requested based on using survey procedures that protect anonymity and confidentiality of participants. Guiding principles for internet surveys were used to increase the likely response rate (Dillman, Smyth & Christian, 2009). Upon approval of the study from the dissertation committee, an email message was sent to a geographic cluster sampling of school district counseling supervisors. This email message provided a request for recipients to participate in the research project along with a hyperlink to the survey instrument hosted on Surveygizmo (www.surveygizmo.com). Surveygizmo did not reveal any information about the participants other than the information collected through the instrument. If an email was returned undeliverable, an attempt was made to contact the school district by phone and obtain an updated name and email address of the current supervisor.

When participants clicked on the website hyperlink, they were directed to the first page of the survey instrument. This page communicated more detailed information about

the study, along with an informed consent statement. Participants were informed that clicking to continue would indicate their consent to participate in the study. Following clicking to continue, participants were be led through the process of completing the instrument. The instrument provided ongoing information to participants about the percentage of content remaining. At the end of the survey a message appeared thanking participants for completing the survey and provided information on how they may contact me and obtain access to the results of the study. Reminder emails were sent out to the sample group in order to increase the return rate. As a feature of Surveygizmo, participants were only able to complete the survey once, based on the unique link sent via email to individuals in the sample.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using statistical software (SPSS Statistics 22.0 [IBM, 2013]). Data for the independent variables (personal/professional and school district characteristics) was collected from participants using a demographic questionnaire. Data analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics, MANOVA and linear regression to analyze the relationship of school district and supervisor characteristics to comprehensive school counseling model selection. Coding of data resulted in continuous (age of district supervisor), nominal (location of school district, sex of school counselor district supervisor), ordinal (level of education, items on the Likert scale) and dichotomous (member of professional organizations) variables.

To address research question #1: To what degree do school districts utilize components of the three most prominent comprehensive school counseling program models? The following null and alternative hypotheses were created.

H₀: School district school counseling supervisors will report no intentional use of any specific school counseling model as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument.

H₁: School districts will score between a four and a six on the Likert Scale indicating use of the three most prominent school counseling models as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument.

School district supervisors were asked to rate the degree of implementation when utilizing a comprehensive school counseling program model using a 6-point Likert scale, for 6 point Likert scales tend to give higher reliability than a 5 point Likert scale (Chomeya, 2010). Descriptive statistics were used to report the highest score rating of comprehensive school counseling program model characteristics for each item. Standard deviation was also reported.

To address research question #2; Is there a difference between comprehensive school counseling program model utilization, type of census defined area in which the school district is located, geographical location, number of students within the district, percentage of students on free and reduced lunch, and number of school counselors employed by the district based on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors? The following null and alternative hypotheses were created.

H₀: The difference between model utilization and school district characteristics is not based on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.

H₁: The association between model utilization and school district characteristics does vary by the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.

Due to the multiple dependent variables and any number of predictors, a MANOVA was used to ascertain if there was a significant relationship between the scores on the instrument and geographical location, the type of census defined area in which the school district is located, number of students in the school district, number of school counselors employed by the district and the percentage of free and reduced lunch students as it relates to the school district program selection. This multivariate test explored how independent variables influence some patterning of response on the dependent variable (Carey, 1998).

To address research question #3: To what extent do the college credentials of the district supervisor, age of the district supervisor, the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations predict selection of comprehensive school counseling programs? The following null and alternative hypotheses were created.

H₀: There is no difference between participants regarding the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs as evidenced by the college credentials of the district supervisor, age of the district supervisor, the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.

H₁: There is a difference between the personal and professional characteristics of the school counseling district supervisors as evidenced by the selection of a particular school counseling model as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.

Multiple regression analyses were conducted to predict the score on identified factors of college credentials of the district supervisor, age of the district supervisor, the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations. The models generated were used to examine the relationship between predictor variables and the scores on identified factors obtained from evaluating school counseling district supervisors. The analyses reported on the percentage of variability in the ratings based on these predictors, and on which percentages were statistically significant.

Validity Threats

Internal validity occurs when a researcher controls all unnecessary variables and the only variable influencing the results of a study is the one being manipulated by the researcher. This means that the variable the researcher intended to study is indeed the one affecting the results and not some other, unwanted variables (Christ, 2007). External validity asks the question of generalizability; to what populations or settings can this effect be generalized (Campbell & Stanley, 1963).

Internal threats to this study included self-report bias, selection and instrumentation. Self-report bias was a threat to the study, for participants may have responded in a socially desirable way. For example, those school districts not using a comprehensive school counseling program model may feel pressure to align with one.

While cluster sampling was used, a selection bias existed due to the completion of the survey being voluntary. Thus, characteristics may have existed that are different between those who choose to complete the survey instrument and those who did not. An instrumentation validity threat exists due to researcher bias. The instrument was created specifically for this study. The circumstances of the creation of the instrument may have influenced items that were included or excluded despite a review of the literature and consultation with experts. External validity threats for this study were the Hawthorne Effect, or participants responding differently because they were being surveyed; history, in which participants are asked to revise or review their comprehensive school counseling program; demand characteristics, in which the participants were provided with cues to the anticipated results of the study; and population and environmental characteristics, such as the participants were all from the same area or geographical location (Christ, 2007).

Strengths of the Proposed Study

A strength of the proposed study was the potential diversity of the sample. The sample was obtained from a comprehensive list of school counseling organizations in the United States that included school districts from diverse areas and various states in the country. Additionally, the validity of the survey instrument was increased through the use of an expert panel to review the initial tool.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this research study was to explore school counseling program models utilized by school districts. This chapter provides the results of this survey-based study. This chapter is organized in the following order: preliminary data screening and provision of variables, demographic information, descriptive data for the outcome variables, results of MANOVA and multiple regression statistical analyses and analysis of results as they relate to the research questions and a summary of the results from the open-ended comments.

Preliminary Data Screening and Provision of Variables

Prior to analysis related to the research questions, data screening was performed for all variables to investigate missing or invalid data utilizing SPSS frequencies, Explore, and Plot procedures. Two variables were transformed from continuous to categorical. *Percentage of free and reduced lunch students in your district* was computed as three categories: (1) Highest Poverty = >75%, (2) High Poverty = 50 – 74%, and (3) Low to No Poverty = <50%. Examination of a box plot of percentage of free and reduced lunch students in your district revealed no outliers. The question regarding the highest counseling degree held by school counseling district level supervisors was computed so that for those who answered with multiple responses, only the common response was recorded. For instance, responses that stated administration and supervision and special education or administration and supervision and English were computed solely as administration and supervision.

Demographic Information

Survey instruments were sent to 567 school counseling district and state supervisors across the United States. Of the 567 supervisors, 48 were state supervisors who were asked to forward to the school counseling district supervisors in their states. Sixty-eight emails were returned undeliverable. Of these, 117 participants completed the instrument ($N = 117$), representing a completion rate of 21%.

Upon completion of the data screening, the 117 participants whose data were valid identified with the following demographic characteristics: 83% were female, 17% were male, 77% were White, 19% were African American, 1% were Native American, 0% were Asian, and 3% were Other. Pertaining to age of the participants, their age ranged from 29 to 69 years, $M = 49.45$, $SD = 9.360$. Regarding the education level of the participants overall, the majority, 60%, reported having a master's degree, 17% an educational specialist degree, 22% a Ph.D., and 1.7% did not answer. Of those who held a master's degree, 71% reported having a master's degree in counseling, 2% of the participants reported possessing a doctoral degree in counseling and 7% reported having an educational specialist degree in counseling. Additionally, 20% responded that their master's degree was not in counseling. Of those who responded, 13% held a master's in administration and supervision, 3% held a master's degree in psychology or social work, 2% held a degree in another discipline, and 82% did not answer.

Regarding years of experience as a school counselor, the length of time in the profession ranged from 0 to 37 years, $M = 11.37$, $SD = 8.760$. Twenty percent of supervisors did not possess credentials to be a school counselor. Of those who did

possess the credentials, 83% had been a district supervisor 10 or less years, while 15% had been a district supervisor over 11 years, and 3% did not answer.

Pertaining to information about the participants' geographical location of their school district, 56% of the respondents worked in school districts in the South (*Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia*), 6% worked in the Midwest (*Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin*), 21% worked in the Northeast (*Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont*), and 17% worked in the West (*Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Wyoming*).

The percentage of coordinators working in school districts in the suburbs was 41%, while those who worked in cities was 24%, those in towns was 14%, and those in rural areas was 20%. The number of students in school districts ranged from 160 to 345,000 students, $M = 34,307$, $SD = 63,759$, with 11% having more than 100,000 students and 88% having less than 100,000 students in their districts. One percent did not report. Regarding the number of school counselors by level, 12% had more than 100 elementary school counselors in their school districts, 77% had zero to 99, and 11% did not answer. Regarding middle school counselors, 7% of participants reported having more than 100, 83% had zero to 99 in their school districts, and 10% did not answer. When reviewing the data for high school counselors, 13% reported having more than 100, 83% had zero to 99, and 4% did not answer the question.

In addition, participants were asked to indicate who selects the comprehensive school counseling model in their districts, 67% reported the district supervisor, 18% reported the school counselor, 8% reported the building administrator, 2% reported the school board, and 5% did not know. When asked which model is currently being used in their school district a majority of 74% indicated the ASCA National Model, 2% the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling model, 18% stated no particular model, and 3% did not know which model was being implemented.

In regards to how many students received free and reduced lunch, 52% reported districts that are low poverty or have less than 50% of students on free and reduced lunch. Thirty percent of the districts reported having 49% - 74% of students receiving free and reduced lunch, while 8% reported highest poverty with 75% or more of their students receiving free and reduced lunch.

Finally participants were asked if they were a member of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and the College Board. A total of 76% indicated that they individually were a member of ASCA and 80% indicated their districts were members of the College Board.

Descriptive Data

Outcome data consisted of the participants' responses regarding school counseling program models utilized by school districts on a Likert scale from 1 to 6 (1 = Not at all, to 6 = To the maximum extent). Table 1 displays means and standard deviations of each item, based on the response option, beginning from lowest mean to highest. All of the 18 items had the maximum range of 5, meaning that for every item there was a respondent who scored the item 1 (Not at all) and another respondent who

scored the same item 6 (To the maximum extent). Item number 18 – “provided by a state credentialed school counselor” – was ranked the highest ($M = 5.79$) and had the lowest standard deviation ($SD = .829$). Item number 13 – “arrange one-on-one school mentoring to provide students additional support for academic success” – was ranked the lowest ($M = 3.67$) and had the largest standard deviation ($SD = 1.390$)

Table 1

Delivery of Services

Response Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
13. Arrange one-on-one school mentoring to provide students additional support for academic success.	3.67	1.390
9. Lead school counselors to examine their own behavior and accept responsibility to help eliminate the achievement gap.	4.05	1.231
5. Focus on student outcomes, teach student competencies, and is delivered with identified professional competencies.	4.15	1.234
1. Do the same thing for all students because it ensures equity.	4.15	1.362
15. Identify the knowledge and skills all students will acquire as a result of the K-12 comprehensive school counseling program.	4.20	1.268
2. Have a framework that is comprehensive in scope, preventative in design and developmental in nature.	4.28	1.395
11. Ensure equitable exposure to a wide range of extracurricular and enrichment opportunities that build leadership, nurture talents and interests, and increase engagement with the school.	4.34	1.115
8. Deliver services to all students in a systematic fashion.	4.35	1.206
14. Ensure that components are applied in ways that are culturally sensitive, with knowledge of how programs, policies, and practices impact the perspectives and experiences of diverse	4.36	1.110

Table 1 Continued

Response Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
student groups.		
3. Build a college going culture on early college awareness by nurturing in students the confidence to aspire to college and the resilience to overcome challenges along the way.	4.45	1.087
10. Play a leadership role in defining and carrying out guidance and counseling functions.	4.42	1.226
17. Provide early and ongoing exposure to experiences and information necessary to make informed decisions when selecting a college or career that connects to academic preparation and future aspirations.	4.47	1.030
7. Promote, plan, and implement prevention programs and activities in career and college readiness course selection and placement activities social and personal management and decision-making.	4.47	1.103
12. Ensure that students and families have an early and ongoing understanding of the college and career application and admission processes so they can find the postsecondary options that are the best fit with their aspirations and interests.	4.47	1.222
4. Base services on standards in academic, career, and personal/social development.	4.67	1.091
6. Provide students and families with comprehensive information about college costs, options for paying for college, and the financial aid and scholarship processes and eligibility requirements so they are able to plan for and afford a college education.	4.68	1.065
16. Hold brief counseling sessions with individual students, groups and families.	4.86	1.025
18. Provided by a state-credentialed school counselor.	5.79	0.839

Research Question #1

Research Question #1 asked, “To what degree do school districts utilize components of the three most prominent comprehensive school counseling program models?”

The null hypothesis for research question #1 stated “School district school counseling supervisors will report no intentional use of any specific school counseling model as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument.”

The alternate hypothesis for research question #1 stated “School districts will score between a four and a six on the Likert Scale indicating use of the three most prominent school counseling models as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument.”

To answer the first question, participants provided an overall rating of various statements related to services provided in comprehensive school counseling models. Specifically, participants were to rate each statement to the extent they believed their school counseling program utilized each component. In total, 18 items had the maximum range of 5, meaning that for every item there was a respondent who scored the item 1 (Not at all) and another respondent who scored the same item 6 (To the maximum extent). Results indicated that out of N=117, more than 75% selected between a four and a six on the Likert Scale indicating use of the three most prominent school counseling models.

