AN EVALUATION OF THE M.ED. IN SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHOOL COUNSELING OUTCOME & PROGRAM EVALUATION SYSTEM

by

STEVEN G. BLAUM

(Under the Direction of Pamela Paisley)

ABSTRACT
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The American educational system is in the early stages of a significant shift toward accountability and evaluation. Since the inception of desegregation laws, America has been striving to meet the academic needs of all students, regardless of race or socio-economic status. Unfortunately, fifty years after the decision of Brown V. Board of Education, statistics show that America is actually backsliding on its progress toward equality in education (The Education Trust, 2003).

In response to these trends in education, the No Child Left Behind Act (Public Law 107-110, 107th United States Congress) was passed in 2001 as a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965). Calling for Adequate Yearly Progress benchmarks to be set by states to ensure the achievement of all students by the year 2014, the role of accountability in education has been dramatically increased. Although every teacher, staff member, and administrator is responsible for helping their students reach their goals, the school counselor has a unique role and opportunity to enhance the success of every student (Education Trust, 2001).

Trained to be advocates for students in equity, access, and support, the role of the school counselor, once ignored by educational reform, has recently been transformed as an integral piece of the education puzzle. Through national movements such as the Transforming School Counseling Initiative, and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, as well as local initiatives such as the Georgia Board of Regent’s Principles and
Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors, the role of the school counselor has been updated to be completely relevant to the accomplishments of today’s students (ASCA 2003).

School counselor preparation programs must now address the need for accountability and evaluation of their school counseling candidates. By using portfolio-based assessment methods, this study outlines the development of an assessment tool designed to serve the following purposes: a) track the development of school counselor candidates from initial preparation through their professional career; b) assess the effectiveness of the preparation program in providing academic and field opportunities to meet the criteria established by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (Georgia Board of Regents, 2004); and c) provide school counselors with data-driven results with which to demonstrate to outside administrators, faculty, and parents the effectiveness of their interventions in promoting the academic, social and emotional success and career preparedness of their students.

**Statement of the Problem**

As America celebrates the upcoming 50-year anniversary of the Brown V. Board of Education decision outlawing segregated public education, the achievement gap between underprivileged and privileged students continues to be a national issue. In the political arena of educational policy reform, the American public and government are engaged in heated debate over new legislation with ideals similar to that landmark decision in 1954 – the No Child Left Behind Act (Education Trust, 2003). NCLB legislation calls for accountability measures to demonstrate the closing of achievement gaps between low-income and/or minority students and their more affluent peers. However, at the same time, research shows that American schools have demonstrated trends of re-segregation since the mid 1980s (Frankenberg & Lee, 2002). Statistics indicate that since the 1960s progress in the desegregation of Latino students has been
almost nonexistent; and since 1986 progress made in desegregation of African American students has been backsliding (Frankenberg & Lee, 2002).

Despite the legislative promise to present all American students with equal opportunities for success regardless of race or ethnicity, the educational landscape 50 years later fails to live up to that ideal. In 2000, for every 100 Latino kindergartners, only 53% graduated from high school, and only 10% obtained a bachelor’s degree. These numbers compare poorly with 91% of Caucasian students receiving a high school diploma and 30% obtaining a bachelor’s degree. Across achievement levels, students from lower-income families attend postsecondary schools at nearly half the rate of similarly achieving students from high-income families (The Education Trust, 2001).

Although contrary to the message of “leaving no child behind” the achievement gap coexists with a funding gap at state and federal levels. In nearly half of the states of this country, highest-poverty school districts receive less per-student funding from state and local sources than do the lowest-poverty school districts (The Education Trust, 2003). Nationwide, the top 25% of school districts in terms of child poverty nationwide receive less funding than the wealthiest 25% of districts. Also, across the nation school districts with the highest percentage of minority children receive less funding than districts with the fewest minority children (The Education Trust, 2003).

The current effort to combat these trends has come through the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act. In 2001, the NCLB was implemented with the goal that all students would become proficient in language arts and mathematics by 2014 through the establishment of yearly benchmark goals. Calling upon the commitment of each state to establish clearly defined goals for consistent improvement by students on standardized tests in math and language arts,
schools have become responsible for demonstrating increased performance from all subgroups of students.

As the American legislative, executive and judicial branches call for drastic educational reform, public schools are entering a time where assessment and evaluation of their students' performance is experiencing a paradigm shift. With the enactment of NCLB, data-driven evaluation and effectiveness are becoming the standards by which student performance, staff evaluation, and institutional funding issues live or die. All members of the school system are affected by and responsible for obtaining, maintaining, and disseminating performance driven data in regards to the effectiveness of their given interventions.

A central figure in each school’s mission to serve its entire student body is the school counselor (ASCA, 2003). School counselors have a unique, school-wide perspective on the needs of all students; they are primary advocates in issues of equity, access, and the lack of supporting conditions for success (House & Hayes, 2002). School counselors work with families, state agencies, and community resources to promote student success in educational, social, career, and personal development (Nystul, 2003). Although their role in education is unique, school counselors and administrators along with others are challenged by accountability legislation to demonstrate the effectiveness of their interventions in measurable terms (American School Counselor Association, 2003).

Prior to 1996, a national assessment of school counselor preparation and practice conducted by The Education Trust determined that the field of school counseling lacked substantive change analogous to the current general education reform movement (House & Hayes, 2002). However, the fact that school counseling practices have been left behind in school policy reform is beginning to be rectified. The Transforming School Counseling Initiative
(TSCI) was generated from the findings of the 2002 Education Trust’s commentary on school counseling and funded through the DeWitt Wallace Reader’s Digest Fund. The TSCI is part of a national movement to establish guidelines for the training and development of effective, modern school counselors (CAREI, 2002). The TSCI, in conjunction with recent professional standards revisions for the practice of school counseling, such as the 2001 standards of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2001), represents a framework for the training, placement, monitoring, and evaluation of counselors in American schools.

The work of the transformed school counselor is integral to the success of students in core areas of academic achievement and social-emotional development (Isaacs, 2003). As national and state level expectations for data-driven accountability increase, school counselors and school counselor training programs must respond to this demand. One body of research suggests that moving toward the development of portfolio-style assessment methods will allow counselors to demonstrate their effectiveness in a manner previously unexplored (Boes, 2001; Rhyne-Winkler & Watson, 1996; Studer & Sommers, 2000). Portfolio assessment should stimulate both personal reflection and data-gathering skills, leading to the improvement of counseling skill and competence, as well as create a concrete compilation of examples of counselor interventions (Rhyne-Winkler & Watson, 1996).

With the research literature nearly devoid of school counselor accountability strategies (Studer & Sommers, 2000), this research study aims to propose a methodology in school counselor accountability evaluation through the development of a portfolio-based instrument that tracks the development of a school counselor candidate from the first stages of preparation through years of professional service. School counselors in American public schools are
entering a time period in educational history where outcome assessment is becoming the new benchmark for their success or failure as professionals. The themes of school reform through acts such as the NCLB demonstrate the centrality of data-driven evaluations in determining the effectiveness of educational policy. As the twenty-first century begins, school counseling reform initiatives are beginning to reshape the landscape of the perceptions, behaviors, assumptions and methods by which school counselors are evaluated. As a result, the face of counseling evaluation in monitoring intervention effectiveness must also change to meet the needs of a dynamic educational and political environment.

In 2000, The Georgia Department of Education’s Office on School Guidance and Counseling Services stated that, in regards to educational reform, “Guidance counselors will assume more of a responsibility for student growth and thus become more accountable in the process. The activities that guidance counselors conduct should have a link to defined student standards” (CAREI, 2002). Therefore, as school counselors become more integral to student success, and more responsible for demonstrating evaluative data to monitor that success, the methodology for this assessment must be reevaluated.

The Quality Basic Education Act of 1985 required that all professional employees in Georgia public schools undergo annual performance evaluations (Anderson, 1994). The Georgia School Counselor Evaluation Program (GSCEP) was initiated in 1987, piloted between 1989-1990, and revised in 1991. Shortly thereafter, statewide funding reallocation and reduction led to the discontinuation of a mandatory statewide implementation ordinance, and use of the GSCEP was discontinued (Anderson, 1994). Since the development of the GSCEP in the early 1990s, the state of Georgia has failed to devise or implement a statewide measure for the effectiveness of school counselors. However, with the calls for accountability from legislation such as the
NCLB, it is unlikely that the state of Georgia, or any other state, will be able to maintain adequate funding, resources, and pay for school counselors without the accumulation of effectiveness data. Although the GSCEP represents a basic model for the development of a statewide school counseling evaluation tool, its philosophy concerning the role of school counselors is significantly outdated. Without accounting for the major advances in school counselor education policy within the last decade, the GSCEP cannot be considered a viable option for school counselor effectiveness evaluation.

With the infeasibility of the GSCEP as a tool for school counselor effectiveness measurement, a new focus on school counselor evaluation must be broached. Considering the significant philosophical and theoretical changes to the field of school counseling in recent years (i.e., TSCI, CACREP) school counselor training programs are challenged to produce measures for the effectiveness of their candidates who are similarly challenged to meet the standards set forth by the new policies.

The challenge to evaluate counselor effectiveness was reaffirmed in 2004 with the implementation of the University System of Georgia's Board of Regents “Principles for the Preparation of School Counselors”. These principles outline rubrics for school counselor preparation programs in the design and implementation of a curriculum that focuses on the development of specific competency areas. As these rubrics are put into action, they provide a new impetus and a new set of guidelines for the measurement of both preparation program and counselor effectiveness.

**Purpose of the Study**

The primary purpose of this dissertation is to evaluate the M.Ed. program in School Counseling at The University of Georgia’s College of Education within the context of the
transforming role of school counselors and new legislative calls for accountability. This evaluation is designed to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the program in training school counselor candidates proficient in knowledge and skills established by the standards of the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (CAREI, 2001), the 2001 standards of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2001), and the Georgia Board of Regent’s Principles for School Counselor Preparation (Georgia Board of Regents, 2003).