Items 2, 4, 5, 8, 15 and 18 reflected statements from the American School Counselor Association’s (ASCA) National Model. More than 75% of school district

supervisors selected between a four and a six on the Likert Scale. Participants' responses to the ASCA National model variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

ASCA Variables

Items	Response Option	Frequency	Percentage
2. Have a framework that is comprehensive in scope, preventative in design and developmental in nature.	1 – 3	29	24.8
	4	28	23.9
	5	37	31.6
	6	23	19.7
4. Base services on standards in academic, career, and personal/ social development.	1 – 3	15	12.9
	4	28	23.9
	5	48	41.0
	6	26	22.2
5. Identify the knowledge and skills all students will acquire as a result of the K-12 comprehensive school counseling program.	1 – 3	29	24.8
	4	35	29.9
	5	36	30.8
	6	17	14.5
8. Focus on student outcomes, teach student competencies, and is delivered with identified professional competencies	1 – 3	28	23.9
	4	40	34.2
	5	35	29.9
	6	14	12.0
15. Provided by a state-credentialed school counselor.	1 – 3	3	2.6
	4	1	0.9
	5	8	6.8
	6	105	89.7
18. Deliver services to all students in a systematic fashion.	1 – 3	28	23.9
	4	31	26.5
	5	37	31.6
	6	21	18.0

Items 1, 7, 9 10, 13 and 16 reflected statements from the Educational Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model. More than 68% of school district counseling supervisors selected between a four and a six on the Likert Scale. Participants' responses to the National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model variables are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

NCTSC Variables

Items	Response Option	Frequency	Percentage
1. Do the same thing for all students because it ensures equity.	1 – 3	37	31.7
	4	31	26.5
	5	25	21.3
	6	24	20.5
7. Lead school counselors to examine their own behavior and accept responsibility to help eliminate the achievement gap.	1 – 3	21	26.5
	4	41	35.0
	5	34	29.1
	6	11	9.4
9. Promote, plan, and implement prevention programs and activities in career and college readiness course selection and placement activities social and personal management and decision-making.	1 – 3	19	16.2
	4	32	27.4
	5	49	41.9
	6	17	14.5
10. Arrange one-on-one school mentoring to provide students additional support for academic success.	1 – 3	48	41.0
	4	34	29.1
	5	25	21.4
	6	10	8.5
13. Play a leadership role in defining and carrying out guidance and counseling functions.	1 – 3	25	21.4
	4	24	20.5
	5	49	41.9
	6	19	16.2

Table 3 Continued

Items	Response Option	Frequency	Percentage
16. Hold brief counseling sessions with individual students, Groups and families.	1 – 3	10	8.6
	4	27	23.0
	5	45	38.5
	6	35	29.9

Items 3, 6, 11, 12, 14 and 17 reflected statements from the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy's Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model. More than 80% of school district counseling supervisors selected between a four and a six on the Likert Scale. Participants' responses to the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model variables are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

NOSCA Variables

Items	Response Options	Frequency	Percentage
3. Build a college going culture based on early college awareness by nurturing in students the confidence to aspire to college and the resilience to overcome challenges along the way.	1 – 3	23	19.7
	4	30	25.6
	5	46	39.3
	6	18	15.4
6. ensure equitable exposure to a wide range of extracurricular and enrichment opportunities that build leadership, nurture talents and interests, and	1 – 3	21	17.9
	4	38	32.5
	5	44	37.6
	6	14	12.0

Table 4 Continued

Items	Response Options	Frequency	Percentage
increase engagement with the school.			
11. provide early and ongoing exposure to experiences and information necessary to make informed decisions when selecting a college or career that connects to academic preparation and future aspirations.	1 – 3	20	17.0
	4	36	30.8
	5	43	36.8
	6	18	15.4
12. provide students and families with comprehensive information about college costs, options for paying for college, and the financial aid and scholarship processes and eligibility requirements so they are able to plan for and afford a college education.	1 – 3	14	12.0
	4	33	28.2
	5	42	35.9
	6	28	23.9
14. Ensure that students and families have an early and ongoing understanding of the college career application and admission processes so they can find the postsecondary options that are the best fit with their aspirations and interests.	1 – 3	22	18.7
	4	29	24.8
	5	43	36.8
	6	23	19.7
17. Ensure that components are applied in ways that are culturally sensitive, with knowledge of how programs, policies, and practices impact the perspectives and experiences of diverse student groups.	1 – 3	23	19.7
	4	38	32.5
	5	39	33.4
	6	17	14.5

Regarding the three models, school district counseling supervisors selected between a four and a six on the Likert Scale relating to delivery of services. Thus, rejecting the null hypothesis for research question #1: "School district school counseling supervisors will report no intentional use of any specific school counseling model as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument". Implications will be discussed in the next chapter.

Correlations were computed among 18 statements from three comprehensive school counseling models. In general, the results suggest that school counseling district supervisors believe characteristics from each of the three comprehensive school counseling models are important. There was a small positive correlation between *provided by a state-credentialed school counselor (StCred)* and *build a college going culture based on early awareness by nurturing in students the confidence to aspire to college and the resilience to overcome challenges along the way (ColCult)* $r(115) = .23$, $p < .05$, indicating that comprehensive school counseling models should be provided by a state-credentialed school counselor slightly believe that it is important for school counselors to promote, plan, and implement college and career readiness prevention programs. There was also a small positive correlation between *provided by a state-credentialed school counselor (StCred)* and *provide students and families with comprehensive information about college costs, options for paying for college, and the financial aid and processes and eligibility requirements so they are able to plan for and afford a college education (ColAff)* $r(115) = .19$, $p < .05$, indicating that comprehensive school counseling models should be provided by a state-credentialed school counselor slightly believe that it is important for school counselors to educate students and families

about planning a college education. Another small positive correlation occurred between *provided by a state-credentialed school counselor (StCred)* and *provide early and ongoing exposure to experiences and information necessary to make informed college decisions when selecting a college or career that connects to academic preparation and future aspirations (FutAsp)* $r(115) = .23, p < .05$, indicating that comprehensive school counseling models should be provided by a state-credentialed school counselor slightly believe that it is important for school counselors to connect academic preparation and future aspirations. The last small positive correlation occurred between *arrange one-on-one school mentoring to provide students additional support for academic success (MentOne)* and *hold brief counseling sessions with individual students, groups and families (CounSes)* $r(115) = .20, p < .05$, indicating that one-on-one mentoring to provide support for academic success should occur with brief counseling sessions with individual students, groups and families.

Table 5

Correlations of Comprehensive School Counseling Model Variables

	2	4	5	8	15	18	1	3	12	7	9	13	6	14	10	17	16	11
2	-	.75	.68	.72	.27	.52	.38	.49	.36	.54	.62	.46	.47	.48	.25	.35	.43	.48
4		-	.75	.79	.11	.64	.38	.57	.50	.58	.66	.52	.57	.61	.33	.44	.36	.58
5			-	.77	.09	.64	.37	.52	.33	.61	.62	.48	.58	.53	.47	.54	.32	.56
8				-	.12	.63	.42	.59	.41	.62	.73	.50	.57	.60	.40	.47	.36	.59
15					-	.02	.16	.23*	.19*	.06	.04	.12	.11	.14	-.01	.55	.33	.23**
18						-	.54	.55	.47	.58	.69	.53	.62	.61	.40	.50	.47	.64
1							-	.53	.34	.37	.41	.36	.35	.34	.11	.32	.35	.35
3								-	.55	.44	.52	.41	.56	.63	.23	.37	.43	.67
12									-	.29	.57	.33	.42	.67	.28	.30	.40	.59
7										-	.57	.49	.57	.48	.31	.49	.28	.29
9											-	.58	.59	.66	.42	.45	.38	.66
13												-	.65	.55	.32	.52	.38	.49

Table 5 Continued

	2	4	5	8	15	18	1	3	12	7	9	13	6	14	10	17	16	11	
6																			
6																			
14																			
10																			
17																			
16																			
11																			

Note: SSDCPS = Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs Scale; ASCA; 2 = Have a framework that is comprehensive in scope, preventative in design and developmental in nature; 4 = Base services on standards in academic, career, and personal/social development; 5 = Identify the knowledge and skills all students will acquire as a result of the K-12 comprehensive school counseling program; 8 = Focus on student outcomes, teach student competencies, and is delivered with identified professional competencies; 15 = Provided by a state-credentialed school counselor ; 18 = Deliver services to all students in a systemic fashion; NCTSC; 1 = Do the same thing for all students because it ensures equity; 7 = Lead school counselors to examine their own behavior and accept responsibility to help eliminate the achievement gap; 9 = Promote, plan and implement prevention programs and activities in career and college readiness course selection and placement activities and personal management and decision-making; 10 = Arrange one-on-one school mentoring to provide students additional support for academic success; 13 = Play a leadership role in defining and carrying out guidance and counseling functions; 16 = Hold brief counseling sessions with individual students, groups and families; NOSCA; 3 = Build a college going culture based on early awareness by nurturing in students the confidence to aspire to college and the resilience to overcome challenges along the way; 6 = Ensure equitable exposure to a wide range of extracurricular and enrichment opportunities that build leadership, nurture talents and interests, and increase engagement with the school; 11 = Provide early and ongoing exposure to experiences and information necessary to make informed college decisions when selecting a college or career that connects to academic preparation and future aspirations; 12 = Provide students and families with comprehensive information about college costs, options for paying for college, and the financial aid and processes and eligibility requirements so they are able to plan for and afford a college education; 14 = Ensure that students and families have an early and ongoing understanding of the college career application and admission processes so they can find the postsecondary options that are best fit with their aspirations and interests; 17 = Ensure that components are applied in ways that are culturally sensitive, with knowledge of how programs, policies, and practices impact the perspectives and experiences of diverse students groups.

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Research Question #2

Research Question #2 asked, “Is there a difference between comprehensive school counseling program model utilization, type of census defined area in which the school district is located, geographical location, number of students within the district, percentage of students on free and reduced lunch, and number of school counselors employed by the district based on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors?”

The null hypothesis for research question #2 stated, “The difference between model utilization and school district characteristics is not based on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.”

The alternate hypothesis for research question #2 stated, “The association between model utilization and school district characteristics does vary by the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.”

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance was run to determine the effects of school counseling district supervisors’ selection on model implementation. Four measures were assessed: number of students in a school district, geographical location of the school district, military impact aid, and percentage of free and reduced lunch students in the district on model implementation. There were four univariate or multivariate outliers assessed as a value greater than 3 box-lengths from the edge of the box. Model

Implementation scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for model implementation for all group combinations of the ASCA National Model, The Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling and the New Vision for School Counselors, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances, $p = .002$. With a sample size was 117; the alpha level was adjusted to .025 in order to achieve a more stringent interpretation of post-hoc results. Thus, a MANOVA was run to test any statistically significant mean differences among the school counseling models and the combination of the dependent variables: number of students in a school district, geographical location of the school district, military impact aid, and percentage of free and reduced lunch students in the district on model implementation (Field, 2009).

There was a statistically significant main interaction among The ASCA National Model, The Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling, and the New Vision for School Counselors and model reported being used by school districts $F(12, 198) = 3.484, p < .002$; Wilks' $\Lambda = .603$. There was a statistically significant two-way interaction among The ASCA National Model, The Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling, and the New Vision for School Counselors model reported being used by school districts and those school districts receiving military impact aid $F(3, 75) = 3.275, p < .025$; Wilks' $\Lambda = .884$. There was a statistically significant three-way interaction among The ASCA National Model, The Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling, and the New Vision for School Counselors model reported being used by school districts, geographical location, and percentage of free and reduced lunch students in the district, $F(6, 150) = 3.071, p < .025$; Wilks' $\Lambda =$

.793. This is an effect of the independent variables (model being used, military impact aid, geographical location, and percentage of free and reduced lunch students in the district) on the multivariate dependent variable (self-reported adherence to The ASCA National Model, The Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling and the New Vision for School Counselors) as presented in Table 6. Statistical significance was accepted at the $p < .025$ level for two-way interactions and main effects. Data are mean \pm standard deviation unless otherwise stated. All simple pairwise comparisons were run for model implementation with a Simple Contrast adjustment applied. However, model implementation usage did not show statistically significant association for the ASCA National Model, The Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling, or the New Vision for School Counselors, nor for geographical location of the school district or if the school district receives military impact aid. Regarding percentage of free and reduced lunch students in the district, a mean difference of -3.216 (95% CI, -6.066 to -0.366) mmol/L, was statistically significant, $p = .028$. In addition, planned simple comparisons were attempted without covariates, so that a Scheffe could be conducted. The post-hoc test revealed no significance. Another MANOVA as post-hoc also resulted in no significance. Finally, three post-hoc ANOVAs on each of the three comprehensive school counseling models were run. Results revealed there was a significance for those district supervisors who indicated that their district's model utilized components from the ASCA National Model and received military impact aid $F(1, 79) = 7.834, p < .025$, and also district supervisors working in the South and the West with percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch $F(2, 79) = 6.132, p < .025$. Therefore, there was model adherence from those district supervisor whose districts

received military impact aid and those whose school districts had students receiving free and reduced lunch in the South and West. However, those who said they used the ASCA National Model did not necessarily adhere to using components. Results of district supervisors who indicated that their district's model utilized components from The Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling revealed there was a significance with the model being implemented $F(4, 79) = 4.719, p < .025$, districts using the model and receiving military impact aid $F(1, 79) = 8.718, p < .025$, district supervisors working in the South and the West with percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch $F(5, 79) = 3.057, p < .025$, and district supervisors working in the South and the West with percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch whose district receives military impact aid $F(2, 79) = 6.986, p < .025$. Therefore, there was model adherence from those district supervisor who stated they use the model, whose districts received military impact aid and from district supervisors whose school districts had students receiving free and reduced lunch in the South and West. Also, for those district supervisors who indicated that they use "no particular model," they used components from the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling more than any other model. District supervisors who indicated that their district's model utilized components from the New Vision for School Counselors results revealed there was a significance with the model being implemented $F(4, 79) = 5.753, p < .025$, those using the model and receiving military impact aid $F(1, 79) = 4.986, p < .025$, and district supervisors working in the South and the West with percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch whose district receives military impact aid $F(2, 79) = 5.477, p < .025$. Therefore, there was model adherence from those district supervisors who stated they use

the model, whose districts received military impact aid and from those whose school districts had students receiving free and reduced lunch in the South and West. Thus, rejecting the null hypothesis, “the association between model utilization and school district characteristics is not based on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at a = .025 level of significance”.

Table 6

Results of MANOVA

Multivariate	Wilks' λ	df	F-Value	Sig.
2 x 2 x 2 x 2 students	.996	3	.103	.958
Model being implemented	.603	12	3.484	.000**
Geographical location	.903	9	.866	.557
Military impact aid	.899	6	1.366	.232
Percentage of free and reduced lunch	.905	9	.849	.572
Model x Geographical location	.907	6	1.247	.286
Model x Military impact aid	.884	3	3.275	.026*
Model x Percentage of free and reduced lunch	.889	9	1.005	.438
Geographical location x Military impact aid	.978	3	.562	.642
Geographical location x percentage FARL	.756	15	1.474	.117
Military impact aid x Percentage FARL	.924	6	1.014	.418
Model x Geographical location x MIA	.988	3	.311	.818
Model x Geo. loc. x Percentage FARL	.793	6	3.071	.007**
Model x MIA x Percentage FARL	1.00	0	-	-
Geo loc. x MIA x Percentage FARL	1.00	0	-	-
Model x Geo loc. x MIA x FARL	1.00	0	-	-

Note: *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Research Question #3

Research Question #3 asked, “To what extent do the college credentials of the school counseling district supervisor, age of the district supervisor, the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations differ among participants regarding the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs?”

The null hypothesis for research question #3 stated, “There is no difference between participants regarding the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs as evidenced by the college credentials of the district supervisor, age of the district supervisor, the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.”

The alternate hypothesis for research question #3 stated, “There is a difference between the personal and professional characteristics of the school counseling district supervisors as evidenced by the selection of a particular school counseling model as evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.”

Prior to conducting saturated multiple regression analyses, data screening was conducted to check for outliers and to assess for normality and homogeneity of variance. A Box Plot revealed four cases of individuals with outlier scores in the variables: non counseling degree, length of time as a school counselor, length of time as a school counseling supervisor and if the school district is a member of the College Board.

Reviewing these cases showed that they represented more than 5% of the data, therefore they were not removed because it was not believed the outliers would affect the result.

Scores regarding *age* and *school district is a member of the College Board* both had a normal distribution. Possessing a *master's degree* and *school district a member of ASCA* were both negatively skewed, while possessing a *non-counseling degree*, *number of years as a school counselor*, *number of years as a school counseling supervisor* and *who selects the school counseling model in your district* were found to be positively skewed. All were assessed by visual inspection of their histograms.

Scatterplots were generated to verify linearity and homoscedasticity between each factor and the assumption of normality was satisfied for all group combinations as assessed by visual inspection of Normal Q-Q Plots.

A multiple regression analysis was run to predict selection of comprehensive school counseling programs from college credentials of the school counseling district supervisor, age of the district supervisor, the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations. The data showed that the main interaction was not significant. Also, the three step regression did not show a significant interaction. Results cannot be analyzed at the district level. Therefore personal traits of the school counseling district supervisors had no influence on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs. Thus, failing to reject the null hypothesis, the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs is not predicted by the college credentials of the district supervisor, age of the district supervisor, the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations as

evidenced by the Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP) instrument at $\alpha = .025$ level of significance.”

Section III: Comments

Section III of the survey instrument asked participants to share any additional comments they had regarding characteristics of the most well-known comprehensive school counseling program models in delivering services to their students. Of the 117 completed responses, 26 participants provided comments in Section III. Two participants stated that their district was utilizing their state model, five participant specified that their district was using the ASCA National Model, and two participants identified using the NOSCA Model. Three participants stated that they are in the process of implementing a school counseling comprehensive model, while two indicated that no model is being used.

In regards to survey ambiguity, one participant stated that he or she did not know what grade level was being referred to by *early*. Another participant indicated that the questions were focused around the secondary level and were difficult to apply to elementary levels. One participant indicated that it is very challenging to implement a curriculum at the secondary level.

Summary of Results

This study explored school counseling program models utilized by school districts. More specifically, this study examined to what degree school districts utilize components of the three most prominent comprehensive school counseling program models. Additionally ten demographic variables were examined to discern if they predicted school district use of the three most prominent comprehensive school

counseling program models. The first section of the survey included 18 combined items from the American School Counselor Association's (ASCA) National Model, the Educational Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling (NCTSC) Model and the College Board's National Office of School Counselor Advocacy's Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model. The responses were rated on a 6-point Likert scale, (1 = Not at all, to 6 = To the maximum extent). In relation to rating the components a four to six, more than 75% of district supervisors rated the ASCA National Model components as such; more than 68% rated the National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model components a four to six; and more than 80% rated the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model framework the same.

For the second section, participants were asked to provide school district and personal characteristic information. On the final section of the instrument, participants were asked to provide any additional comments they had regarding characteristics of the most well-known comprehensive school counseling program models in delivering services to their students.

Results showed that district supervisors overwhelmingly implement The ASCA National Model as their districts comprehensive school counseling model, however they indicated that they use components from the American School Counselor Association's (ASCA) National Model, the Educational Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling (NCTSC) Model and the College Board's National Office of School Counselor Advocacy's Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model. Conversely, while district supervisors state they implement specific models, those that implement the ASCA National Model adhere to the components of that model the least,

with those stating “no particular model” utilizing components from the College Board’s National Office of School Counselor Advocacy’s Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model. Furthermore, only when the independent variables relating to the school district (size of the school district, geographical location, number of students within the district, percentage of students on free and reduced lunch, the number of school counselors employed by the district), were saturated and analyzed together did they predict a difference among school counseling program models utilized by school districts. Regrettably, personal traits of school counseling district supervisors had no influence on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs. The analysis and post-hoc test results were not significant and cannot be analyzed at the district level.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

This chapter presents a discussion of the results of this study and is organized in the following order: summary of findings, implications for school counseling district supervisors, implications for school counseling practice, implications for counselor educators, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree to which supervisors of school counseling programs within school districts utilized the most well-known comprehensive school counseling program models in delivering counseling services to their students. In addition, this study sought to determine whether any demographic professional factors or school district characteristics predicted the use of specified school counseling models. For purposes of this study, utilization of models was assessed by examining district counseling supervisors' ratings of the degree to which their school district's comprehensive school counseling program was associated with particular characteristics from three well-known comprehensive school counseling program models. The highest score from ratings of the school counseling model characteristics was the dependent variable in this study. Five independent variables were related to school districts: size; geographical location; number of students; percentage of students on free and reduced lunch; and number of school counselors employed by the district. Six other independent variables were related to the school district supervisors' personal/professional characteristics: the education and professional credentials of the district supervisor; age of the district supervisor; the number of years the supervisor has

worked as a school counselor; the number of years of experience in the position; and membership in professional organizations.

Because no instrument existed that assessed the selection of school counseling program models utilized by school districts, an instrument was created to investigate to what degree the various components of comprehensive school counseling programs were utilized by school district supervisors. Peer-reviewed literature was used to uncover the distinctive characteristics of the three most prominent models: The ASCA National Model, created by the American School Counselor Association (ASCA, 2012); the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling Model, created by the National Office for School Counselor Advocacy (NOSCA, 2010); and the New Vision for School Counseling Model, created by the Education Trust (2009a). Based on findings in the professional literature and discussions with research professionals, I created an initial list of items for the survey instrument by analyzing the major components of each model. These components were gathered from the internet, in which information was downloaded from the respective organization's websites.

In an effort to establish validity of this instrument, the initial list of items was sent to two counselor educators, one school counselor organization professional, and four retired school counselor district supervisors with theoretical and practical expertise in implementing a comprehensive school counseling program. These experts were asked to what extent the list of items were relevant to the characteristics of the three comprehensive school counseling models. Specifically, experts were asked to indicate for each item whether it was a characteristic of one or more of the three comprehensive school counseling models being used in this study. Additionally, experts were asked to

provide any additional items that they believed should be included in the instrument.

Based on review of the feedback, no changes were made because of the unanimous approval of the instrument construction. Each reviewer identified seven items belonging to the Educational Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling model, seven items from the College Board's National Office of School Counselor Advocacy model, and six items from the American School Counselor Association's (ASCA's) National Model.

A list was then made of all of the components. Similar statements were discarded from the lists and narrowed down so that only distinct statements pertinent to each model remained, leaving a total of 20 items. Two ambiguous items were discarded to achieve an instrument with 18 items or 6 items per model.

A list of school counseling district supervisors in the United States was obtained by accessing member online databases of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), the Virginia School Counselor Association (VSCA), the National Association for College Admissions Counselors (NACAC), the Potomac and Chesapeake Association for College Admission Counselors (PCACAC), and lists obtained by state departments of education. Email addresses were obtained for each supervisor and were used to contact participants. Private, independent, parochial, and charter schools were not included in this study. Geographic cluster sampling (a sampling technique where the entire population is divided into groups, or geographical clusters, and a random sample of these clusters are selected) was used for this study.

The 18 item instrument on a 6-point Likert scale asked participants to indicate to what degree the comprehensive school counseling model characteristics matched what

was being used in their school district. The instrument contained one scale, delivery of services. The response options for each item ranged from 1 – ‘not at all’ to 6 – ‘to the maximum extent’ in which higher scores indicated more extensive use of comprehensive school counseling programs within a school district. Six items were created by identifying the major components of each comprehensive school counseling model developed by the American School Counselor Association, the Education Trust, and the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy. The total scores from each group of school counseling model component items were summed to obtain the highest score. Selection was assessed by examining school counseling district supervisors’ ratings to the degree in which they believed was the most important characteristic of a comprehensive school counseling program model based on the particular characteristics of the three major models. Of the 567 district supervisors receiving the survey, 117 completed the instrument for a completion rate of 23%.

A diversity of participants and geographical locations were represented in the study. Participants on average had approximately 11 years of experience as a school counselor. Eighty percent indicated that they had credentials to be school counselor. Eighty-three percent indicated having worked 10 years or less as school counseling district supervisor. Seventy-seven percent indicated being White and 83% indicated being female.

School counseling district supervisors from all four geographical locations (South, Midwest, Northeast, and West) were represented in the study, with 41% working in the suburbs, a quarter in cities, and over 30% working in towns and rural communities. Approximately 88% of the participants were from school districts with 100,000 or less

students enrolled. The majority of participants (approximately 77% – 83%) reported having less than 100 school counselors in their school district at each level.

Sixty-seven percent of the respondents were school counseling district supervisors and 18% were school counselors in the district. The ASCA National Model is the model reported as being used in school districts by 74% of the respondents, while 2% reported that the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling Model was being used. A little over 20% of the respondents indicated that no particular model was being used at all. Seventy-six percent of the respondents reported they were a member of ASCA and 80% reported their school district was a member of the College Board. Fifty-two percent of the respondents reported that their district had low poverty (the percentage of free and reduced lunch students in school districts were less than 50%). Seventeen percent reported that their school district received military impact aid.

All of the 18 items in the survey instrument used in this study had the maximum range of 5, meaning that for every item there was a respondent who scored the item 1 (Not at all) and another respondent who scored the same item 6 (To the maximum extent). Item number 18 – “provided by a state credentialed school counselor” – was ranked the highest ($M = 5.79$) and had the lowest standard deviation ($SD = .829$) and thus was seen as the most important characteristic of a comprehensive school counseling program model and the most agreed upon at the descriptive level. Item number 13 – “arrange one-on-one school mentoring to provide students additional support for academic success” – was ranked the lowest ($M = 3.67$) and had the largest standard deviation ($SD = 1.390$) and thus resulted in the most disagreement among respondents.

Research Question 1

Over 75% of the respondents selected between a four and six on statements on the instrument that constituted components of the American School Counselor Association's (ASCA) National Model. Additionally, more than 68% selected between a four and six on statements that reflected the Educational Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model. Over 80% of district supervisors selected between a four and six on statements that reflected the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy's Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model. This result suggests that the important components of all three of the major school counseling models have been accepted and have been implemented in school districts throughout the United States. Although most district supervisors stated they are using The ASCA National Model, the majority selected components from the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model.

Open-ended responses allowed respondents to provide statements regarding the implementation of a school counseling model in their school districts. Some respondents said that statements in the instrument did not apply to school counseling programs at elementary levels, while others indicated that statements were not applicable to school counseling programs at secondary levels. Other responses noted that their school district was using the ASCA or NOSCA Model, that their state had its own model, that their school district was in the process of developing a comprehensive school counseling model, or that their school district focused on college and career readiness. Responses also indicated that some respondents had difficulty ensuring comprehensive school counseling model implementation because school counselors are evaluated by building

principals. Some responses in the open-ended section of the instrument revealed that some supervisors had experience as school counselors prior to being placed in the supervisor position, that some districts did not employ a school counseling supervisor, and that some supervisors wore many hats by advising many areas within the school division (school counselors, special education, nurses, etc.).