The secondary purpose of this study is to outline a methodology of program evaluation generalizable to similar programs across higher education in Georgia. This methodology of program evaluation is designed to meet the needs of Georgia-based school counseling preparation programs in collecting intervention effectiveness data and to monitor the progress of school counselor candidates’ development over time.

The primary and secondary goals of this dissertation, the program evaluation and the methods systemization, are discussed in the final section of this dissertation as being used as the foundation for a manual to be developed that will follow the candidate from entrance into a school counselor preparation program, through graduation, and into the work force as a school counselor. This system, theorized from the program evaluation taking place in the primary goal of this dissertation, will allow the training program to evaluate and monitor over time their school counselors’ development in crucial skill areas. The system will provide the school counselor with a concrete data-driven resource to demonstrate the effectiveness of their interventions in promoting the academic and social achievement of their students.

Previous attempts at devising a standardized manual have not been realized for various reasons, including lack of funding. As of 2004, the state of Georgia does not possess an up to
date method of evaluation that is generalizable across grade levels (K-12) and district location. The development of this manual is perceived as an initial step in creating a statewide, standardized system for the evaluation of school counseling department performance in enhancing all levels of student success. Based on current school counseling policy guidelines (i.e., TSCI, CACREP) five major areas of counselor activities need to be evaluated by this manual: leadership, advocacy, counseling and coordination, teaming and collaboration, and program evaluation.

**Significance of the Study**

In June 2003, the Education Trust and MetLife Foundation established the National Center for Transforming School Counseling (NCTSC). Upon establishment of this Center, Education Trust Director Kati Haycock made the following statement: “For the first time in history, schools are being held accountable for the achievement of all groups of students; school counselors are ideally positioned to serve as advocates for students and create opportunities for all students to reach these new high academic goals” (Education Trust, 2003). The responsibility of the school counselor in generating evaluative data concerning the effectiveness of their interventions represents a lynchpin in the future of the professions relevance toward success for all students and the school as an organization. In fact, a closer examination of language the “Adequate Yearly Progress” legislation reveals startling consequences for school counselors in academic institutions that are unable to demonstrate effectiveness evaluations.

Should a school be unable to meet its AYP provisions for four consecutive years, numerous “corrective actions” are required by NCLB guidelines. After four years of not meeting AYP state standards, the legislation calls for replacement of school staff who are “relevant to the failure to make AYP”, as well as institute new curriculum, decrease management authority, and
restructure the school’s internal organizational structure. In the fifth year of underperformance, “all or most” of the staff is to be replaced and the school operated by a private company. Although hope exists that no school will fail to meet its AYP goals for consecutive years, it may be unrealistic to assume that will be so. In that event, school counselors will be forced to be in a position to demonstrate how their interventions directly relate to the success and achievement of all students in their school. In the educational environment of data-driven evaluation, school counselors can simply not afford to be left “holding the bag” when proof of effectiveness is required for continued employment.

The necessity for school counselor accountability assessment can also be seen in the state legislative arena. In 2003, Georgia Governor Sonny Purdue vetoed a bill authorizing a pay increase for nationally certified counselors. According to Purdue’s representative at a legislative meeting during the 2003 GSCA conference in Atlanta, pay increases for school counselors could not be approved until data-driven evidence of the effectiveness of school counselors could be obtained.

Along with the need for counselor job security and pay increases, the needs of the students play a role in the call for accountability in education. In the majority of today’s schools, school counselor-to-student ratios are vastly higher than recommended (Fileds & Pine, 2000). School counselors have more and more students to serve and less and less time in which to serve them. School counselors simply cannot afford to implement programs and interventions that are not effective. To help their students succeed, school counselors need to be able to call upon interventions that have been evaluated for utility and feasibility.

The field of school counseling, at least in the state of Georgia, appears to be at a professional crossroads. School reform is a critical national and local issue, and school
counselors are in a unique position to facilitate that reform toward success for all students. However, without data to monitor and uphold the important work done by these counselors, the relevance of the position could be in considerable jeopardy. A standardized, statewide system for documenting skill development and the implementation of effective interventions will provide school counselors a means that presents to school administration the philosophies, tasks, and tools of modern effective school counseling practices.

**Assumptions**

The following conditions are anticipated to limit the effectiveness of the present study: Administrators and evaluators often avoid negative evaluations. On the 1990 field test of the Georgia School Counselor Evaluation Program, 99% of the counselors were classified as satisfactory (Anderson, 1994). Anecdotal evidence suggested that administrators avoided unsatisfactory scores due to scarcity of qualified counselors, increased workload on the evaluator from unsatisfactory scores, and the desire to simply avoid negative evaluations (Anderson, 1994).

School administrators are often unaware of the guidelines for school counseling practices and training. In qualitative interviews, numerous counselors’ supervisors (principals & vice-principals) were generally unaware of the areas of emphasis of counselor training programs and the most effective tasks for counselors given their specialized training (Blaum, 2003). If asked to evaluate the progress or effectiveness of the school or counselors, the lack of familiarity with established guidelines could hamper appropriate evaluation.

At the present time, school counselor training programs do not necessarily provide similar curricula or internship sites in school counselor training. The diversity of experiences,
both academic and practical, in the training of school counselors may limit the generalizability of a standardized evaluation

**Research Question**

There are two objectives to this dissertation, 1) evaluate one school counseling preparation program operating under the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia; and 2) describe a system by which future evaluations of similar programs may be accomplished. The primary question behind this evaluation is to determine how to operationalize the rubrics and principles of transformed school counseling, primarily from the 2004 Georgia Board of Regents “Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors”. Imbedded in this purpose are questions of identifying relevant stakeholders from which to collect data for evaluation, and determining the data to collect to meet this demand in a manner that is comprehensive enough to meet legislative accountability demands, yet not so demanding as to be infeasible.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

The introduction of this study briefly examined the education gap at the national level and the movements in school counseling associated with closing that gap. The aim of this study, however, is to create a portfolio-based instrument rooted in the school counseling preparation standards set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia for use within the state. With the goal of describing a program evaluation used by a nationally accredited school counseling program, the scope of this study is limited to standards set forth by Georgia legislated policy for use in post-secondary school counseling preparation programs located within the state of Georgia.

This chapter begins with a justification for the counseling psychologist who endeavors to be involved in program evaluation/consultation. Second, an outline of a model for program evaluation is presented to lay the foundation for the methodology described later in this study. This literature review presents an analysis of the education and funding gaps in Georgia public schools and the ways in which these gaps have created new calls for accountability in educational reform. As the call for accountability becomes the dominant paradigm in education, the role of the school counselor in meeting accountability goals is then discussed. Initiatives designed to transform the philosophies of and about school counseling – first at the national level and then as statewide policy in Georgia, are then outlined. Finally, portfolio assessment as a methodology capable of addressing the needs for school counselor accountability in educational reform in Georgia is discussed.
Counseling psychology is a field with a long history of incorporating consultation into its development (Shullman, 2002). Seven years after Division 17 of the American Psychological Association was formed in 1944, counseling psychology was recognized as a distinct specialty. At the time, that specialty was defined as “extending psychology to counseling and guidance…whether in educational institutions, industrial or business enterprises, government agencies, or private practice” (Whitely, 1984, p.11). This definition of counseling psychology presents a wide scope of venues in which the counseling psychologist operates. In 1997 the Committee for the Recognition of Proficiencies and Specialties in Professional Psychology defined counseling psychology as the facilitation of “personal and interpersonal functioning across the life span with a focus on…typical as well as atypical or dysfunctional development as it applies to human experience from individual, family, group, systems, and organizational perspectives” (Stone, Walsh, Nevill, & Lent, 1997, p.31).

Taken from these definitions, it is appropriate for a counseling psychologist to facilitate the development of human experience from a systems and organizational perspective in an educational institution. But is it only the setting and actions that define what a counseling psychologist engages in? In 1968 Jordan, Myers, Layton & Morgan identified three core roles for counseling psychologists. These roles include: (a) remediation - working with individuals or groups, to assist them in remedying problems of one kind or another; (b) prevention - anticipate, circumvent, and if possible, forestall difficulties that may arise in the future; and (c) help individuals to plan, obtain, and derive maximum benefits from the kinds of experiences, which will enable them to discover and develop their potentialities. By working to help school counselors more effectively deliver their services; this program evaluation is guided by the idea
that it will in turn foster the personal and interpersonal functioning of students across a very wide scale of activities, including those in which remediation, prevention, and planning will help students achieve greater academic and emotional success.

**A Model for Effective Program Evaluation**

The system of program evaluation described is based on Posavac & Carey’s (2003) model for program evaluation. Posavac & Carey (2003) break down the process of program evaluation into four main categories – evaluation of need, evaluation of process, evaluation of outcome, and evaluation of efficiency. This study approaches program evaluation through the evaluation of process model. This type of evaluation seeks to determine if a program that is already in place (in this case the preparation and employment of school counselors) is implemented as designed and serves the target population effectively. The new guidelines for school counselor preparation and practice established by the Georgia Board of Regents, The Transforming School Counseling Initiative, and other national movements in school counselor reform, require a change in the process by which school counselor training programs educate candidates and collect evaluative data. The theoretical and methodological basis established by Posavac & Carey (2003) is described in this chapter, while the manner in which it was applied to this study is outlined in the following chapter.

Posavac & Carey (2003) outline six steps necessary in the process of planning an effective program evaluation. Theses steps include the following: (a) identification of relevant people; (b) arranging preliminary meetings; (c) assessing the evaluability of the program; (d) examining the literature, (e) determining the methodology; and (f) writing a proposal. In the first step, identification of relevant people, individuals who have an investment in the program or who are affected by the program are identified as “stakeholders”. Once these stakeholders are
identified, they are included in methodology development for the program evaluation so as to maximize the effectiveness and utility of the evaluation.