As addressed in Chapter 2, there is a gap in the professional literature related to state or school district level supervisors and the comprehensive school counseling program models they are utilizing (Beale, 2004; Borders & Drury, 1992; Gysbers, 2004; Henderson, 1999). Open-ended responses on the instrument used in this study indicate that school districts across the country either employ a district supervisor (centralized) or they do not employ a district supervisor (decentralized) regarding their practices of school counseling (Gysbers, 2010).

The results of this study reveal that most school counseling district supervisors are aware of comprehensive school counseling models and are implementing them. These results support previous research that indicates there has been inconsistency in the rate of the implementation of comprehensive school counseling models (Gysbers, 2010).

Research Question 2

This study also looked for school district factors that may have predicted the selection of comprehensive school counseling program models by school counseling district supervisors. No overall statistically significant factors were found as a result of the comprehensive school counseling program model utilization, type of census defined area in which the school district is located, geographical location, number of students

within the district, percentage of students on free and reduced lunch, or number of school counselors employed by the district.

There was also model adherence from those district supervisors who stated they use The ASCA National Model, the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness or the New Vision for School Counselors. These districts also received military impact aid and had students receiving free and reduced lunch in the South and West. Also, for those district supervisors who indicated that they use “no particular model”, they used components from the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling more than any other model; and those who said they used the ASCA National Model did not necessarily adhere to using its components.

Research Question 3

Additionally, this study investigated whether the personal characteristics of school counseling district supervisors influenced the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs. No overall statistically significant characteristics were found when the comprehensive school counseling program model selected was compared to the supervisors' age, the number of years worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations. Results cannot be analyzed at the district level. Therefore personal traits of the school counseling district supervisors had no influence on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs.

Implications for School Counseling District Supervisors

Findings from this study indicate that school counseling district supervisors are implementing components of comprehensive school counseling models. While many

supervisors indicated they had not selected a particular model, almost all are implementing most components from all of the three most popular comprehensive school counseling models. The school district counseling supervisors seem to overwhelmingly know key components that counseling programs should include that will help children succeed in school and life and are including program components from the personal/social, college and career, or academic areas.

However, school counseling district supervisors may need to pay attention to model selection as it relates to those who work in districts that have a high free and reduced lunch ratio and receive military impact aid, to see if the components actually benefit the children receiving those services. When it comes to districts with higher percentages of free and reduced lunch, components such as the following can benefit students: *do the same thing for all students because it ensures equity; lead school counselors to examine their own behavior and accept responsibility to help eliminate the achievement gap; promote, plan, and implement prevention programs and activities in career and college readiness course selection and placement activities social and personal management and decision-making; Arrange one-on-one school mentoring to provide students additional support for academic success; play a leadership role in defining and carrying out guidance and counseling functions; and hold brief counseling sessions with individual students, groups and families.* While school districts may receive additional revenue for their percentage of military personnel dependent students (DODEA, n.d.), these districts are held to the same academic standards, while receiving less of their city's money for district resources (Budden, Gill & Zimmer, 2004). For this

reason school districts receiving military impact aid can benefit from a comprehensive school counseling model.

Implications for School Counseling Practice

Based on the findings, school counseling district supervisors are overall prepared to select comprehensive school counseling models for implementation. Yet, neither school district characteristics nor the personal characteristics of district supervisors predict or influence model selection negatively or positively within the field of school counseling. However, this study does reveal that although three quarters of school district supervisors surveyed stated they use the ASCA National Model, yet rated components of the Educational Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model and the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy's Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model, just as high or higher in some instances. So, while school counseling district supervisors may not indicate they are using all three of the models, they are using components of all three models. Also district supervisors reported that 80% of their school districts were members of the College Board, but a mere 2% indicated that they use the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model, which comes under the umbrella of the College Board. Similarly, no district supervisors indicated usage of the National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model, but again, rated the components of that model just as high as or higher than those of the ASCA National Model.

This indicates that many see the components as overlapping; and that these are services that should be prevalent in any comprehensive school counseling model, for school district supervisors selected the components without knowing from which models

they were derived. Therefore, perhaps school counselors should be integrating or blending these models to provide the best services to students. Not solely using one model over another.

Implications for Counselor Educators

The results of this study support counselor education programs that are adequately preparing counseling students for working in K-12 public schools, while also revealing areas for improvement. Specifically, counseling graduate programs should be teaching counseling students so they learn about all comprehensive school counseling programs and models. Focus could be put upon key components of the models opposed to the overall model itself.

Finally, counselor educators can play an important role as advocates for future school counselors as coursework, practicums, and internships round out the school counseling student's experience, regardless of the university's accrediting body. Methods of training for school counselor students need to be considered as well as the content of the training (Burkhard, Gillen, Martinez, & Skytte, 2012). School counselor students should be properly trained to implement a school counseling program while being able to meet the individual needs of students (ASCA, 2010; CACREP, 2009), regardless of the program.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations exist in this study that should be considered in the interpretation of results. These limitations relate to the instrument and the sample used.

Instrumentation limitations

As an exploratory study the instrument utilized in the study was created specifically for this study. While steps were taken to review the validity of the instrument, its novelty increases the possibility that items selected were not the best representatives of the comprehensive school counseling model components because only six were selected from over a dozen components within each model. Additionally, although the instrument did weigh the importance of items by school counseling district supervisors, their ratings of possible less important components may distort conclusions on overall selection. Similarly, some components may be more or less important to school counseling district supervisors based on their school district and/or personal characteristics, which may affect components of models already implemented.

Additionally, this study makes an inference on the implementation of comprehensive school counseling models based on the degree to which supervisors reported that components of the three models were being implemented. As many participants noted in comments, the model implementation may be related substantially to institutionalized district factors that do not reflect what is best for students in that school district, such as mandating prerequisite courses, grade point averages or summative test scores for certain rigorous or higher level courses, instituting summer assignments or not allowing students to drop courses that may become challenging or difficult. This variance due to district factors may limit the ability to extract from the data broader implications about which comprehensive school counseling models are being implemented in school districts.

Feedback from participants also raised some additional potential limitations. One participant's comment indicated that the supervisor who completed the form was "not trained as a school counselor, but performs academic counseling." It appears that a bachelor's level teacher who does academic advising completed the survey even though the study asked that only counselors or counselor supervisors submit completed forms.

Sampling limitations

Related to sampling limitations, a relatively low percentage of the population surveyed completed the instrument, which may affect generalizability. Specifically, the low completion rate increases the risk of self-selection bias. It is possible that differences may have existed between the district supervisors that completed the instrument and those who did not. On the other hand, a return rate of 21% could be considered high, or at least appropriate for a population of professionals who have so many responsibilities and are so busy.

A few emails were received from district supervisors who indicated that they were not completing the study because they were not trained as a school counselor. While these directors were emailed back and notified that this was not a pre-requisite for completing the study, it is possible that a number of district supervisors may have failed to complete the study based on the perception that they needed to be school counselors themselves. The surveys were also sent out during the last week in May to the first week in June. A majority of school districts in the West and Mid-West completed their school year before Memorial Day. Therefore, they did not have the option to participate in the survey. At the same time, since the study did not account for school districts with lead counselors, results may be skewed by perceptions that do not accurately reflect those of district

supervisors. Also the sample for the survey was also limited to directors of public school districts in the United States.

Suggestions for Future Research

As a follow up to this study, future research could explore other perspectives of school counseling district supervisors. One suggested study would be to conduct a qualitative study in which school counseling district supervisors would be interviewed regarding their perceptions of comprehensive school counseling model implementation. These findings from such a study could then be compared and contrasted with the results of this study for a more thorough representation of comprehensive school counseling models being selected within school districts.

Additionally, it is important to further explore the importance of various roles of the district supervisors and the needs of the school counselors they supervise. The relationships between school district supervisions and the counselors in their districts need to be evaluated in future studies. Better understanding the relevant importance district supervisors place on various roles they perform and school counselor needs they address in school districts will help provide better services to students. While there are a number of studies that have researched the implementation of comprehensive school counseling models, there is a lack of studies focusing on how school counseling district supervisors select comprehensive school counseling models to implement.

It could be helpful to learn more about what district supervisors value when hiring school counselors. For example, what do directors think about university school counseling preparation programs that teach specific comprehensive school counseling

models? These data could be important in helping universities improve the relevancy of their preparation programs.

An additional important area for future research would be related to studying school counselors and professional development. The majority of school district supervisors indicated that the ASCA National Model was being utilized in their school district. Therefore, is all of their professional development related to the ASCA National Model? Arranging training that provides exposure to other school counseling models may allow district supervisors the opportunity to determine which models are best for the students in their school districts.

Summary

School counseling program models utilized by school districts were studied in this survey research project which examined district supervisors' ratings of the degree to which their school district's comprehensive school counseling program is associated with particular characteristics of the three major models: The American School Counselor Association's (ASCA) National Model, the Educational Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model, and the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy's Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model. Results indicated that school counseling district supervisors are implementing components from all school counseling models in their comprehensive school counseling programs; and they believe that all model have important components. The study was unable to account for school district characteristics that may have predicted model selection by school counseling district supervisors or account for how the differences in personal characteristics of the school counseling district supervisors influenced model selection.

The results may help school counseling district supervisors or those interested in securing employment as a school counseling district supervisor and help counselor educators identify areas to improve teaching counseling students so they learn about all comprehensive school counseling programs and models and not just one model. Future research is recommended to further explore the relative importance of roles fulfilled by school counseling district supervisors and the needs of the school counselors they supervise, and to further evaluate professional development experiences of school counselors and their school counseling district supervisors.

CHAPTER SIX**MANUSCRIPT****SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM MODELS****UTILIZED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

Tracy L. Jackson
Virginia Beach City Public Schools
Virginia Beach, Virginia

Theodore P. Remley, Jr.
Our Lady of Holy Cross College
New Orleans, Louisiana

Jeffrey Moe
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia

Tara Hill
Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio

This project was completed when Ms. Jackson and Dr. Remley were affiliated with Old Dominion University.

to be submitted to the
Professional School Counseling Journal

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore district supervisors' selection of comprehensive school counseling program models. Model selection was assessed by examining district supervisors' ratings of the degree to which their school district's comprehensive school counseling program was associated with traits of the most popular models, and if school district and personal characteristics influenced the selection process. The characteristics listed in the instrument was based on existing literature and frameworks regarding comprehensive school counseling models. Results revealed that components from the three most popular frameworks, The ASCA National Model, the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling, and the New Vision for School Counselors were reported as being implemented in school districts; with district supervisors reported implementing the ASCA National Model most often.

INTRODUCTION

School counseling has become synonymous with a service that is provided to students in schools by master's level degreed personnel. This service is predicated in comprehensive school counseling models. Today's models are as varied and diverse as the students they serve and the school districts in which they find themselves.

What has emerged is a cadre of organizations that are leading the way by having created comprehensive school counseling models and they have found their niche of students to assist with the models they have developed. Comprehensive school counseling models support student achievement. They are developmental, preventive, and wide-ranging. These models assist school counselors in using data and supporting their school's mission (The Education Trust, 2009; National Office for School Counselor Advocacy, 2011; American School Counselor Association, 2012). Currently, there are three organizations which provide the primary comprehensive K-12 school counseling models for school counselors: the American School Counselor Association (www.schoolcounselor.org); The Education Trust (www.edtrust.org); and the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy (nosca.collegeboard.org).

The American School Counselor Association's ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs (www.schoolcounselor.org) is the most popular and perhaps the most widely used modern comprehensive school counseling model (ASCA, 2012). The American School Counselor Association's focus is on "how are students different as a result of what school counselors do?", and using their model can assist in answering that question (ASCA, 2008). The Education Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling, created their model, The New Vision for

School Counselors (www.edtrust.org). It is The Education Trust's belief that school counselors should advocate for educational equity, access to a rigorous college and career-readiness curriculum, and academic success for all students. The mission of the Education Trust is to transform school counselors into powerful agents of change in schools to close the gaps in opportunity and achievement for low-income students and students of color (The Education Trust, 2009a). The newest model, the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling has been created by the College Board's National Office of School Counselor Advocacy (nosca.collegeboard.org). NOSCA (2014a) believes in a comprehensive, systemic approach for school counselors. The College Board desires that school counselors inspire all students and prepare them for college success and opportunities, especially students from underrepresented populations.

The purpose of this study was to explore district supervisors' selection of comprehensive school counseling program models. Selection was assessed by examining district supervisors' ratings of the degree to which their school district's comprehensive school counseling program is associated with particular characteristics of the three major models. The characteristics assessed were based on existing literature and frameworks regarding comprehensive school counseling models.

Reporting Usage of Comprehensive School Counseling Models

Empirical studies verify the importance of comprehensive school counseling models as they relate to student success (Cary & Dimmitt, 2012; Dimmit, Harrington, Martin, & Hoffman, 2012; Dimmit, Harrington, Martin, & Stevenson, 2012; Dimmit & Wilkerson, 2012; Lapan, Gysbers, Stanley, & Pierce, 2012). Yet, there is a gap in the

professional literature related to state or school district level supervisors and the comprehensive school counseling program models they are utilizing (Beale, 2004; Borders & Drury, 1992; Gysbers, 2004; Henderson, 1999). Many studies in the literature were completed over a decade or more ago, thus leaving a large hole in the current literature (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Sink & MacDonald, 1998; Wilson & Remley, 1987). Current literature seems to explore comprehensive school counseling model selection by school counselors in buildings, comprehensive school counseling model implementation, and comprehensive school counseling model evaluation (Beale, 2004; Borders & Drury, 1992, Burkard, Gillen, Martinez, & Skytte, 2012; Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Hoffman, 2012; Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Stevenson, 2012; Dimmitt & Wilkerson, 2012; Lapan, 2012; Lapan, Whitcomb, & Alaman, 2012; Mason, 2006; O'Dell, 1996; Olson & Perrone, 1991; Trevisan, 2001; Payne, 2011; Sink & MacDonald, 1998; Steen & Rudd, 2009; Trevisan, 2001; Wingfield, Reese, & West-Olatunji, 2010).