The second step, arranging preliminary meetings, is done in order to allow for the investigation of five questions that provide background information necessary to the program evaluation. The first of these questions, “Who wants the evaluation”, addresses the target audience for the intervention and sets the stage for how the final results are presented. The second question, “What type of evaluation is desired”, is designed to aid the evaluators in clarifying the methodology needed to answer the relevant questions. The third question, “why is the evaluation desired” is asked to ensure that once the evaluation is complete, it be utilized in an effective, fair and responsible manner. Posavac & Carey (2003) cite examples of program evaluations being used as political leverage, or as a means to delay important decision-making, as examples of why this step is necessary and important. The fourth question, “When is the evaluation desired” involves the setting of deadlines and goals by those either asking for the evaluation or implementing the evaluation. The final question, “What resources are available”, is asked in the evaluation of what is at hand and what is needed in order to complete an effective program evaluation.

The third step in planning an evaluation is assessing the evaluability of the program. A step rooted in utility, it is here that the question of whether or not the evaluation should be undertaken is determined. Only after the evaluators have developed a theoretical basis, have allotted sufficient resources, and determined that those involved are prepared for adequate commitment should evaluation begin. The fourth step is to examine the literature. In an examination of the relevant literature key questions can be addressed – questions such as “have previous evaluations been done one similar programs?”, “what designs may have been
previously implemented?”, or “has the question at hand been answered previously in past studies?"

The fifth step of Posavac & Carey’s (2003) model for program evaluation is the development of the methodology. The development of the methodology involves the determination of the most effective strategy and design, population and sampling, control and comparison groups, selection of measures, data collection, method of analysis, and final report. The development of the methodology acts as a blueprint for how the program evaluation is carried out from the program’s conception to its termination. In the sixth and final step a written proposal is presented to the individuals who have a stake in the program evaluation. In this report data is presented, conclusions are made, and recommendations for future changes are presented.

**Educational Reform on the National Scale**

It is believed that each year nearly 500,000 students graduate from high schools in America with only the most rudimentary reading skills (Lewis, 2003). Even without a detailed breakdown of the numbers of students, regardless of race, age, gender, socio-economic status across various states in the US, the consensus is that America’s schools are not teaching every student all the skills he or she needs in order to be successful. Over the course of American educational history, educational reform has focused on many ideals – i.e., gender equality or desegregation. At the closing of the 20th century and as the 21st century begins, the face of educational reform is that of accountability.

Accountability in American education refers to a process by which educators are to be held responsible for the academic performance of their students. By evaluating student performance over time, and in the United States that currently means by monitoring performance
on standardized testing, schools are tracked statistically by how effective they are in educating all of their students – regardless of race, gender, socio-economic status, etc. (Wiener & Ross, 2004). Accountability in education means being held responsible for actions and interventions designed to enhance academic abilities, social/emotional well being, or career preparedness of any individual within the school system – students, parents, or staff. Accountability entails the establishment of goals, the outlining of objectives and procedures, and the collection of data to monitor progress (Myrick, 2003). In 2001, the No Child left Behind Act, an extension of the 1994 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was authorized to establish one of the most ambitious calls for accountability in education in American legislative history (Haycock & Wiener, 2003).

The call for accountability under NCLB means that every state and school district is responsible for ensuring that all students meet state standards by 2014. Further, schools are required to disaggregate standardized testing data in order to monitor the progress of their students by ethnic/racial group and by socio-economic status. Should schools be unable to meet the state-set requirements, known as Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), states, districts, and schools are required to focus additional attention and resources on schools determined to need improvement.

Should a school fail to meet goals set by AYP, gradations of intervention occur from year three to year seven in order to produce significant improvement. After failure to meet AYP for two consecutive years parents are given the option to transfer their children to higher performing schools within that school district. After three years tutoring and other supplemental educational services must be made available to minority and low-income students paid for by federal funds. In the fourth to sixth year of inability to meet AYP goals the school is subjected to “corrective
action” including replacement of staff, administration and management who are deemed “relevant to the failure to make AYP” (The Education Trust, 2003).

The strikingly glaring education gap between minority and poor students with affluent and White students in America is undeniable. The Adequate Yearly Progress goals of the NCLB sets standards for consistent progress by schools based on standards set by each state to ensure the academic proficiency of every student by 2014. This new call for accountability means that every teacher, staff member, and administrator is accountable for the reaching of these goals. Although every member of the organization of the school is responsible for meeting these accountability demands, this study examines the role of the school counselor as a force for positive student achievement.

**Georgia’s Education Gap and the Initiation of Accountability**

Under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, every state must ensure that every student meets or exceeds the state’s standard of proficiency in reading and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic term (The Education Trust, 2003). The most recent assessment of Elementary Reading Achievement shows that 74% of all fourth graders in Georgia meet or exceed the state’s standards for reading. However, this percentage of performance is not available in a disaggregated format to allow for examination of proficiency across racial/ethnic categories.

Beginning in 1992, The Education Trust has produced documentation for each state examining key education facts and figures related to the closing of educational gaps across racial/ethnic groups as called for by the NCLB legislation. The most recent data available from Georgia that allows for disaggregating of data across racial/ethnic categories are from the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) where 86% of all fourth graders
performed at the “basic” or higher level of reading (59% basic, 27% proficient or above). Disaggregated across racial/ethnic categories, significant differences across groups are evident in the percentage of students displaying basic or proficient skills. In 2003, 38% of the White 4th grade students scored at the proficient or above level compared to only 18% of the Latino students and 13% of the African American students. While only 28% of White 4th grade students scored on the below basic level of reading proficiency, 52% of Latino and 58% of African American students failed to meet at least basic requirements for reading proficiency. Over the six years from 1992 to 1998, the gaps in reading proficiency between White and African American students in Georgia actually widened by 4 points (roughly equivalent to half a year’s worth of learning), demonstrating a backslide in efforts to close the racial/ethnic gap in reading education (The Education Trust, 2003). From 1998 to 2003 there has been no statistical change in the performance gap between White and African American students in Georgia (National Center for Education Statistics, 2005).

Examining the most recent data available at the time of this review, the education gap in Georgia continues to persist. NAEP data for 2003 available at The Ed Watch Interactive State & National Data Site show that the average White 4th grade student scores significantly above the basic level and nearly at the proficient level for reading ability (NAEP average scale score – 226). However, both the average Latino and African American 4th grade student score below the basic level (NAEP average scale score – 201, 199 respectively). Also, nearly identical scores are evident between average scores for non-poor 4th graders (NAEP average scale score – 227) and average scores for poor 4th grades (NAEP average scale score – 200).

Similar patterns of gaps between performance of White students and African American and Latino students, and non-poor and poor students are evident in Georgia for each monitored
subject area (math, reading, science) from 1992 to 2003 (The Education Trust, 2004). Compared
to other states, Georgia ranked 41st out of 50 states (including District of Columbia) in
mathematics performance of its 4th graders; 40th in mathematics performance of its 8th graders;
38th in reading performance of its 4th graders; and 39th in reading performance of its 8th graders
(The Education Trust, 2004).

The scores reported for Georgia, although lower than the national average scores,
demonstrate similar trends across all states. White and affluent children score significantly
higher on measures of reading and mathematics ability than do their minority and less affluent
peers. Further, the average poor or minority student in America does not meet basic proficiency
levels for reading and mathematics in 2003 – with little, almost no, progress over the past decade
(The Education Trust, 2004).

Statistics such as these demonstrate the type of failure in closing the gap in educational
achievement that has lead to legislation such as the NCLB. The NCLB legislation reauthorizes
the Elementary and Secondary Act, allocating an additional ten billion dollars for teacher
recruitment and professional development, educational technology, after school programs, and
other educational purposes (The Education Trust, 2003). However, the addition of increased
funding under the NCLB also carries with it important accountability provisions establishing a
framework for expected progress in raising student achievement. These accountability
provisions require that states set clear timelines for the improvement of student performance –
especially the closing of achievement gaps between minority and low-income students and their
more affluent and Caucasian peers (The Education Trust, 2003).
The Call for School Counselor Accountability

The movement toward greater accountability has resulted in approaching education through the evaluation of teachers, counselors, administrators, schools, and entire districts based on student achievement on standardized tests, as well as other student performance indicators such as attendance, course selection, risk behaviors, graduation rates, retention rates, and educator training and certification (Isaacs, 2003). Although calls for accountability in education have been made prior to the NCLB 2001 legislation, and some school counselors have been involved in types of accountability efforts (Otwell & Mullis, 1997), as AYP progress is monitored and school performance evaluated under new legislation, the contribution of the school counselor in student achievement is under more scrutiny than ever before (Myrick, 2003).

In answering the call of accountability, the school counselor faces unique challenges. Four specific challenges emerge in the research concerning school counselors and accountability practices. These challenges include: (a) a limited body of research literature to draw upon; (b) absence from legislative policy; (c) school counselor role ambiguity, and (d) counselor resistance to evaluation (Green & Keyes, 2001; Myrick, 2003; Isaacs, 2003; Anderson, 2002).

For school counselors looking to educational or psychological literature for school counseling outcome-based evaluations studies, they may have to expect disappointment. According to Green and Keys (2001) these types of studies are virtually nonexistent. Other researchers have also described the body of literature on school counselor accountability as lacking or limited (Borders & Drury, 1992; Vacc, Rhyne-Winkler & Poidevant, 1993; Otwell & Mullis, 1997; Anderson, 2002). Myrick (2003) proposes that school counselors have largely ignored accountability practices because they view themselves as support personnel and not classroom teachers. Although calls for accountability are not new to American education, the
notion that funding for school counseling programs could be in jeopardy of being cut has not
been an aspect of previous policy, possibly explaining counselor apathy towards accountability
to this point (Otwell & Mullis, 1997). Although the causes for limited research may be
obfuscated, the brevity of the body of research exploring school counselor accountability is clear.

Another challenge facing school counselor accountability is the fact that school
counselors have largely been ignored in legislative policy. Psychological development and
social/emotional growth are less impressive to educational policymakers than is educational
development evidenced by improved test scores and grades (Gerler, 1992). For nearly the past
decade school counseling has been viewed as peripheral in the functioning of an educational
system and the reform of its practices. Although there have been numerous reports and proposals
made concerning the need and structure of school reform (e.g., National Commission on
Excellence in Education, 1983; National Education Goals Panel, 1994; U.S. Department of
Education, 1987) virtually none of these reports delineated school counseling as crucial to the
increase of student success in schools (Dahir, 2001). School counselors have been left out of
nearly every major school reform publication (Myrick, 2003), suggesting by omission, that
school counselors are not held accountable in the same ways that teachers and administrators are.
With school counselors left out of the school reform legislative policy and publications, the
preparation programs and school counselors themselves must answer the call for accountability.

The role of the school counselor often varies by school, district and state, and is often
subject to the perception of the supervisor or principal (Isaacs, 2003). Counselors are often
asked to act as consultants, crisis interventionists, trainers, group leaders, coordinators, and
psychological educators (Hardesty & Dillard, 1994; Ribak-Rosenthal, 1994). Counselors are
also asked to develop appropriate curriculum, educate parents and staff on issues and trends
related to the student welfare, oversee conflict resolution or mediation, participate in student assistance teams, and enhance career development skills (Cormey & Brantly, 1996). Coll and Freeman (1997) found that elementary school counselors were also asked to be substitute teachers, lunchroom and playground monitors, and to complete administrative tasks, in addition to their prescribed counseling duties. School counselors are also asked to be schedulers, secretaries, nurses, and aids when the demand arises. In a qualitative interview of novice school counselors and their supervisors (principals or assistant principals) Blaum (2003) found that counselors and supervisors often held different visions for the goal of school counseling and different ideas of what actions best served the goal of enhancing student success.

Not only must school counselors deal with a myriad of ideals for what school counseling should be, they must also deal with a myriad of external factors that impact their ability to practice effectively. Paisley & McMahon (2001) reported that the average student-to-counselor ratio ranges from 1 to 313 (Vermont) to 1 to 1,182 (California) (ACA, 1999). The number of students that a school counselor may serve can be very unpredictable; making it difficult to determine which interventions will be effective. Paisley and McMahon (2001) also described the challenge of the changing demographics in American society, reflected in the school systems. School counselors trained along traditionally Eurocentric lines may find that their educational theories and practices are not the most efficient or relevant for students with substantially different worldviews (Paisley & McMahon, 2001). Although initiatives have been taken to expound the role of multicultural education in school counseling preparation programs (i.e., The Multicultural Counseling Competencies and Standards {Sue, Arredondo, & McDairs, 1992], adopted by the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development) many preparation
programs provide only a single semester of a multicultural counseling course with limited opportunities for continued skill development (Paisley & McMahon, 2001).

Due to confusion about the appropriate role of the school counselor in the school’s mission of enhancing student success, common ideas about accountability are difficult to envision. Anderson (2002) described accountability efforts by those who do not understand the most effective interventions and most appropriate role of the school counselor as “haphazard and irresponsible.” Without clear expectations about the duties and boundaries of the school counselor, accountability methodology cannot be well defined and generalizable.

Myrick (2003) outlined a number of negative attitudes that school counselors tend to hold concerning evaluation and accountability. With high counselor-student ratios, a myriad of responsibilities, and varying expectations, counselors often believe that they simply do not have the time to engage in data collection. Currently without standardized methodologies for accountability, counselors often believe that they have to devise collection, organization, and analysis procedures with little or no support (Isaacs, 2003). To not only take on the responsibility of gathering effectiveness data, but to be responsible for developing the methodology to make that data meaningful presents the already-strapped-for-time school counselor with a truly daunting task.

Concurrent with concerns about time management, Myrick (2003) proposes that counselors often believe that they do not have the training or knowledge to effectively collect data and evaluate effectiveness. In the past, preparation programs have failed to prepare counselors to conduct empirical accountability evaluations (Campbell & Robinson, 1990). Due to their lack of training in accountability, school counselors often consider effectiveness evaluations as “scary”, “confronting”, and “threatening” (Myrick, 2003).
Although school counselor accountability has been largely neglected in American education prior to the twenty-first century, forces are currently converging to reverse this trend. Within the school counseling profession, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) has proposed standards to delineate clear direction concerning the role of the school counselor in the development, implementation and evaluation of a comprehensive school counseling program (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). In compliment to their standards, ASCA has also developed a model for school counseling programs. This model provides counselors with a methodology for developing district and school-based counseling programs to ensure the success of all students, setting the stage for standardized accountability practices (ASCA, 2003). Along with ASCA initiatives, the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) and CACREP standards have outlined new models for the roles of the school counselor in advocacy, leadership, counseling, collaboration and evaluation (Education Trust, 2003) as previously discussed.

From outside the profession of school counseling and the field of education, pressures for school counselor accountability are also mounting. States and districts are increasingly using standards-based models in funding allocations, pressing counselors to move towards accountability practices in order to secure resources (Isaacs, 2003). The No Child Left Behind Act (2001) represents possibly the most visible and widespread movement towards increased demand and reliance on data-driven accountability practices.

In developing new ideas for school counselor accountability, counselors must focus on accountability efforts that make the benefits of counseling, coordination, and consultation understandable and concrete (Otwell & Mullis, 1997). Traditional school counseling evaluations have focused more on readily available data (inputs; e.g., activities) rather than critical data (outcomes; e.g., retention rate) (Isaacs, 2003). Looking for established methodologies of
accountability to meet this change in data focus is largely a fruitless effort. However, Krumboltz (1974) was one of the first researchers to advocate for school counseling accountability, and proposed criteria for an effective accountability system (Myrick, 2003). These criteria include the following guidelines: (a) the general goals of counseling must be agreed upon by all parties, (b) gains must be stated in observable behavior changes by students, (c) counselor interventions and activities are viewed as costs, not accomplishments, (d) accountability systems must be positive and not designed to punish poor performance, (e) failures and unknown outcomes must be permitted without punishment, (f) those participating in the system must be involved in designing it, and (g) the system itself must be subject to evaluation and modification.

Data-driven effectiveness evaluation in school counseling can no longer be considered an optional activity for school counselors. Movements from within the field of school counseling and pressures from legislation at the local, state, and federal levels have exposed the lack of school counselor accountability practices as a void in education that must be addressed. School counselors and their preparation programs are faced with the challenge of designing accountability methodologies with few historical examples. This methodology for school counselor accountability described in this program evaluation is founded in Krumboltz’s ideas of mutually understood and developed roles and goals for the school counselor, a focus on critical outcome data rather than counselor activities, and constructive development rather than negative punishment.

**National Initiatives in Transforming School Counseling**

A national assessment of school counselor preparation and practice conducted by The Education Trust determined that prior to 1996 the field of school counseling lacked substantive change analogous to the current education reform movement (House & Hayes, 2002). Without a
unifying vision for how school counseling could be transformed, changes in counselor education

curriculum were limited to the addition of more course work. Counselor educators generally

lacked experience as school counselors and had limited recent or ongoing contact with practicing

school counselors. School counselor preparation was much akin to the preparation for mental

health specialists - focused primarily on generic counseling skills courses (The Education Trust,

2001).

With the belief that the work of school counselors is essential to student achievement, yet

often neglected in quality education, the Education Trust and the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund

undertook a national effort in 1998, designated as the Transforming School Counseling Initiative

(TSCI), to reform public school counseling (CAREI, 2001). The immediate goal of the TSCI

was to improve school counseling in public schools by transforming the graduate-level

preparation of counselors (CAREI, 2001). By changing the manner in which school counselors

are prepared, it was the overarching goals of the TSCI to close the gap in student success

between poor minority students and their more affluent peers. TSCI documentation has outlined

three objectives for the preparation of school counselors who can positively enhance student

success: (a) to prepare counselors who are knowledgeable about schools and the public school

system; (b) to prepare counselors who are equipped to help students meet academic and

social/emotional needs; and (c) prepare counselors who can advocate for systemic change to

remove barriers that impede the success of all students (CAREI, 2001).

In the achievement of these goals, the TSCI has emphasized specific skills that school

counselors need to be trained to effectively implement if they are to accomplish the goals of the

TSCI. These skills include: (a) teaming and collaboration with teachers, staff, administration,

and community partners; (b) provision of in-service trainings for teachers concerning children’s
developmental needs; (c) creation of peer mentoring and peer counseling programs to provide
support for all students; (d) assessment and evaluation of barriers to student success; (e)
collection and interpretation of student data for use in effectiveness evaluation and educational
reform; (f) advocacy for rigorous academic preparation and experiences that will broaden
educational and career options for all students; and (g) ability to link community agencies and
services with students and families (Musheno & Talbert, 2002).

The outlining of immediate and long term goals, objectives for preparation, and
establishment of specific skills sets for the transformed school counselor represents a significant
shift in the philosophy of the training and implementation of school counseling. TSCI
established school counselors as individuals who, previously responsible for supporting
individual students’ personal and social issues (CAREI, 2001), are now responsible for being
“proactive leaders and advocates for high achievement for all students, especially poor and
minority youth” (The Education Trust, 2000).

As part of the TSCI, the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds awarded planning and
implementation grants to school counselor preparation programs at six universities – California
State University, Indiana State University, The Ohio State University, University of West
Georgia, The University of Georgia, and the University of North Florida (CAREI, 2001, 2002c).
These universities have undertaken the tasks of updating their curriculum, recruiting a more
diverse counseling student population, redesigning their practicum experiences, and
strengthening their partnerships with local school districts and state education agencies (CAREI,
2002c). These tasks of change for the TSCI preparation programs were guided by eight specific
elements outlined by the Education Trust. These elements included the mandatory
implementation of change in the following areas central to school counselor preparation: (a)
criteria for selection and recruitment of candidates, (b) curricular content, structure and sequence
of courses, (c) methods of instruction, field experiences and practices, (d) induction process into
the profession, (e) working relationships with community partners, (f) professional development
for counselor educators, (g) university/school district partnerships, and (h) university/state
department of education partnerships (CAREI, 2001).

As the six targeted universities implemented initial changes into their preparation
programs, a number of concerns and challenges become evident in the TSCI literature. These
concerns and challenges represented roadblocks to the transformation of the school counselor as
an individual responsible for individual support into one responsible for systemic student
success. The complexity of the change espoused by the TSCI requires attention to state
mandates and district policies that may either support or limit the ways in which school
counselor reform is implemented (Eilers, 2002). Also, given the recent pushes in federal and
state legislation, state accountability requirements present additional challenges to the goals and
strategies of the TSCI (CAREI, 2002b). A third significant challenge to the implementation of
the TSCI is that a change in the actions and attitudes of school counselors is a long-term project.
Any change that occurs in school counselor performance through the preparation program will
likely occur as new policies and expectations become embedded in the cultures of the school
over time (CAREI, 2002b).