It is important for the field of school counseling to receive feedback that can effectively assist district supervisors in selecting the best model for their school district based on the needs of the community and students. This is paramount due to the multiple roles school counselors serve and the unique and challenging needs of the student population.

Roles and Functions of District School Counseling Supervisors

Beginning in the early nineteenth hundreds training was being provided to individuals in vocational counseling and in certain school districts and central offices, departments of vocational guidance were being created (Gysbers, 2010; Thompson 2012; Wittmer, 2007). However it was in the 1930s that guidance began to split into two camps

based on decisions made in school districts. School guidance was either centralized (one local authority) or decentralized (authority was vested in school building principals). School systems with centralized guidance employed a director who was responsible for vocational counseling for the whole division. Decentralized guidance was site-based and varied among school buildings in a school district. Some districts employed full-time vocational counselors but were still unsure of their contribution and the majority of school systems were still using administrators, deans, and visiting teachers to serve in the role of vocational counselors (Gysbers, 2010; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998). Under the George Dean Act of 1936, states could be reimbursed for vocational guidance under a state guidance supervisor (Gysbers, 2010), who created their own organization in 1953, the National Association of Guidance Supervisors, later to become the Association of Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) when counselor educators and counselor trainers were added to the organization (American Counseling Association, n.d.; Gysbers, 2006).

The American School Counselor Association (2014) defined the role of school counselor directors and coordinators as follows:

“School counselor directors/coordinators collaborate with professional school counselors to develop, implement and evaluate comprehensive school counseling programs. Comprehensive school counseling programs, aligned with school, district and state missions, promote academic achievement and success for all students as they prepare for the ever-changing world of the 21st century. The ASCA National Model® serves as a guide for today’s professional school counselor, who is uniquely trained to implement this program. Driven by student data and based on standards of academic, career and personal/social development, these programs lead to results measured by improvement in academics, attendance and behavior of all students.” [brochure]

Currently, district school counseling supervisors can find themselves providing one or two managerial tasks; developmental and program supervision (overseeing the activities of the school counselor); or administrative supervision (evaluating the job performance of the school counselor). Roberts (1994) reported that out of 168 school counselors in North Carolina, 59% indicated that they would like to receive administrative supervision on a regular basis for their own professional development. In addition, 86% stated they too, would like to receive program or developmental supervision on a regular basis and believed it would aid in their professional development.

Developmental or program supervision occurs when district school counseling supervisors are responsible for the competence and commitment to the profession of school counselors. Supervisors focus on the knowledge base of the school counselor by goal setting, professional development activities, and monitoring growth and development of personnel. Program implementation and caseload management are also taken into consideration. Supervisors ensure that all aspects and facets of the model are being executed properly by school counselors to ascertain that services to students are being offered (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998). By contrast, administrative supervision occurs when district school counseling supervisors monitor and evaluate the job performance of school counselors. In this capacity, the use of time, consultation, conferencing, collaborative relationships, outcome data of the school counseling program, and culturally responsive services provided to students by the school counselor are assessed (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Henderson, 2009; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998).

Administrative supervisors make sure school board policies are properly adhered to and that school counselors are practicing according to their ethical codes. Most school districts utilize building principals, who lack school counseling training, for administrative supervision and use teacher supervision models when working with school counselors (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Henderson, 2009; Henderson & Gysbers, 1998; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Schmidt & Barret, 1983; Somody, Henderson, Cook, & Zambrano, 2008).

Although theoretically different, both types of supervision (developmental and administrative) have a direct impact on school counseling services. Without developmental supervision, students may not benefit from an effective comprehensive school counseling program (Henderson & Gysbers, 1998). Developmental supervision ensures that school counselors are continuously developing and honing their counseling skills in order to understand students and conceptualize their issues and strengths. Without administrative supervision, school counselors may wander away from legal and ethical decision making. Their decision making and professional judgment could become clouded, increasing the opportunity to provide services that are not compliant with laws and policy (Henderson & Gysbers, 1998).

Comprehensive School Counseling Program Models

With the onset of the Comprehensive Developmental Guidance Program in the 1970s, school counseling shifted from an ancillary or *nice, but not needed* secondary support services to a primary educational program that focused on prevention as well as remediation in order to assist in student academic success (Beale, 2004; Gysbers, 2013; Gysbers & Henderson, 2012). Comprehensive Developmental Guidance Programs focus

on all students by teaching classroom guidance lessons that are preventive in nature and can be used to promote student mastery of academic and life skills. Student competencies in the domains of Academic (strategies and activities to support and maximize each student's ability to learn), Career (acquisition of skills, attitudes and knowledge that enable students to make a successful transition from school to the world of work, and from job to job across the life span), and Personal/Social (the foundation for personal and social growth as students' progress through school and into adulthood) set the foundation for grade-specific learning outcomes (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Dahir, 2001; Gysbers & Lapan, 2001; McGannon, Carey, Dimmit 2005), thus providing clarity to role of the school counselor.

In the 21st century, three organizations, the American School Counselor Association (www.schoolcounselor.org), the Education Trust (www.edtrust.org), and the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy (nosca.collegeboard.org) advocate for the school counseling profession and shape the work that school counselors do to help the children they serve. Although varied, all are comprehensive developmental guidance programs. All focus on meeting the academic, career, and personal/social needs of students. They equate the school counselor as a leader, consultant, and advocate who uses data, assists in closing achievement gaps, and addresses student needs through counseling and coordination. Each organization boasts its own version of a comprehensive school counseling program model: ASCA's *National Model* (2012); The Education Trust's *New Vision for School Counselors: Scope of Work* (2009a); and NOSCA's *Eight Components of College and Career Readiness* (2010). These models reinforce the basis of developmental supervision and stress that when comprehensive school counseling

programs are delivered properly, students receive services and learn skills that have positive outcomes (Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Hoffman, 2012; Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Stevenson, 2012; Dimmitt & Wilkerson, 2012; Lapan, Gysbers, Stanley, & Pierce, 2012; Lapan, Whitcomb, & Aleman, 2012).

American School Counselor Association

As explained earlier, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) was established in 1953 as a new division of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, later to be known as the American Counseling Association. “ASCA promotes school counseling professionals and interest in activities that affect the personal, educational, and career development of students” (American Counseling Association, n.d.).

In 1997, Campbell and Dahir published *The National Standards for School Counseling Programs*. It was composed of nine standards, three within each of the following domains: academic, career, and personal/social development. The standards were the basis for systemic change of comprehensive and developmental guidance programs and brought about changes to school counseling curricula. The standards reinforced and unified what students should know as a result of having a school counselor and comprehensive guidance program (Erford, 2012; McGannon, Carey, & Dimmitt 2005).

After the release of *The National Standards for School Counseling Programs*, the American School Counselor Association published *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* (2012). This publication has become the cornerstone of the organization and provides four components of a school counseling

program: foundation, service delivery, management, and accountability. The principal belief published in these standards is that comprehensive school counseling programs should be student data driven and should encompass the academic, career, and personal/social domains (American School Counselor Association, 2010). Because of its comprehensive nature, *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* serves to provide direct and indirect services to all students (ASCA, 2008). Above all, *The ASCA Model* provided tangible content from which building administrators and central office personnel can adequately evaluate a school counselor's performance (Henderson & Gysbers, 1998).

National Center for Transforming School Counseling

In the early 1990s a national agenda to improve school counseling was underway. If school counseling was to keep up with the ever changing K-12 environment, a new framework for how school counselors functioned and how they were trained needed to be instituted (Martin, 2002). The Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) was developed by MetLife and other sponsors in conjunction with the Education Trust to look at the way school counselors were being trained by universities (Steen & Rudd, 2009; The Education Trust, 2009b; Wright, 2012). By the late 1990s, 16 universities were awarded grants to help lead the charge of improving school counseling. Out of the 16, six became Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) universities. This initiative stresses a social justice framework and the importance of school counselors as leaders within the school community and advocates for student academic success (Beale, 2004; Cook, 2013; The Education Trust, 2009b). *The New Vision for School Counseling* was a result of the Transforming School Counseling Initiative. According to Erford (2011), this

vision focuses on the role of the school counselor and how their impact on student success by changing the way the school counselor is viewed in the educational system and as leaders, school counselors have the ability to change policy and practice in order to attain systemic interventions that help all students (Perusse & Colbert, 2007). This is captured in the *Scope of the Work*, a document which provides five directives in each of the following areas: leadership, advocacy, team and collaboration, counseling and coordination, and assessment and use of data (The Education Trust, 2009c).

In June of 2003, The Education Trust and MetLife again partnered and established the National Center for Transforming School Counseling. The center promoted *The New Vision for School Counseling* in which school counselors advocated for educational equity, access to a rigorous college and career-readiness curriculum, and academic success for all students. One of their first goals was to ensure that school counselors could be trained and ready to help all groups of students reach high academic standards as states and districts focused more on high stakes testing. The National Center for Transforming School Counseling wanted to confirm that school counselors played an advocacy role as it related to the historical inequity of low income students and students of color in testing preparation, thus results (The Education Trust, 2009a).

Exposure of social justice frameworks by district school counseling supervisors can help develop a better learning environment for all students. School counselors can learn to use data to recognize achievement gaps due to injustices and systems of oppression. Cultural interventions can be created to empower students and families and help them gain access to resources for which they may not have knowledge. A social

justice framework can teach school counselors about their own cultural awareness and possible biases (Griffin & Steen, 2011; Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007).

National Office for School Counselor Advocacy

During the mid-2000s the College Board formed the National Office for School Counselor Advocacy (NOSCA) as a part of the Advocacy & Policy Center. NOSCA's early work consisted mainly of lobbying efforts on Capitol Hill for educational reform and the inclusion of school counselors within it, and the training of school counselors as part of their outreach initiatives, such as their Advisory Committee, the Train-the-Trainer Institutes and the Urban School Counseling Initiative (NOSCA, 2014a). As NOSCA grew in popularity, so did its goal to ensure that school counselors could assist all students in college and career readiness by developing a college going culture (Steen & Rudd, 2009). NOSCA became a leader as it related to advocating for student achievement and school-wide reform (Cook, 2013).

In 2010, NOSCA published the *Eight Components for College and Career Readiness Counseling*. This model is a K-12 comprehensive, systemic approach for school counselors to inspire all students and prepare them for college success and opportunity; especially students from underrepresented populations. The components of the model consist of (1) College Aspirations, (2) Academic Planning for College and Career Readiness, (3) Enrichment and Extracurricular Engagement, (4) College and Career Exploration and Selection Processes, (5) College and Career Assessments, (6) College Affordability Planning, (7) College and Career Admission Processes, and (8) Transition for High School Graduation to College Enrollment.

Each counselor uses these components in addition to thinking about the context, cultural competence, multilevel intervention, and data of their school or district; thus creating a *transformative process* for all involved. What results, is the equitable outcome of college and career readiness for all students (NOSCA, 2014a).

NOSCA's advocacy efforts continued with their "*Own the Turf*" Campaign, which was created to ensure that school counselors become and be known as the K-12 experts in college and career readiness. They also collaborated with the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), ASCA and College Board to create a better understanding of the principal-counselor relationship.

District school counseling supervisors can provide a college and career readiness culture by teaching all students about the whole college and career readiness process, especially the hidden costs of college and technical training that extend beyond tuition (Virginia College Access Network, personal communication). Guaranteeing that school counselors teach students the knowledge and skills they will need to make the best decisions impact the students' overall development (Gysbers, 2013).

METHOD

This study explored the degree to which district supervisors' selection of the most well-known comprehensive school counseling program models was utilized in delivering counseling services to their students. In addition, the study investigated whether any demographic professional factors or school district characteristics predicted the use of specified school counseling models.

Procedure

Data were collected during the 2013-2014 school academic school year. A list of school counseling district supervisors in the United States were obtained by accessing member online databases of national and state school counseling associations, as well as lists obtained by state departments of education. Email addresses were obtained for each supervisor and were used to contact participants.

Geographic cluster sampling (a sampling technique where the entire population is divided into groups, or geographical clusters, and a random sample of these clusters are selected) was used for this study. All observations in the selected clusters were included in the sample and was used to obtain data from this population. Survey instruments were sent to 567 school counseling district and state coordinators across the United States. Of the 567 coordinators, 48 were state coordinators who were asked to forward to the school counseling district coordinators in their states. Sixty-eight emails were returned undeliverable reducing the list of participants to 499. Of these, 117 participants completed the instrument ($n = 117$), representing a completion rate of 23%.

Participants

A sample of 117 public school counseling district supervisors from across the United States participated in this study. The district supervisor sample was mainly composed of master's degree (60%) White (77%) women (83%) with a median age of 49.45. Seventy-one percent reported having a master's degree in counseling. The median years of experience as a school counselor or the length of time in the profession was 11.37. Twenty percent of supervisors did not possess credentials to be a school counselor. More than 83% had been a district supervisor 10 or less years. Participants were asked to

indicate who selects the comprehensive school counseling model in their districts; 67% reported the district supervisor, 18% reported the school counselor, 8% reported the building administrator, 2% reported the school board, and 5% did not know. When asked which model is currently being used in their school district a majority of 74% indicated the ASCA National Model, 2% the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling model, 18% stated no particular model, and 3% did not know which model was being implemented. More than 50% reported they worked in a school district that has low poverty or have less than 50% of students on free and reduced lunch and 17% of school districts reported receiving military impact aid. A total of 76% indicated that they individually were a member of ASCA and 80% indicated their districts were members of the College Board.