While the Transforming School Counseling Initiative, supported by the Wallace-Reader’s
Digest Fund and The Education Trust is an ambitious and comprehensive plan for the evolution
of the school counseling profession, it is not the only one. In 2002 the American School
Counseling Association (ASCA) created a national model for the framework of school
counseling programs. While the TSCI focuses mainly on the structure and philosophy of school
counseling preparation programs, the ASCA national model lays out a plan for the revision of existing school counseling programs.

The goals of the ASCA national model are to establish the school counseling program as an integral component of the school’s academic mission, to ensure that every student has equitable access to the school counseling program, to identify and deliver knowledge and skills that all students should acquire and to ensure that the school counseling program is comprehensive in design and systemically serves all students (ASCA, 2003). The ASCA model is comprised of four components – foundation, delivery system, management systems and accountability designed to lead to systemic change (ASCA, 2003). Based on the goals of each school, a programmatic foundation created by a shared vision and clear beliefs and philosophies based on the ASCA national standards are crucial to the development of a progressive and effective school counseling department. Based on a strong foundation, the delivery system refers to the guidance curriculum, responsive services, individual student planning, and system support that ensure the delivery of services. As a foundation is built and the systems for delivery implemented, a management system is implemented that clearly delineates the school counselors’ role in meeting the needs of the school. Although not typically viewed as “managers”, counselors can promote organizational continuity by using school wide data to evaluate interventions, developing action plans to address desired systemic changes, and communicating the ideal use of the school counselor’s time and abilities to staff and administration. Finally, counselors can embrace accountability by collecting outcome data and linking their interventions to demonstrated student success (ASCA, 2003).

A set of national standards established by the ASCA National Model outlines the competencies (knowledge, attitudes, skills) that a competent school counselor is expected to
demonstrate. The school counselor who adheres to these ASCA standards is able to enhance the academic development, career development and personal/social development of all students (ASCA, 2003). These standards also outline the expected responsibilities of the school counselor. The ASCA National Standards, embedded in the National Model, assert that school counselors are most effective in enhancing the success of students when they act as consultant to master scheduling, as opposed to a data manager. Further, school counselors are most effective when they coordinate testing and interpret results, as opposed to test administration. They are most effective when providing counseling to students facing disciplinary action, as opposed to initiating discipline themselves (ASCA, 2003).

In 1981, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) was organized for the purpose of reviewing and evaluating counseling practices in higher education programs in light of a set of nationally recognized standards (Bobby & Kandor, 1995). Created through the American Counseling Association (ACA) CACREP was designed to define the knowledge and skills required for entry into the profession and to advocate that these requirements be implemented by the preparation programs offering counseling degrees (Bobby & Kandor, 1995). CACREP’s mission – to promote the advancement of quality educational program through accreditation based on accepted standards, is viewed by CACREP as “a means of proactively strengthening our profession…(and) a powerful tool for self-evaluation and improvement” (CACREP, 2004).

In 2001 CACREP disseminated a set of standards that represent the “minimal criteria for the preparation of professional counselors, counselor educators, and student affairs professionals” (CACREP, 2001). These standards establish requirements for programmatic accreditation of school counseling preparation programs based on eight areas of core
competence. The areas included: (a) professional identity and orientation, (b) social and cultural diversity, (c) human growth and development, (d) career development, (e) helping relationships, (f) group work, (g) assessment and evaluation, and (h) research and program evaluation. In addition to these eight areas of competence, school counseling preparation programs must also include within their curriculum experiences that address the foundations of school counseling, the contextual dimension of school counseling, the knowledge and skills required for school counseling, and a 600-hour supervised internship experience (CACREP, 2001).

The TSCI, ASCA National Model and CACREP accreditation present ambitious and comprehensive ideals for the future of school counseling. While previously left out of school reform discussions, the rise of accountability in American education has forced the hands of school counselors to be more relevant and crucial to successful delivery of educational services to all students – regardless of race or economic access. Preparation programs are beginning to structure their training in new ways to meet increasing demands upon their graduates. School counselors are expected to be able to be leaders, advocates, collaborators and evaluators. By embracing these changes in philosophy and action at all stages in the preparation and career of the school counselor, it may be possible to move the school counselor into a position not forgotten in school reform, but central to it.

The Georgia Board of Regents’ Principles and Actions for School Counselor Training

In 1931 The University System of Georgia's Board of Regents was created as a part of a reorganization of Georgia's state government. The Board was created to oversee public higher education in Georgia under a single governing body. Appointed by the governor, members to the Board each serve a seven-year term. Currently, the Board of Regents is composed of 18 members, five appointed from the state-at-large, and one from each of the 13 congressional
districts. The Board is responsible for the oversight of 34 academic institutions: 4 research universities, 2 regional universities, 13 state universities, 2 state colleges, and 13 two-year colleges. These institutions enroll more than 233,000 students and employ more than 9,000 faculty and 35,000 employees to provide teaching and related services to students and the communities in which they are located (Georgia Board of Regents, 2003).

In 1998, the Georgia Board of Regents approved the “Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools.” Addressing teachers, educational leaders and school counselors, three sections delineate the standards for the preparation of these professionals in public Georgian universities. Approved in the fall of 2004, Section III – “Principles for the Preparation of School Counselors” outlines rubrics that measure institutional progress towards the meeting of goals of quality assurance, collaboration and responsiveness set by the Board (Georgia Board of Regents, 2003).

These rubrics outline the scope of work that school counselors are expected to perform, as well as the manner by which counselor preparation programs are expected to monitor and assess their graduates’ proficiencies. There are five major areas outlined in Section III as being necessary for counselors to be effective in increasing student success: leadership, advocacy, teamwork and collaboration, counseling and coordination, and assessment and evaluation (Georgia Board of Regents, 2003).

Based on these principles, the school counselor will now be expected to demonstrate effective leadership in the development, implementation, and evaluation of a comprehensive school plan that works toward school reform (Rubric IIA[4]). In addition, the counselor must be an advocate for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students (Rubric IIA[1]). Further, the counselor must demonstrate
effective collaboration with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and community initiatives that meet student needs (Rubric IIA[7]). As well, counselors must be effective in providing individual and group classroom guidance that promotes academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for each student (Rubric IIA[6]). And finally, the counselor must be effective in assessing student needs via outcome data and implementing change to facilitate student success (Rubric IIA[5]).

Section III also outlines the manner by which counselor education programs are accountable for their graduates’ proficiencies, including but not limited to: guaranteeing that graduates meet all expectations, and providing additional training for any graduate identified by a school system as not meeting expectations (Rubric IIB[1]); mentoring graduates during their first two years of practice as newly certified school counselors in Georgia (Rubric IIB[2]); and ensuring that the number of school counselor graduates reflects the racial/ethnic diversity represented in the school-age population of the institution’s service area (Rubric IIB[4]) (Georgia Board of Regents, 2003).

According the Georgia Board of Regents – “school counselors are largely responsible for the social, emotional, and career development necessary for the academic success of all children and should serve in a leadership role to create conditions that support student and teacher success (Regents’ Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors, p.1). This philosophy concerning the importance of school counselors, if not influenced by, then at least mirroring efforts from, the TSCI, CACREP, and ASCA movements, sets the stage for the preparation of school counselors integral to school reform in the state of Georgia.
The Use of Portfolio Assessment in Answering the Call for Counselor Accountability

Over the past decade, educators have endorsed the use of collecting cumulative and representative samples of students’ work through portfolio evaluations. Portfolios are designed to document the progress, accomplishments, experiences, and development of students through the collection of produced works, reflection, and evaluation (Magnuson, 1997). A number of benefits have been identified in evaluating performance through portfolio work, including offering a growth-oriented format for monitoring development over time; and displaying unique strengths and weakness of the individual evidenced in their actual work (Boes, 2001).

Existing literature concerning portfolio assessment has primarily focused on teacher assessment of student performance. Guidance portfolios of students’ work has been introduced to chronicle students’ interests and goals, facilitate safekeeping and convenient reference of individual information, and facilitate communication between students, guidance staff, and parents (Magnuson, 1997). Observable results of portfolio evaluation have included increased student ability to identify and anticipate personal changes in learning and competence, recognition of relationships between interests and career decision-making, and age-appropriate career exploration and research (Magnuson, 1997).

Despite the present calls in legislation for accountability, school counseling evaluation and accountability studies are virtually nonexistent (Studer & Sommers, 2000). However, there have been suggestions in counselor accountability literature to modify portfolio assessment for use by school counselors (Boes, 2001; Studer & Sommers, 2000; Rhyne-Winkler & Wooten, 1996). By generalizing the portfolio process to counselor evaluation is believed to be able to stimulate development in the areas of counseling skill, personal identity, professional identity, competence, and interpersonal relationships (Rhyne-Winkler & Wooten, 1996). School
counselor portfolios, designed to allow counselors to take personal responsibility in the evaluation process, are necessary if counselors wish to provide in-depth portrayals of the effectiveness of their work (Rhyne-Winkler & Wooten, 1996).

Portfolio assessment, although central for the school counselor in demonstrating effectiveness, is not without its own unique challenges. Portfolios often suffer from poor organization, proper storage and care, and a lack of standardization and generalizability (Lockledge & Weinman, 2001). As portfolio evaluation is often perceived as a “hodgepodge” of collected works, some educators navigate the process by simply collecting anything relevant to their work with the idea that it may one day be useful. The “pack rat” approach to portfolio assessment limits effective communication, ease of navigation, and relevance to student outcome accountability. The solution to these approaches to portfolio collection come from the world of the technological – dubbed “e-portfolios” (Lockledge & Weinman, 2001).

The e-portfolio, a compilation of school counselor works and experiences based in electronic formatting (e.g., World Wide Web, CD-ROM) has four distinct advantages over traditional portfolio compilation: accessibility, maintainability, usability, and security (Rogers, 1998). Accessibility refers to the ease of which school counselors, candidates, faculty, and administrators can access and/or manipulate data in the development of the portfolio. Internet-based assessments benefit from the ability to be accessed from virtually any computer terminal with access to the Internet across the globe. Regardless of physical location, as long as access to the Internet is available, the portfolio’s content can be accessed by anyone with proper authorization. CD-ROM based portfolios are less accessible, as ownership of the data disk itself is necessary for manipulation; however through server uploads and downloads over the Internet, the data on the CD-ROM may be transferred with instantaneous results and accuracy.
Maintenance of e-portfolios requires equal or less effort that paper compilations of work samples. For example, a school counselor who was influential in the development of a new mission statement for their counseling department wishes to add the statement to their portfolio. An e-portfolio allows for the transfer of a word processing document to be simply copied to a disk and “drop and dragged” into the appropriate folder on the CD-ROM or uploaded to a personal web page on the Internet. A traditional portfolio demands a paper print out of the statement, inserted into a physical folder stored either at the counselor’s home or office, subject to damage from fire, the family dog, or any number of everyday environmental hazards. Maintenance also of a consistent structure of the e-portfolio is necessary to insure ease of navigation and appropriate availability of necessary information (Lockledge & Weinman, 2001).

Usability of the e-portfolio refers to the ease of which the system is to use. Both the individual compiling the information, and those who receive the information, must perceive the process as easy to use. Lockledge & Weinman (2001) state that in order to ensure the usability of the e-portfolio system, clear definitions must be provided for the objectives of the portfolio, methods of assessment and evaluation rubrics. Also, technological instruction must be available to individuals who are required to utilize an e-portfolio system but do not exhibit confidence in their technological prowess.

Security of electronic information is a critical issue in the application of sensitive information available over the Internet or on computer format. Security of information moves in two directions – can those who should not have access to the information be locked out; and should those who should have access to the information be allowed in? (Lockledge & Weinman, 2001). While there are no absolute answers to the questions of electronic security vs. Internet hackers, any ventures into the use of e-portfolios must take into account the most reasonable
measures to insure the secure transfer of sensitive and often personal information obtained in school counseling.

There are two predominate models for portfolio systems used by educators – the developmental model and the showcase model (Christy & Lima, 1998). The developmental model is the result of material added by the student to the portfolio throughout the learning process. The development portfolio is designed to accommodate a comprehensive collection of the student’s work – regardless of quality, outcome, or evaluation. The showcase model differs in that it is essentially a “best of” compilation of the student’s work. This type of portfolio contains items of examples that represent the student’s best work – either the most well constructed or the most effective. The showcase model of portfolio designed is considered the most effective in demonstrating skills and developmental progress.

The call for accountability in education no longer affords any school staff member ignorance of effectiveness evaluation. Through the use of portfolio assessment, school counselors can document the progress of their professional development, record accomplishments and personally rewarding experiences, and provide an opportunity to demonstrate to instructors, peers, administrators, and evaluators the effectiveness of their interventions (Magnuson, 1997). Traditional conceptions of the portfolio – typically binders or folders housing paper records are limited by issues of accessibility, maintainability, usability, and security (Lockledge & Weinman, 2001). The e-portfolio, an electronic compilation of school counselors’ various works, reflections, preparation materials, and outcome data, allows for greater ease and communication of accountability related information.
Summary

The continuance of the gap between impoverished and privileged students in America is a primary force driving calls for accountability in education reform. New initiatives in school counselor reform are driving the school counselor to be a central figure in closing this gap by promoting the academic, emotional, and social success of every student they serve.

It is the work of counseling psychologists to help individuals lead more productive and meaningful lives. This description of a program evaluation is an attempt by one counseling psychologist to do that by analyzing and reshaping the process by which school counselors impact the emotional and academic success of their students. By helping school counselors more effectively intervene in the lives of their students, this evaluation will hopefully generate long-term positive results for all students, regardless of their race, gender or socioeconomic status. Further, this program evaluation will hopefully generate a system by which future program evaluations can be developed and organized efficiently and effectively.

The program evaluation described here is based on the human services evaluation model designed by Posavac & Carey (2003). In this chapter the methodological outline was presented; in the next chapter the specific ways in which that outline will be implemented are described. This description utilizes a process model of evaluation to examine how the existing structure of school counseling training and implementation can be retooled according to changes in school counseling preparation policy to more effectively deliver services to students.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

This dissertation represents the in-depth written report that documents the review of the literature, the identification of stakeholders, and the results of the program evaluation of one School Counseling preparation program in the state of Georgia; and recommendations for the development of a system – the School Counseling Outcome & Program Evaluation (SCOPE) that can be used as a standardized system for similar evaluations with other preparation programs. The methods and procedures used to assess the Masters in School Counseling program at the University of Georgia are described based on Posovac & Carey’s (2003) model for human services process evaluation, described in the previous chapter.

The first goal of the following chapter is to outline the process by which the Masters in School Counseling program at the University of Georgia was evaluated for compliance with the guidelines of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia’s “Regent’s Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors” implemented in 2004. As reviewed in chapter 2, Posovac & Carey (2003) outline six steps necessary for the implementation of a human services process program evaluation.

These steps include the following, which are used as an outline for the evaluation of the preparation program: (a) identification of relevant people; (b) arranging preliminary meetings; (c) assessing the evaluability of the program; (d) examining the literature, (e) determining the methodology; and (f) writing a proposal. Due to the nature of this evaluation, within the context of a doctoral level dissertation, some modification is made to the order in which these steps are
undertaken, however qualitative alterations to Posovac & Carey’s (2003) were attempted to be kept to a minimum. As should be evident to the reader, the fourth step described by Posovac & Carey, examining the literature, was conducted in the earliest stages of this evaluation and is presented in the second chapter. This program evaluation was designed within the context of national and state level educational reform and accountability, the changing role of the school counselor, and the proliferation of portfolio-based assessment methods in accountability – the most salient issues of these contexts presented in the previous chapters.

The second goal of this dissertation is to outline the development of the School Counseling Outcome & Program Evaluation (SCOPE) system, a multi-tool process designed to guide the future evaluation of school counselor preparation programs in the assessment of their students’ abilities and philosophies over the course of preparation through graduation and employment. This system was conceived as a method to collect, organize and present evaluative data in future evaluations of similar programs in a manner that is efficient and effective.

*Phase One - Pre-Evaluation*

This program evaluation is theoretically based on the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia’s “Regent’s Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors” implemented in 2004. This evaluation is also founded philosophically on the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) national model and the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) core areas of counseling.

Prior to the initiation of this program evaluation, the faculty and administration of the Masters in School Counseling program attended trainings from the Georgia Board of Regents in regards to the new principles for the preparation of school counselors. These trainings were held in Atlanta, GA and included collaborative discussions with faculty and administration across
various school counselor preparation programs working under the auspices of the Board of Regents in the state of Georgia.

Documentation was provided to the faculty and administrations delineating nine performance-based rubrics that graduates of school counseling programs are expected to be proficient at upon completion of their preparation. In becoming proficient in these nine areas, school counselors are expected to increase students’ social/emotional development and career preparedness (Rubric [IA]), and enhance student’s academic success (Rubric [IB]). The nine performance outcomes for school counselor candidates are listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIA(1)</td>
<td>Advocate for school policies, programs and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA(2)</td>
<td>Advocate for rigorous academic preparation of all students to close the achievement gaps among demographic groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA(3)</td>
<td>Coordinate a school to career transition plan for each student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA(4)</td>
<td>Provide leadership in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan that contributes to school renewal by promoting increased academic success, career preparedness, and social/emotional development for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA(5)</td>
<td>Use student outcome data to facilitate student academic success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA(6)</td>
<td>Provide individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA(7)</td>
<td>Collaborate with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA(8)</td>
<td>Assess student needs and make appropriate referrals to school and/or community resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA(9)</td>
<td>Demonstrate mastery and application of the content knowledge in each of the following eight core areas of counseling recommended by CACREP: (1) Professional Identity and Orientation; (2) Social and Cultural Diversity; (3) Human Growth and Development; (4) Career Development; (5) Helping Relationships; (6) Group Work; (7) Assessment and Evaluation; (8) Research and Program Evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each performance outcome for school counselor performance listed in Table 1, the “Regent’s Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors” outlines five levels of progress that represents the development of each skills area from presentation by the preparation program to mastery of the skill by the school counselor. These levels of progress, outlined by the Georgia Board of Regents, are benchmarks for the progress of the preparation program and the school counselor. An example of these levels of progress, as taken from the Regent’s Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counseling (Georgia Board of Regents, 2004) is presented in Table 2.
Table 2. Example for levels of progress of performance outcomes for school counselor candidates for counselor candidate performance rubric IA(1) (Georgia Board of Regents, 2004)

IA(1). Advocate for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description of Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Curriculum includes the advocacy role of school counselors for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Candidates have opportunities during field-placements to practice advocating for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Candidates are assessed on their effectiveness in advocating for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evidence confirms that candidates have demonstrated effective advocacy for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The levels of progress described in Table 2 are thematically similar across the nine performance outcomes. For each performance outcome, the “0” level indicates insufficient evidence for judgment concerning the counselors’ competency in the area; the “1” level indicates
inclusion of skills and/or philosophies necessary for understanding of the area; the “2” level indicates opportunities in practicum or internship field sites for development of the area; the “3” level indicates that the school counselor candidate has been assessed by preparation program faculty and/or field-placement staff in regards to the outcome area, and the “4” level indicates that the assessment of that school counselor indicates effectiveness in implementation of the outcome area.

Successful evaluation of this level of progression, however, is dependent upon the efforts of not only the preparation program faculty and administration, but on the field-placement staff and administration and the school counselor candidates themselves. In the initial stages of preparation, level one school counselors are expected to be gaining initial exposure to the expected performance areas (Table 1). This exposure occurs through course work and experiences such as service learning projects that are detailed within course syllabi (Table 2). At this level, it is the responsibility of the preparation program to provide evidence of exposure from these course syllabi. Development at level two indicates that candidates have opportunities for learning and practicing the specific performance outcome at their field-placement. At this level, it is the responsibility of both the preparation program and the administration of the field-placement to provide descriptive documentation of these opportunities.