Instrument

Survey of School District Counseling Supervisors and Programs (SSDCP).

The SSDCP is an 18-item scale created for this study that collected information from school counseling district supervisors across the United States regarding their utilization of comprehensive school counseling program models. Responses are coded on a Likert scale from 1 to 6 (*1 = Not at all, to 6 = To the maximum extent*). The mean score for the scale was 60.85 (SD = 14.728) with an alpha of .938.

Data Analysis

All analyses were performed using SPSS version 22.0. Means and standard deviations were examined to understand model differences. A MANOVA was used to determine the effects of school counseling district supervisors' selection on model implementation. A Scheffe post-hoc analysis for planned simple comparisons was

attempted without covariates, as well as, an ANOVA post-hoc analysis to find further significance of the three comprehensive models. Lastly, a multiple regression analysis was run to predict selection of comprehensive school counseling programs against the personal characteristics of school counseling district supervisors.

RESULTS

Regarding the three models, school district counseling supervisors selected between a four and a six on the Likert Scale relating to delivery of services as it related what components school districts utilize. In relation to rating the components a 4, 5 or 6, more than 75% of district supervisors rated the ASCA National Model components as such; more than 68% rated the National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model components a 4, 5, or 6; and more than 80% rated the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model framework the same.

The second research question asked if there was a difference between comprehensive school counseling program model utilization, type of census defined area in which the school district is located, geographical location, number of students within the district, percentage of students on free and reduced lunch, and number of school counselors employed by the district based on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs by school counseling district supervisors. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. The results showed after three post-hoc ANOVAs on each of the three comprehensive school counseling models were run that there was a significance for those district supervisors who indicated that their district's model utilized components from the ASCA National Model and received military impact aid $F(1, 79) = 7.834, p < .025$, and

also district supervisors working in the South and the West with percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch $F(2, 79) = 6.132, p < .025$. Results from district supervisors who indicated that their district's model utilized components from The Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling revealed there was a significance with the model being implemented $F(4, 79) = 4.719, p < .025$, districts using the model and receiving military impact aid $F(1, 79) = 8.718, p < .025$, district supervisors working in the South and the West with percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch $F(5, 79) = 3.057, p < .025$, and district supervisors working in the South and the West with percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch whose district receives military impact aid $F(2, 79) = 6.986, p < .025$. Lastly, district supervisors who indicated that their district's model utilized components from the New Vision for School Counselors results revealed there was a significance with the model being implemented $F(4, 79) = 5.753, p < .025$, those using the model and receiving military impact aid $F(1, 79) = 4.986, p < .025$, and district supervisors working in the South and the West with percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch whose district receives military impact aid $F(2, 79) = 5.477, p < .025$.

The third research question asked, to what extent do the college credentials of the school counseling district supervisor, age of the district supervisor, the number of years the supervisor has worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations differ among participants regarding the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs. After conducting a saturated multiple regression analyses the data revealed that personal traits of the school counseling

district supervisors had no influence on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs. Therefore, results could not be analyzed at the district level.

DISCUSSION

Over 75% of the respondents selected between a four and six on statements on the instrument that constituted components of the American School Counselor Association's (ASCA) National Model. Additionally, more than 68% selected between a four and six on statements that reflected the Educational Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model. Over 80% of district supervisors selected between a four and six on statements that reflected the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy's Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model. This result suggests that the important components of all three of the major school counseling models have been accepted and have been implemented in school districts throughout the United States. Although most district supervisors stated they are using The ASCA National Model, the majority selected components from the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model.

Open-ended responses allowed respondents to provide statements regarding the implementation of a school counseling model in their school districts. Some respondents said that statements in the instrument did not apply to school counseling programs at elementary levels, while others indicated that statements were not applicable to school counseling programs at secondary levels. Other responses noted that their school district was using the ASCA or NOSCA Model, that their state had its own model, that their school district was in the process of developing a comprehensive school counseling model, or that their school district focused on college and career readiness. Responses

also indicated that some respondents had difficulty ensuring comprehensive school counseling model implementation because school counselors are evaluated by building principals. Some responses in the open-ended section of the instrument revealed that some supervisors had experience as school counselors prior to being placed in the supervisor position, that some districts did not employ a school counseling supervisor, and that some supervisors wore many hats by advising many areas within the school division (school counselors, special education, nurses, etc.).

As addressed in Chapter 2, there is a gap in the professional literature related to state or school district level supervisors and the comprehensive school counseling program models they are utilizing (Beale, 2004; Borders & Drury, 1992; Gysbers, 2004; Henderson, 1999). Open-ended responses on the instrument used in this study indicate that school districts across the country either employ a district supervisor (centralized) or they do not employ a district supervisor (decentralized) regarding their practices of school counseling (Gysbers, 2010).

The results of this study reveal that school counseling district supervisors are aware of comprehensive school counseling models and are implementing them. These results support previous research that indicates there has been inconsistency in the rate of the implementation of comprehensive school counseling models (Gysbers, 2010).

Research Question 2

This study also looked for school district factors that may have predicted the selection of comprehensive school counseling program models by school counseling district supervisors. No overall statistically significant factors were found as a result of the comprehensive school counseling program model utilization, type of census defined

area in which the school district is located, geographical location, number of students within the district, percentage of students on free and reduced lunch, or number of school counselors employed by the district.

There was also model adherence from those district supervisors who stated they use The ASCA National Model, the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness or the New Vision for School Counselors. These districts also received military impact aid and had students receiving free and reduced lunch in the South and West. Also, for those district supervisors who indicated that they use “no particular model,” they used components from the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling more than any other model; and those who said they used the ASCA National Model did not necessarily adhere to using its components

Research Question 3

Additionally, this study investigated whether the personal characteristics of school counseling district supervisors influenced the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs. No overall statistically significant characteristics were found when the comprehensive school counseling program model selected was compared to the supervisors' age, the number of years worked as a school counselor, the years of experience in the position, and membership in professional organizations. Results cannot be analyzed at the district level. Therefore personal traits of the school counseling district supervisors had no influence on the selection of comprehensive school counseling programs.

LIMITATIONS

As an exploratory study the instrument utilized in the study was created specifically for this study. While steps were taken to review the validity of the instrument, its novelty increases the possibility that items selected were not the best representatives of the comprehensive school counseling model components because only six were selected from over a dozen components within each model. Additionally, although the instrument did weigh the importance of items by school counseling district supervisors, their ratings of possible less important components may distort conclusions on overall selection. Similarly, some components may be more or less important to school counseling district supervisors based on their school district and/or personal characteristics, which may affect components of models already implemented.

Additionally, this study makes an inference on the implementation of comprehensive school counseling models based on the degree to which supervisors reported that components of the three models were being implemented. As many participants noted in comments, the model implementation may be related substantially to institutionalized district factors that do not reflect what is best for students in that school district, such as mandating prerequisite courses, grade point averages or summative test scores for certain rigorous or higher level courses, instituting summer assignments or not allowing students to drop courses that may become challenging or difficult. This variance due to district factors may limit the ability to extract from the data broader implications about which comprehensive school counseling models are being implemented in school districts.

Feedback from participants also raised some additional potential limitations. One participant's comment indicated that the supervisor who completed the form was "not trained as a school counselor, but performs academic counseling." It appears that a bachelor's level teacher who does academic advising completed the survey even though the study asked that only counselors or counselor supervisors submit completed forms.

Related to sampling limitations, a relatively low percentage of the population surveyed completed the instrument, which may affect generalizability. Specifically, the low completion rate increases the risk of self-selection bias. It is possible that differences may have existed between the district supervisors that completed the instrument and those who did not. On the other hand, a return rate of 23% could be considered high, or at least appropriate for a population of professionals who have so many responsibilities and are so busy.

A few emails were received from district supervisors who indicated that they were not completing the study because they were not trained as a school counselor. While these directors were emailed back and notified that this was not a pre-requisite for completing the study, it is possible that a number of district supervisors may have failed to complete the study based on the perception that they needed to be school counselors themselves. The surveys were also sent out during the last week in May to the first week in June. A majority of school districts in the West and Mid-West had ended school before Memorial Day. Therefore, they did not have the option to participate in the survey. At the same time, since the study did not account for school districts with lead counselors, results may be skewed by perceptions that do not accurately reflect those of district

supervisors. Also the sample for the survey was also limited to directors of public school districts in the United States.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL COUNSELORS

Implications for School Counseling District Supervisors

Findings from this study indicate that school counseling district supervisors are implementing components of comprehensive school counseling models. While many supervisors indicated they had not selected a particular model, almost all are implementing most components from all of the three most popular comprehensive school counseling models. The school district counseling supervisors seem to overwhelmingly know key components that counseling programs should include that will help children succeed in school and life and are including program components from the personal/social, college and career, or academic areas.

However, school counseling district supervisors may need to pay attention to model selection as it relates to those who work in districts that have a high free and reduced lunch ratio and receive military impact aid, to see if the components actually benefit the children receiving those services. Studies have demonstrated that students who attend school districts receiving military impact aid can benefit from any of the comprehensive school counseling models. This could be due to the transient nature of military families, so any and all components that can teach military children skills are viewed as an asset.

Implications for School Counseling Practice

Based on the findings that school counseling district supervisors are overall prepared to select comprehensive school counseling models for implementation and that

neither school district characteristics nor the personal characteristics predict or influence model selection neither negatively or positively impacts the field of school counseling. However, this study does reveal that although three quarters of school district supervisors surveyed state that they use the ASCA National Model, they rated components of the Educational Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model and the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy's Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model, just as high or higher in some instances, nor are they solely adhering the ASCA National Model components. So, while school counseling district supervisors may not indicate they are using all three of the models, they are using components of all three models. Also district supervisors reported that 80% of their school districts were members of the College Board, but a mere 2% indicated that they use the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model, which comes under the umbrella of the College Board. Similarly, no district supervisors indicated usage of the National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model, but again, rated the components of that model just as high as or higher than those of the ASCA National Model.

This indicates that many see the components as overlapping; and that these are services that should be prevalent in any comprehensive school counseling model, for school district supervisors selected the components without knowing from which models they were derived. Therefore, perhaps school counselors should be integrating or blending these models to provide the best services to students. Not solely using one model over another.

Implications for Counselor Educators

The results of this study support counselor education programs that are adequately preparing counseling students for working in K-12 public schools, while also revealing areas for improvement. Specifically, counseling graduate programs should be teaching counseling students so they learn about all comprehensive school counseling programs and models. Focus could be put upon key components of the models opposed to the overall model itself. The method of training needs to be considered as well as the content of the training (Burkhard, Gillen, Martinez, & Skytte, 2012). School counselor educators can play an important role as advocates for future school counselors as coursework, practicums, and internships round out the school counseling student's experience, regardless of the university's accrediting body. School counselors should be properly trained to implement a school counseling program while meeting the individual needs of students (ASCA, 2010; CACREP, 2009), regardless of the program.

CONCLUSION

School counseling program models utilized by school districts were studied in this survey research project which examined district supervisors' ratings of the degree to which their school district's comprehensive school counseling program is associated with particular characteristics of the three major models: The American School Counselor Association's (ASCA) National Model, the Educational Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling Model, and the National Office of School Counselor Advocacy's Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Model. Results indicated that school counseling district supervisors are implementing components from all school counseling models in their comprehensive school counseling programs; and

they believe that all models have important components. The study was unable to account for school district characteristics that may have predicted model selection by school counseling district supervisors or account for how the differences in personal characteristics of the school counseling district supervisors influenced model selection.

The results may help school counseling district supervisors or those interested in securing employment as a school counseling district supervisor and help counselor educators identify areas to improve teaching counseling students so they learn about all comprehensive school counseling programs and models and not just one model. Future research is recommended to further explore the relative importance of roles fulfilled by school counseling district supervisors and the needs of the school counselors they supervise, and to further evaluate professional development experiences of school counselors and their school counseling district supervisors.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER SIX

- American School Counselor Association. (ASCA). (2008). *ASCA National Model*. Retrieved from <http://www.ascanationalmodel.org>
- American School Counselor Association. (ASCA). (2010). *Ethical standards for school counselors*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (ASCA). (2012). *ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs (3rd ed)*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Beale, A. V. (2004). Questioning whether you have a contemporary school counseling program. *The Clearing House*, 2, 73. doi:10.2307/30197688
- Borders, L., & Drury, S. M. (1992). Comprehensive school counseling programs: A review for policy makers and practitioners. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70(4), 487-498.
- Burkard, A. W., Gillen, M., Martinez, M. J., & Skytte, S. (2012). Implementation challenges and training needs for comprehensive school counseling programs in Wisconsin high schools. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(2), 136.
- Campbell, C. A., & Dahir, C. A. (1997). *Sharing the vision: The national standards for school counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association
- Carey, J. & Dimmitt, C. (2012). School counseling and student outcomes: Summary of six statewide studies. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(2), 146-153.
- Carey, J., Harrington, K., Martin, I., & Hoffman, D. (2012). A statewide evaluation of the outcomes of the implementation of ASCA national model school counseling programs in rural and suburban Nebraska high schools. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(2), 100-107.
- Carey, J., Harrington, K., Martin, I., & Stevenson, D. (2012). A statewide evaluation of the outcomes of the implementation of ASCA national model school counseling programs in Utah high schools. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(2), 89-99.
- Cook, A. (2013, Nov). Forging ahead to college. *Counseling Today*, 56(5), 51-55.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (CACREP). (2009). *2009 standards for accreditation*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Dahir, C.A. (2001). The national standards for school counseling programs: Development and implementation. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(5), 320.