Development at level three indicates that candidates are assessed on their effectiveness in implementing the expected performance outcome (Table 2). The final level, level four (Table 2) indicates that the candidate has effectively mastered the skill outlined by providing appropriate evidence determined for level three, and that the evidence has been evaluated by the candidate’s supervisors and found to have generated measurable outcomes with positive results. This level of developmental achievement will undoubtedly require input across all levels – the preparation
program faculty and administration, the field-placement staff and administration and the school counselor candidates themselves.

**Phase Two – Instrument Development**

An evaluation of the Masters in School Counseling program in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services was begun in the spring academic semester 2004 at the College of Education at the University of Georgia in Athens, GA. The University of Georgia is a state-chartered institution located in northeast Georgia with approximately 33,000 enrolled students (undergraduate and graduate). Along with undergraduate education, the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services houses graduate programs in college student affairs administration, community counseling, counseling psychology, recreation and leisure studies, and school counseling.

This program evaluation began through the School Research Group (SRG), a research group comprised of doctoral and masters level students and departmental faculty from the counseling psychology, community counseling, and school counseling departments. The SRG focuses on field-based action research models designed to assess a variety of school interventions developed to impact real-world school problems. Research is conducted in partnership with practicing school counselors, including the Clarke County Community Collaborative, on a broad range of issues, including: empowerment, school climate, professional development, school violence, drop-out prevention, and mentoring minority students.

The School Research Group was utilized in the first three steps of Posovac and Carey’s (2003) model - identifying relevant people, arranging preliminary meetings, and assessing the evaluability of the program. These steps were initially undertaken within the School Research
Group to set the foundation for the methodology needed to generate an effective evaluation of the Masters in School Counseling program through the SCOPE system.

Specific questions concerning the feasibility to evaluate the program include the following: (a) has the theoretical basis of the program been established; (b) have sufficient resources been allotted for the evaluation; (c) are sponsors of the evaluation prepared to implement proposed changes; and (d) are the expectations of the program plausible. In meetings over the course of the Spring 2004 and Fall 2005 semesters, discussions took place among students and faculty, the content of which was recorded and is presented in chapter four of this study.

As part of this process, the SRG reviewed documents from the Board of Regents, from the initial report to the GBOR, and from CACREP, as well as program evaluations used in the Transforming School Counseling Initiative. At this time program faculty and doctoral students from the SRG developed the program evaluation process and system by operationalizing the competencies and determining the types of documentation that would be used to support mastery. From the development of this evaluation, a number of instruments were developed in order to facilitate an organized and efficient program evaluation. These instruments include the SCOPE Candidate Evaluation Form Prototype (SCOPE CEF; Appendix A), the SCOPE CEF Feedback Form (Appendix B), the SCOPE Preparation Program Assessment Form (SCOPE PRAF; Appendix C), and the SCOPE Supervisor Evaluation Form (SCOPE SEF; Appendix D).

With the presented rubrics and levels of progress established by the Georgia Board of Regents, initial SRG discussion focused on operationalizing the supporting documentation necessary to begin tracking school counselor candidate progress. The organization of this process took the shape of the SCOPE Candidate Evaluation Form (CEF; Appendix A). The
SCOPE CEF is the primary document in the SCOPE system and represents the method by which
school counselor candidate progress is tracked. The SCOPE CEF outlines the levels of progress
for each principle (see Table 2) and then provides five corresponding levels of documentation for
each level of progress, as seen in Table 3.

| 0 = No documentation provided or documentation does not support principle. |
| 1 = Course syllabi documenting lessons/class activities/practicum work requiring understanding of school policies and programs related to cultural differences among students; as well as advocacy actions that address cultural achievement gaps in student success. Above principle evident in course objectives (knowledge, skills attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings available in included course syllabi. |
| 2 = Description of practicum/internship field placement provided by the candidate preparation program and field placement administration detailing activities for learning and participation in advocacy process concerning school policies addressing cultural achievement gaps in student success. Field placements described in program handbook, stated in Memorandum of Understanding between preparation program and field site, and/or opportunities described in field site’s brochure/literature. |
| 3 = Description of class assignment or field case study in which candidate engaged in advocacy that addressed cultural achievement gaps in student success. Log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees, and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio. |
Over the course of the candidate’s development, the preparation program utilizes the SCOPE CEF to monitor the development of counseling skills, and to guide collection of materials necessary for accountability of mastery of required competencies.

The SCOPE CEF Feedback Form (Appendix B) was designed by the SRG to organize recommendations concerning the CEF and determine feasibility of using the CEF in future program evaluation. Four qualitative questions (Table 4) were designed to obtain feedback from respondents regarding aspects of the SCOPE CEF.

**Table 4. Questions on the SCOPE CEF Feedback Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Is this instrument feasible for pre-service preparation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Is this instrument feasible for in-service evaluation/accountability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) If not, what other method would you suggest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) What would a candidate or counselor have to document to demonstrate competence?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In early SRG meetings it was established that the SCOPE CEF, although not necessarily in the same format at the beginning of phase one as in its final development, would be the basis
for the entire SCOPE system. The SCOPE CEF was conceptualized as the foundation for monitoring candidate development by the preparation program.

The SCOPE Preparation Program Assessment Form (Appendix C) was also created from SRG collaboration. The SCOPE Preparation Program Assessment Form (PPAF) uses a Likert-type scale in which individuals respond to three questions about the preparation program’s introduction of the Georgia Board of Regent’s Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors (2004). The respondent is asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Not at All; 2 = Somewhat; 3 = Quite A Lot; 4 = Completely) the three questions listed in Table 5 across the Georgia Board of Regent’s nine principles.

| Question 1. Please rate the degree to which you believe that your preparation program has presented you with a clear understanding of the meaning of the principle and its importance as a competency for school counselors. |
| Question 2. Please rate the degree to which you believe that your preparation program has designed learning experiences to help you gain exposure and mastery over the competencies involved. |
| Question 3. Please rate the degree to which you believe that you have/will have access to supporting documentation required to verify knowledge of the required competency. |

The SCOPE Supervisor Evaluation Form (SCOPE SEF; Appendix D) was designed by the SRG in order to obtain qualitative feedback from on-site supervisors regarding the availability of
opportunities to practice required principles (see Table 1) at the site, and supervisor evaluation of candidate’s level of competence for each principle.

The SCOPE SEF lists each principle (Table 1) and asks supervisors to indicate a yes or no response to the statement “opportunities have been provided”. For each principle, supervisors were also asked to indicate the “level of competence” by endorsing one of the following: N/A, Needs Improvement, Satisfactory, and Highly Competent. Space is provided for comments at the end of each section, which is encouraged in the instructions of the SEF. The manner in which these items were presented is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Example Question on the SCOPE Supervisor Evaluation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. School counselor candidates advocate for school policies, programs and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities have been provided.  ____ yes  ____ no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of competence (please circle one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase Three – Evaluation of the Program**

As previously noted, in the review of the literature in chapter two, the next phase entails determination of the methodology. For this study both qualitative and quantitative feedback from stakeholders previously collected by preparation program faculty was evaluated to achieve the most complete picture of the issues associated with the incorporation of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia’s Regent’s Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors (2004) in the school counseling program. After identifying the stakeholders
through the School Research Group, the results of which are described in chapter four, feedback from these individuals was examined in the evaluation of the program as a whole. This progressive evaluative analysis of pre-existing data was made available by the faculty and administration in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services at the University of Georgia.

This third phase of the evaluation involves an evaluation of an interim structure for the process evaluation at the University of Georgia’s Masters in School Counseling preparation program. In this program, school counseling program faculty and administration required candidates to use the SCOPE documents developed by the School Research Group to develop experience and opportunities for learning during their yearlong internship. Additionally, candidates were evaluated twice by their site supervisors using the Supervisor Evaluation Form – once at the end of fall semester as a formative evaluation delineating opportunities for involvement with that area and level of competence related to the principle. At the end of internship, supervisors completed a final version of the SEF. Interns were also required to complete a data-based intervention and turn in a summary of the project. In addition, they completed a standard College of Education end-of-course evaluation, a Preparation Program Assessment Form, an exit survey, and an exit interview. One student volunteered to provide feedback about strengths, difficulties, etc. through an extended interview with the Program Coordinator and one of the doctoral students.

From these programmatic activities, available data was obtained from program faculty and administrators who utilized SCOPE documents in the gathering and organization of feedback. Of the program activities described the following activities yielded enough data to be effectively assessed in this program evaluation: (a) student use of the SCOPE CEF Feedback
Form to develop experience and opportunities for learning; (b) intern evaluations from site supervisors at the end of the Fall 2004 semester as a formative evaluation and at the end of the Spring 2005 semester as a final evaluation; (c) intern completion of the SCOPE Preparation Program Evaluation Form to evaluate programmatic strengths and weaknesses; (d) graduating student exit surveys of the School Counseling M.Ed. Program administered by the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services; and (e) an exit interview from one school counseling candidate conducted by the Program Coordinator and one doctoral student. Due to the availability of data and feasibility issues the candidate summary of a data-based intervention and the end-of-course evaluations required by the College of Education were unable to be obtained for evaluation.

**Step One.**

The evaluation of the preparation program began with an analysis of qualitative feedback generated in an internship class from students enrolled in the Education Specialist (Ed.S.) - School Behavior Specialist degree. Program faculty presented the system to current Masters and Ed.S. students, as well as members of the Classic City Counselors’ Collaborative, the primary advisory group for the program, to solicit feedback for refining the process including feasibility and utility for graduate candidates and practicing counselors. The CEF Feedback Form was used by program faculty and doctoral students to organize recommendations and determine feasibility.

The SCOPE CEF feedback Form was presented to 21 students during an internship level supervisory class. Of these 21 students, 10 identified themselves as school counselors with three or more years of experience; 3 identified themselves as licensed professional counselors (LPC); 2 as school counselor supervisors; 2 as school counselors with less than two years of experience;
2 as first year school counseling graduate students; 1 as a school counselor educator; and 1 as a school social worker with three or more years of experience.