- Dimmitt, C., & Wilkerson, B. (2012). Comprehensive school counseling in Rhode Island: Access to services and student outcomes. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(2), 125.
- The Education Trust. (2009a). *The new vision for school counseling*. Retrieved from the Education Trust website: <http://www.edtrust.org>
- The Education Trust. (2009b). *History of TCI*. Retrieved from the Education Trust website: <http://www.edtrust.org>
- The Education Trust. (2009c). *The new vision for school counselors: Scope of the work*. Retrieved from the Education Trust website: <http://www.edtrust.org>
- Erford, B. T. (2011). *Transforming the school counseling profession (3rd ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Griffin, D. S. (2011). A social Justice Approach to school counseling. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling & Psychology, 3*(1), 74-85.
- Gysbers, N. C. (2004). Comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: The evolution of accountability. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(1), 1-14.
- Gysbers, N. C. (2006). Improved school guidance and counseling practices through effective and sustained state leadership: A response to Miller. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(3), 245-247.
- Gysbers, N. (2010). *Remembering the past, shaping the future: A history of school counseling*. Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.
- Gysbers, N. C., Henderson, P., & ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services, G. C. (2001). Leading and managing comprehensive school guidance programs. *ERIC/CASS Digest*.
- Gysbers, N., & Henderson, P. (2012). *Developing and managing your school guidance and counseling program (5th ed.)*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Gysbers, N., & Lapan, R. (2001). The implementation and evaluation of comprehensive school guidance programs in the United States: Progress and prospects. *International Journal for Educational & Vocational Guidance, 1*(3), 197-208. doi:10.1023/A:1012297314669
- Henderson, P. (1999). Providing leadership for school counselors to achieve an effective guidance program. (School counselors: A bridge to students). *NASSP Bulletin, 603*, 77.

- Henderson, P. (2009). *The new handbook of administrative supervision*. New York: Rutledge.
- Henderson, P., & Gysbers N. (1998). *Leading and managing you school guidance program staff: A manual for school administrators and directors of guidance*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Lambie, G. W., & Williamson, L. L. (2004). The challenge to change from guidance counseling to professional school counseling: A historical proposition. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(2), 124-131.
- Lapan, R. (2012). Comprehensive school counseling programs: In some schools for some students but not in all schools for all students. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(2), 84-88.
- Lapan, R., Gysbers, N., Stanley, B., & Pierce, M. (2012). Missouri professional school counselors: ratios matter, especially in high-poverty schools. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(2), 108.
- Lapan, R. T., Whitcomb, S. A., & Aleman, N. M. (2012). Connecticut professional school counselors: College career counseling services and smaller ratios benefit students. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(2), 117.
- Martin, P. J. (2002). Transforming school counseling: A national perspective. *Theory into Practice, 41*(3), 148.
- Mason, C. (2006). The essence of transforming the school counseling program in *Ideas and research you can use: VISTAS 2006* (pp. 1-9). Retrieved from <http://www.counseling.org/Resources/>
- McGannon, W., Carey, J., Dimmitt, C., & University of Massachusetts Amherst, C. (2005). *The current status of school counseling outcome research*. Research Monograph, Number 2. Center for School Counseling Outcome Research.
- National Office of School Counselor Advocacy. (2011). *Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling*. Retrieved from the College Board website: <http://nosca.collegeboard.org>
- National Office of School Counselor Advocacy. (2014a) *About*. Retrieved from the College Board website: <http://nosca.collegeboard.org>
- National Office of School Counselor Advocacy. (2014b). *Webinars*. Retrieved from the College Board website: <http://nosca.collegeboard.org>

- National Office of School Counselor Advocacy. (2014c). *Research*. Retrieved from the College Board website: <http://nosca.collegeboard.org>
- O'Dell, F. F. (1996). Guidance for the 1990s: Revitalizing the counselor's role. *Clearing House*, 69(5), 303.
- Olson, M. J., & Perrine, P.A. (1991). Changing to a developmental guidance program. *School Counselor*, 39(1), 41.
- Pérusse, R., & Colbert, R. D. (2007). The last word: An interview with Peggy Hines, director of the Education Trust's National Center for Transforming School Counseling. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 18(3), 477-487.
- Roberts, E. (1994). Supervision of school counselors: Administrative, program, and counseling. *School Counselor*, 41(3), 149.
- Schmidt, J., & Barret, R. L. (1983). Who's in charge? School counseling supervision in North Carolina. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 23, 109-116.
- Sink, C. A., & MacDonald, G. (1998). The status of comprehensive guidance and counseling in the United States. *Professional School Counseling*, 2(2), 88-94.
- Somody, C., Henderson, P., Cook, K., & Zambrano, E. (2008). A working system of school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, 12(1), 22-33.
- Steen, S., & Rudd, T. (2009). Preparing the 21st century school counselor: Alternatives and implications for counselor educators. *Counseling & Human Development*, 42(2), 1-12.
- Thompson, R. (2012). *Professional school counseling: Best practices for working in the schools*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Trevisan, M. S. (2001). Implementing comprehensive guidance program evaluation support: lessons learned. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(3), 225.
- Wilson, N. S., & Remley, T. P. (1987). Leadership in guidance: A survey of school counseling supervisors. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 26(3), 213-220.
- Wingfield, R. J., Reese, R. F., & West-Olatunji, C. A. (2010). Counselors as leaders in schools. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*, 4(1), 114-130.
- Wittmer, J. (2007). *Managing your school counseling program: K-12 developmental strategies (3rd ed.)*. Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media Corporation.
- Wright, R. J. (2012). *Introduction to school counseling*. SAGE (CA).

REFERENCES

- Alexander, C. M., Kruczek, T., Zigelbaum, A., & Ramirez, M. (2003). A review of the school counseling literature for themes evolving from the education trust initiative. *Professional School Counseling, 7*(1), 29-34.
- Amatea, E. S., & Clark, M. (2005). Changing schools, changing counselors: A qualitative study of school administrators' conceptions of the school counselor role. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(1), 16.
- American Counseling Association. (2012). *A guide to state laws and regulations on professional school counseling*. Office of Public Policy & Legislation. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- American School Counselor Association (ASCA). (2008). *ASCA National Model*. Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association. Retrieved from <http://www.ascanationalmodel.org/>
- American School Counselor Association (ASCA). (2010). *Ethical standards for school counselors*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association (ASCA). (2012). *ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs (3rd ed)*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (ASCA). (n.d.). *The role of the professional school counselor*. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org>
- American School Counselor Association. (ASCA). (n.d.). *Who are school counselors?* Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org>
- American School Counselor Association. (ASCA). (n.d.). *Why school counseling directors/coordinators?* Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org>
- American School Counselor Association. (ASCA). (n.d.). *State certification*. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org>
- American School Counselor Association. (ASCA). (n.d.). *ASCA position statements*. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org>
- Baker, D. B. (2009). Choosing a vocation at 100: Time, change and context. *The Career Development Quarterly, 57*, 199-206.
- Baker, S. B. (1994). Mandatory teaching experience for school counselors: An impediment to uniform certification standards for school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33*(4), 314-326.

- Beale, A. V. (2004). Questioning whether you have a contemporary school counseling program. *The Clearing House*, 2, 73. doi:10.2307/30197688
- Borders, L., & Drury, S. M. (1992). Comprehensive school counseling programs: A review for policy makers and practitioners. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70(4), 487-498.
- Bridgeland, J., Bruce, M., & College Board Advocacy & Policy, C. (2011). *2011 national survey of school counselors: Counseling at a crossroads*. New York: College Board Advocacy & Policy Center.
- Bringman, N., & Lee, S. (2008). Middle school counselors' competence in conducting developmental classroom lessons: Is teaching experience necessary? *Professional School Counseling*, 11(6), 380-385.
- Bruce, M., Bridgeland, J., & College Board Advocacy & Policy, C. (2012). *2012 national survey of school counselors: True north--charting the course to college and career readiness*. New York: College Board Advocacy & Policy Center.
- Budden, R., Gill, B., & Zimmer, R. (2004). Examining federal impact aid's reimbursement for local school districts. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 22(4), 534-543.
- Burkard, A. W., Gillen, M., Martinez, M. J., & Skytte, S. (2012). Implementation challenges and training needs for comprehensive school counseling programs in Wisconsin high schools. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(2), 136.
- Campbell, C. A., & Dahir, C. A. (1997). *Sharing the vision: The national standards for school counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 171-246). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Carey, J., & Dimmitt, C. (2012). School counseling and student outcomes: Summary of six statewide studies. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(2), 146-153.
- Carey, J., Harrington, K., Martin, I., & Hoffman, D. (2012). A statewide evaluation of the outcomes of the implementation of ASCA national model school counseling programs in rural and suburban Nebraska high schools. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(2), 100-107.

- Carey, J., Harrington, K., Martin, I., & Stevenson, D. (2012). A statewide evaluation of the outcomes of the implementation of ASCA national model school counseling programs in Utah high schools. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(2), 89-99.
- Chomeya, R. (2010). Quality of psychology test between Likert scale 5 and 6 points. *Journal of Social Sciences, 6*(3), 399-403.
- Christ, T. J. (2007). Experimental control and threats to internal validity of concurrent and noncurrent multiple baseline designs. *Psychology in the Schools, 44*(5), 451-459. doi: 10.1002/pits.20237
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155
- Cook, A. (2013, Nov). Forging ahead to college. *Counseling Today, 56*(5), 51-55.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). (2009). *2009 standards for accreditation*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Coy, D. (1999). The role and training of the school counselor: Background and purpose. *NASSP Bulletin, 83*(603), 2-8.
- Dahir, C. A. (2000). The national standards for school counseling programs: A partnership in preparing students for the new millennium. *NASSP Bulletin, 84*(616), 68-76.
- Dahir, C.A. (2001). The national standards for school counseling programs: Development and implementation. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(5), 320.
- Dahir, C. A., Burnham, J. J., & Stone, C. (2009). Listen to the voices: School counselors and comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(3), 182-192.
- Dillman, D., Smyth, J. & Christian, L., (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*, New York: Wiley.
- Dimmitt, C., & Wilkerson, B. (2012). Comprehensive school counseling in Rhode Island: Access to services and student outcomes. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(2), 125.
- The Education Trust. (2009a). *The new vision for school counseling*. Retrieved from the Education Trust website: <http://www.edtrust.org>
- The Education Trust. (2009b). *History of TCI*. Retrieved from Education Trust website: <http://www.edtrust.org>

- The Education Trust. (2009c). *The new vision for school counselors: Scope of the work*. Retrieved from Education Trust website: <http://www.edtrust.org>
- Eilers, A. M. (2004). Below the accountability radar screen: What does state policy say about school counseling? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12(3).
- Erford, B. T. (2011). *Transforming the school counseling profession (3rd ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149-1160.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: Sage.
- Griffin, D. S. (2011). A social justice approach to school counseling. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling & Psychology*, 3(1), 74-85.
- Gysbers, N. (2000). School board policies for guidance and counseling: A call to action. *Professional School Counseling*, 3(5), 349.
- Gysbers, N. C. (2004). Comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: The evolution of accountability. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(1), 1-14.
- Gysbers, N. C. (2006). Improved school guidance and counseling practices through effective and sustained state leadership: A response to Miller. *Professional School Counseling*, 9(3), 245-247.
- Gysbers, N. (2010). *Remembering the past, shaping the future: A history of school counseling*. Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.
- Gysbers, N. (2013). Career-ready students: A goal of comprehensive school counseling programs. *Career Development Quarterly*, 61(3), 283-288. doi:10.1002/J.2161-0045.2013.00057.x
- Gysbers, N. C., Henderson, P., & ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services, G. C. (2001). Leading and managing comprehensive school guidance programs. *ERIC/CASS Digest*.
- Gysbers, N. & Henderson, P. (2012). *Developing and managing your school guidance and counseling program (5th ed.)*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Gysbers, N., & Lapan, R. (2001). The implementation and evaluation of comprehensive school guidance programs in the United States: Progress and

prospects. *International Journal for Educational & Vocational Guidance*, 1(3), 197-208. doi:10.1023/A:1012297314669

- Henderson, P. (1999). Providing leadership for school counselors to achieve an effective guidance program. (School counselors: A bridge to students). *NASSP Bulletin*, (603), 77.
- Henderson, P. (2009). *The new handbook of administrative supervision*. New York: Rutledge.
- Henderson, P., & Gysbers N. (1998). *Leading and managing you school guidance program staff: A manual for school administrators and directors of guidance*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Herr, E. L. (2003). Historical roots and future issues. In B.T. Erford (Ed.), *Transforming the school counseling profession (3rd ed.)* (pp. 21-38). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Hines, P., Lemons, R. & The Education Trust. (2011). *Poised to lead: How school counselors can drive college and career readiness*. K-12 Practice. The Education Trust.
- IBM Corporation. (2013). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 22.0*. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.
- Kaplan, L. S., & Evans, M. R. (1999). Hiring the best school counseling candidates to promote students' achievement. (School counselors: A bridge to students). *NASSP Bulletin*, (603), 34.
- Kozlowski, K. A., & Huss, S. (2013). Training of school counselors in *Ideas and research you can use: VISTAS 2013* (pp. 1-17). Retrieved from <http://www.counseling.org/Resources/>
- Lambie, G. W., & Williamson, L. L. (2004). The challenge to change from guidance counseling to professional school counseling: A historical proposition. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(2), 124-131.
- Lapan, R. (2012). Comprehensive school counseling programs: In some schools for some students but not in all schools for all students. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(2), 84-88.
- Lapan, R., Gysbers, N., Stanley, B., & Pierce, M. (2012). Missouri professional school counselors: Ratios matter, especially in high-poverty schools. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(2), 108.

- Lapan, R. T., Whitcomb, S. A., & Aleman, N. M. (2012). Connecticut professional school counselors: College career counseling services and smaller ratios benefit students. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(2), 117.
- Martin, I., Carey, J., & DeCoster, K. (2009). A national study of the current status of state school counseling models. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(5), 378.
- Martin, P. J. (2002). Transforming school counseling: A national perspective. *Theory into Practice, 41*(3), 148.
- Mason, C. (2006). The essence of transforming the school counseling program in *Ideas and research you can use: VISTAS 2006* (pp. 1-9). Retrieved from <http://www.counseling.org/Resources/>
- McGannon, W., Carey, J., Dimmitt, C., & University of Massachusetts Amherst, C. (2005). *The current status of school counseling outcome research*. Research Monograph, Number 2. Center for School Counseling Outcome Research.
- National Career Development Association. (n.d.). NCD A history. Retrieved from the National Career Development Association website: <http://www.ncda.org>
- The National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html>
- National Consortium of State Guidance Leadership. (2012). *NCSGL white paper on the importance of state guidance leadership for the 21st century: Recommendation for improvement* [White paper]. Retrieved from <http://www.coloradostateplan.com/Counseling/TheImportanceofStateGuidanceLeadershipforthe21stCentury.pdf>
- National Office of School Counselor Advocacy. (2011). *Eight components of college and career readiness counseling*. Retrieved from the College Board website: <http://nosca.collegeboard.org>
- National Office of School Counselor Advocacy. (2014a). *About*. Retrieved from the College Board website: <http://nosca.collegeboard.org>
- National Office of School Counselor Advocacy. (2014b). *Webinars*. Retrieved from College Board website: <http://nosca.collegeboard.org>
- National Office of School Counselor Advocacy. (2014c). *Research*. Retrieved from College Board website: <http://nosca.collegeboard.org>

- The New England Vocational Guidance Association, 1920–1925. (1925). *The Vocational Guidance Magazine*, 4(1), 26-27. doi:10.1002/j.2164-5884.1925.tb00988.x
- O'Dell, F. F. (1996). Guidance for the 1990s: Revitalizing the counselor's role. *Clearing House*, 69(5), 303.
- Olson, M. J., & Perrine, P.A. (1991). Changing to a developmental guidance program. *School Counselor*, 39(1), 41.
- Owens, D., Thomas, D., & Strong, L. (2011). School counselors assisting students with disabilities. *Education*, (2), 235.
- Pérusse, R., & Colbert, R. D. (2007). The last word: An interview with Peggy Hines, director of the education trust's national center for transforming school counseling. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 18(3), 477-487.
- Pérusse, R., Goodnough, G. E., Donegan, J., & Jones, C. (2004). Perceptions of school counselors and school principals about the national standards for school counseling programs and the transformative school counseling initiative. *Professional School Counseling*, 7(3), 152-161.
- Poynton, T. A., Schumacher, R. A., & Wilczenski, F. L. (2008). School counselors' attitudes regarding statewide comprehensive developmental guidance model implementation. *Professional School Counseling*, 11(6), 417-422.
doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2010-11.417
- Pyne, J. R. (2011). Comprehensive school counseling programs, job satisfaction, and the ASCA national model. *Professional School Counseling*, 15(2), 88-97.
- Ratts, M. J., DeKruyf, L., & Chen-Hayes, S. F. (2007). The ACA advocacy competencies: A social justice advocacy framework for professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling*, 11(2), 90-97.
doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2010-11.90
- Richards, L. S. (1881). *Vocophy: The new profession. A system enabling a person to name the calling of vocation one is best suited to follow*. Marlboro, MA; Pratt Brothers.
- Roberts, E. (1994). Supervision of school counselors: Administrative, program, and counseling. *School Counselor*, 41(3), 149.
- Schellenberg, R. (2013). *A new era in school counseling: A practical guide (2nd ed.)*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Education.

- Schmidt, J. J. (2003). *Counseling in schools: Essential services and comprehensive programs (4th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Schmidt, J., & Barret, R. L. (1983). Who's in charge? School counseling supervision in North Carolina. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 23, 109-116.
- Sink, C. A., & MacDonald, G. (1998). The status of comprehensive guidance and counseling in the United States. *Professional School Counseling*, 2(2), 88-94.
- Somody, C., Henderson, P., Cook, K., & Zambrano, E. (2008). A working system of school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, 12(1), 22-33.
- Steen, S., & Rudd, T. (2009). Preparing the 21st century school counselor: Alternatives and implications for counselor educators. *Counseling & Human Development*, 42(2), 1-12.
- Stein, D. M., & DeBerard, S. (2010). Does holding a teacher education degree make a difference in school counselors' job performance? *Journal of School Counseling*, 81-26.
- Studer, J. R., Diambra, J. F., Breckner, J. A., & Heidel, R. (2011). Obstacles and successes in implementing the ASCA national model in schools. *Journal of School Counseling*, 91-26.
- Thompson, R. (2012). *Professional school counseling: Best practices for working in the schools*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Trevisan, M. S. (2001). Implementing comprehensive guidance program evaluation support: Lessons learned. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(3), 225.
- United States Census. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/maps/pdfs/reference/us_regdiv.pdf
- United States Department of Defense Education Activity. (n.d.). DoD impact aid for military connected school districts. Retrieved from <http://www.dodea.edu/partnership/impact.cfm>
- United States Department of Education. (2002). Fact Sheet on Title I, Part A. Retrieved from <http://www2.Ed.Gov/Rschstat/Eval/Disadv/Title1-Factsheet.pdf>
- United States Department of Education. (2014). Elementary and secondary school counseling programs. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/elseccounseling/index.html>
- United States Department of Education. (n.d.). About impact aid. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oese/impactaid/whatisia.html>

- Wilkerson, K., Pérusse, R., & Hughes, A. (2013). Comprehensive school counseling programs and student achievement outcomes: A comparative analysis of ramp versus non-ramp schools. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(3), 172-184.
- Williamson, L. L. (1998). School counseling: Is teaching experience necessary? *Texas Counseling Association Journal, 26*, 28-33.
- Wilson, N. S., & Remley, T. P., Jr. (1987). Leadership in guidance: A survey of school counseling supervisors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 26*(3) 213-220.
- Wingfield, R. J., Reese, R. F., & West-Olatunji, C. A. (2010). Counselors as leaders in schools. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy, 4*(1), 114-130.
- Wittmer, J. (2007). *Managing your school counseling program: K-12 developmental strategies (3rd ed.)*. Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media Corporation.
- Wright, R. J. (2012). *Introduction to school counseling*. SAGE (CA).

Section II: Personal and School District Characteristics

Please provide the following information about yourself and the school division where you are employed:

1. What is your gender?
 - Male Female
2. Please indicate your age in years
3. Please identify your racial identity; You may report more than one
 - White
 - Black or African American
 - American Indian or Alaska Native
 - Asian
 - Native Hawaiian of Other Pacific Islander
 - Other
4. Please indicate the highest degree, of any kind, that you have attained
 - Bachelor's
 - Master's
 - Specialist
 - Doctorate
5. Please indicate the highest counseling degree that you currently hold
 - Bachelor's
 - Master's
 - Specialist
 - Doctorate
 - N/A If N/A, please indicate the content area of your degree
6. Please indicate how long you have been a school counselor in years
7. Please indicate how long you have been a school counselor district supervisor in years
8. Please indicate the geographical location of your school district
 - Northeast (*Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont*)
 - Midwest (*Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin*)

- South (*Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia*)
- West (*Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Wyoming*)
10. Please indicate the type of area your school district is located within (Census-defined)
- Rural (*Territory that is less than or equal to 5 miles from an urbanized area, as well as rural territory that is less than or equal to 2.5 miles from an urban cluster or that is more than 25 miles from an urbanized area and is also more than 10 miles from an urban cluster*)
- Town (*Territory inside an urban cluster that is less than or equal to 10 miles from an urbanized area or more than 35 miles from an urbanized area*)
- Suburb (*Territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area with population of more than 250,000 and less than 100,000*)
- City (*Territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city with population of more than 250,000 and less than 100,000*)
11. Please indicate the number of students in your school division
12. Please indicate how many counselors are in your division by level:
- Elementary
- Middle/Jr. High
- High
13. Please indicate who selects the comprehensive school counseling model in your school district.
- District Supervisor School Counselor Building Administrator
- School Board I don't know
14. Please indicate the model being implemented in your school district.
- The ASCA National Model
- The Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling
- The New Vision for School Counselors
- No particular model is being implemented I don't know
15. Please indicate the percentage of free and reduced lunch students in your division
16. Please indicate if your school division receives military impact aid
- Yes No
17. Please indicate if you are a member of the American School Counselor Association
- Yes No
18. Please indicate if your school district is a member of the College Board
- Yes No

Section III: (Optional) Other Feedback on Characteristics

Please share any additional comments you have regarding characteristics of the most well-known comprehensive school counseling program models in delivering counseling services to their students.

Appendix B

Informed Consent Document

Old Dominion University
Department of Counseling and Human Services
Informed Consent

Title: SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM MODELS UTILIZED BY SCHOOL
DISTRICTS

Faculty Principal Investigator: Theodore P. Remley, Jr. J.D., Ph.D.

Student Principal Investigator: Tracy L. Jackson, M.S.

I. Purpose:

You are being asked to take part in a research study. The purpose of this study is to explore district supervisors' selection of comprehensive school counseling program models. Model selection will be assessed by examining district supervisors' ratings to the degree in which their school district's comprehensive school counseling program is associated with a particular model. You are invited to participate because you self-identify as a school counseling district supervisor. A total number of approximately 100 participants will be recruited for this study. Participation will require approximately 15 minutes or less of your time.

II. Procedures:

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to answer a series of questions about your school district's comprehensive school counseling model. Some questions will also ask for demographic information about your school district and yourself (e.g., how many students in your district, location of district, your age, gender, race/ethnicity and education). You will report your answers through an online survey link. You will not need to interact with anyone. You can complete the questions on your own time and at your own pace.

III. Risks:

In this study, you will likely not have any more risks than you would in a normal day of life.

There is the possibility that participation in this study may cause you to feel uneasy. The risk is likely minimal. If you feel uncomfortable, you have several options. You can choose not to answer some questions. You can take a break and start again later, or you

can choose not to finish the study. You may contact the study Principal Investigator, Dr. Remley, at (757) 683-6695 should you have any questions.

IV. Benefits:

Participation in this study may benefit you personally. As a result of your participation, you may learn more about comprehensive school counseling program models. Overall, we hope to gain information that will improve our understanding of school counseling program models utilized by school districts.

V. Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal:

Participation in research is voluntary. You do not have to be in this study. If you decide to be in the study and change your mind, you have the right to drop out at any time. You may skip questions or stop participating at any time. Whatever you decide, you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

VI. Confidentiality:

We will keep your records private to the extent allowed by law. Dr. Theodore Remley, Dr. Tara Hill and Dr. Garret McAuliffe will have access to the information you provide. Information may also be shared with those who make sure the study is done ethically (ODU Institutional Review Board). The information you provide will be stored in password-protected and firewall-protected devices. Please note that data sent over the internet may not be secure. Your name and other identifying will not appear when we present this information or publish its results. The findings will be summarized and reported in group form. You will not be identified personally.

VII. Contact Persons:

If at any time you feel pressured to participate, or if you have any questions about your rights or this form, then you should contact Dr. Eddie Hill, Member of the Darden College of Education Human Subjects Review Committee, Old Dominion University, at ehill@odu.edu.

VIII. Copy of Consent Form to Subject:

You can print a copy of this consent form for your records.

If you agree to participate in this research, please click 'I agree' to continue with the survey.

VITA

Tracy L. Jackson earned a Bachelor of Arts degree from University of Rhode Island in 1993. She earned a Master of Science in Counseling from North Carolina A&T State University in 1998. She also holds an endorsement from the University of Virginia where she studied Administration and Leadership in 2007. She is a Nationally Certified Counselor, a National Certified School Counselor, a Distance Certified Counselor, a Certified Educational and Vocational Guidance Practitioner, and an Approved Clinical Supervisor.

Ms. Jackson is a member of several national professional organizations including the American School Counselor Association, the American Counseling Association, Chi Sigma Iota Honor Society, and the Virginia School Counselor Association, where she serves as the immediate past president and is a former Counselor Supervisor Vice President. She has presented at national and state conferences on topics related to school counseling and was a guest presenter for the Virginia Department of Education's webinar on Academic and Career Planning. She is the Virginia Department of Education's Regional Administrator in School Counseling - Region II, a Ramp Reviewer for the American School Counselor Association, a member of the Guidance Council for Cappex.com, and is a member of the National Office for School Counselor Advocacy's Advisory Team.

As a student at Old Dominion University, Ms. Jackson was a student member of Chi Sigma Iota and served as chair of the Awards Committee. She was also the graduate assistant for the Southern Association of Counselor Education and Supervision's Award Committee. She is a recipient of the Hampton Roads Counselor Association's and the

Virginia Counselor Association's Counselor of the Year Award, as well as Chi Sigma Iota's Outstanding Counselor Practitioner Supervisor Award. She the creator of a blog site for school counselor resources and information.

Ms. Jackson currently services as the Coordinator of Guidance Services for Virginia Beach City Public Schools in Virginia Beach, Virginia. Ms. Jackson has been a school counselor for 16 years and has worked the elementary, middle, and high school levels.