The goal of this phase was to receive feedback on the initial prototype of the SCOPE CEF in regards to its feasibility in the format it was presented. Realizing that the SCOPE CEF, although not necessarily in the same format at the beginning of phase one as in its final development, would be the basis for the entire SCOPE system. The SCOPE CEF was conceptualized as the basic tool for monitoring candidate development by the preparation program.

Step Two.

The second step involves an analysis of the presentation of the SCOPE Preparation Program Assessment Form (Appendix C) to a panel of twelve school counselor candidates currently attending the Masters of Education Program in school counseling at the University of Georgia. The SCOPE PRAF was presented by the course instructor to a group of school counselor candidates during the fall semester. Candidates were asked to provide feedback based on their preparation experiences compared to the experiences required by the Georgia Board of Regents Principles. The goal of this evaluation is to compare the extent to which the nine core principles have been presented to the candidates, and to determine the extent to which the candidates currently perceive that they have access to supporting documentation required to verify knowledge of the required core principles.

Step Three.

In the third step of the program evaluation, the responses of one student from the twelve school counselor candidates (described in phase two) were evaluated for a more in-depth analysis of issues and concerns regarding the Georgia Board of Regents “Principles for the
Preparation of School Counselors” (Georgia Board of Regents, 2004). This student was chosen and interviewed by the Program Coordinator of School Counseling program at the University of Georgia due to a record of excellence in academic and practical work.

The targeted student was asked to comment on the following: (a) the extent which the preparation program at the University of Georgia currently addresses each of the nine principles (Georgia Board of Regents, 2004); (b) the extent to which obtaining required supporting documentation listed on the SCOPE CEF was feasible; and (c) general comments on the development of the SCOPE system. The interview lasted for approximately 45 minutes and was recorded. In this evaluation, the salient issues of that interview were analyzed and transcribed based on their relevance to the evaluation of the targeted program.

**Step Four.**

In the fourth step of the program evaluation, graduating student exit surveys administered by the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services at the University of Georgia were evaluated. These exit surveys were administered by the Program Coordinator to the twelve school counseling candidates at the end of the Spring 2005 academic semester. The Graduating Student Exit Survey (Appendix E) asked candidates to quantitatively rate (using a five-point scale with 5 representing the highest level of and 1 representing the lowest level) the perceived importance and quality of classes comprising the school counseling curriculum. Candidates were also asked to rate the quality of the following items using the five-point rating scale: (a) faculty support; (b) staff support; (c) practicum experience; (d) internship experience; and (e) doctoral student supervision.

Candidates were asked to provide qualitative responses providing comments, suggestions, or recommendations for any of the quantitative items, as well as recommendations
to other students concerning electives courses taken and an overall letter grade of the program on a scale of A to F. Of the twelve exit surveys completed by the candidates, all twelve were made available by the Program Coordinator for this evaluation.

*Step Five.*

In the fifth step of program evaluation the SCOPE Supervisor Evaluation Forms (SCOPE SEF; Appendix D) was evaluated. These evaluations had been provided to the supervisors of the twelve school counselor candidates (see students in phase two) by the Program Coordinator and subsequently made available for this evaluation. The evaluations available for analysis were completed at the mid-point and end-point of a yearlong internship position.

*Phase Four – Summarizing the Evaluation*

The fourth phase in this study, in keeping with Posovac & Carey’s (2003) model for process evaluation of human services programs, is to write a comprehensive report. In this study, chapter five presents a generalizable format across higher education institutions in Georgia for the preparation and training of school counselors according to the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia’s 2004 “Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors”.
As stated in the previous chapter, the first step in the development of this program evaluation system occurred from dialogue within the School Research Group (SRG) in the Department of Counseling and Human Development at the University of Georgia. Presented in the first section of this results chapter are the outcomes of specific conversations relevant to the initial development of this evaluation process. The method for program evaluation was developed through a stepwise progression of checking for utility and feasibility by individuals identified as stakeholders in the development of a transformed system by which school counselors would be prepared in the state of Georgia. The described system was piloted as the program evaluation for one Georgia Board of Regents School Counseling Program.

The manner by which this evaluation’s methodology was designed was presented in the previous chapter. In this chapter, the results of this methodology are presented. In the following and final chapter, these results are synthesized into a new vision for how preparation programs can evaluate and change the way in which their school counselors are trained to comply with the Georgia Board of Regents, national movements in school counseling transformation, and accountability legislature.

Phase Two – Instrument Development

Through the School Research Group meetings conducted in the Department of Counseling and Human Development at the University of Georgia, the relevant stakeholders in the initiative to create an evaluation system for transforming the preparation of school counselors
in the state of Georgia were identified. By doing this, the stepwise methodology described by Posovac & Carey (2003) could be designed to address the needs and questions of each stakeholder effectively.

Guided by the idea that the SCOPE system would be the most utilitarian and feasible if inclusive of as many layers of the school counseling training process as possible, the following individuals were identified as necessary to be included in this SCOPE system development:

(a) School counseling preparation program faculty. These individuals are responsible for contributing to the decisions of the administrators; for the direct instruction and supervision of the school counseling candidates; for communicating the principles and goals of the preparation program through course syllabi; and evaluation of candidate performance.

(b) School counselors. These individuals are currently delivering services to students. Having completed their preparation and training, they are familiar with the working of their school, the demands of their profession to deliver excellent counseling services, and are more familiar than candidates in how to deliver the services in the “real-world”. Current school counselors may have very different preparation and training depending upon the institution at which they received them. At the present time, school counselors, even those trained and working in the state of Georgia, may have very different skills or ideas about the position of the school counselor.

(c) School counseling candidates. These individuals receive instruction and training on how to effectively enhance the academic and emotional success of school students. Done through a variety of means and ideals, school counselor candidates in Georgia are faced with a changing climate in which they are prepared affect by federal and state legislature, national
movements in school counseling transformation, and changing ideals by the governing board of higher education in their state.

   (d) School counselor candidate on-site supervisors. These individuals may be current school counselors or school administrators who oversee the development of school counseling candidates. They are responsible for the organization and presentation of their filed site and the availability of training opportunities at their site. Literature in the field of school counseling suggests that often supervisors have very different ideas for the role of school counselors than do the counselors themselves. Supervisors are often unfamiliar with the preparation program’s philosophies or ideals, or with the goals of national movements in school counseling (e.g., CACREP, TSCI).

   (e) School counseling preparation program administrators. These individuals set the policies and guidelines of the preparation program; determine the curriculum that candidates will advance through as they are trained; play a vital role in establishing the philosophy, mission, and principles upon which candidates are prepared; communicate the ideals and goals of the preparation program to outside affiliates; and ultimately make the final decisions upon how the preparation from evolves.

   (f) Non-supervising administrators. These individuals may include school administrators or district-level administrators who may not oversee school counselors or candidates directly, but have influence in policy-making decisions that affect school counseling. This group of individuals also includes policy makers who affect the course of school counseling transformation without direct contact with school counselors. Feedback from non-supervising administrators is presented in the sixth and final phase of the third step.
To obtain the data, both qualitative and quantitative, necessary to evaluated the progression of the SCOPE instrument a plan was developed within the School Research Group. This plan involved identification of specific individuals who represented a sample of those stakeholders identified in step one of the fourth step.

School counselor candidates and school counselors were determined to be available through the Department of Counseling and Human Development in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. Through faculty involved in the development of the SCOPE system both through involvement in the SRG and on the faculty committee of this study, class time was made available work on feedback forms for use in step four, phase one and two (SCOPE CEF Feedback Form and Preparation Program Assessment Form) and for in person interview in phase three.

The school counseling program faculty coordinated the instruction and delivery of the SCOPE Supervisor Evaluation Form through class time. School counseling candidates were instructed in class by faculty involved with the development of the SCOPE system through the SRG on the presentation of the form to their supervisor. The forms were collected through this method as well, and correspond to the fourth phase of the fourth step.

Contact with school counseling preparation program administrators and non-supervising administrators was also coordinated by faculty from within the School Research Group. Primarily through electronic communication (e-mail), the SCOPE CEF Feedback Form was delivered and received and presented in the fifth and sixth phases of the fourth step.

The questions raised by Posovac & Carey (2003) were addressed by the author of this study and are presented in the following section.
(a) Has the theoretical basis of the program been established? This study is based upon the idea that the theoretical basis for the school counseling programs in the state of Georgia are undergoing a significant paradigm shift. In fact, a primary reason for this program evaluation is that the shift in theoretical foundation is necessitating a shift in preparation and evaluation practices. However, there are certain foundations of school counselor preparation that provide enough consistency between the past theory and the new to allow for a feasible evaluation. These include assumptions such as continuing to use class work, faculty supervision, practicum and internship work to prepare school counselor candidates.

Specifically while the theoretical ideals of school counseling preparation may be changing, there is not the question of root practice change that would disallow a feasible evaluation. Were it the case that even the most basic ideas of school counselor preparation were being challenged – i.e., that no graduate education was necessary, that no supervision of clinical experiences were necessary, or that all training could be completed within one semester, than this type of program evaluation would either look drastically different or even be impossible. However, considering the fact that the basic foundations of the school counseling preparation program are not in question, but rather this study represents a refining of the process rather than a complete overhaul, it appears evident that enough theoretical consistency exists for this evaluation to be feasible. It should also be noted that substantial literature, presented in the second chapter of this study, concerning the past, present, and future theoretical guidelines for the preparation of school counselors exists upon which to formulate reasonable and general ideals about the practice of school counseling for the purposes of this study.

(b) Have sufficient resources been allotted for the evaluation? For the purposes of this study, enough funding, time, and access to stakeholders appears to have been allotted for an
effective evaluation. Although not all occurrences can be foreseen, it is unlikely at this point that there are insufficient resources for this program evaluation. It should be noted that follow-up studies subsequent to this study may be needed in order to further evaluation the most effective methods by which school counseling preparation programs can uniformly comply with the new guidelines and ideals outlined in this study.

(c) Are sponsors of the evaluation prepared to implement proposed changes? Although the scope of this study is to affect change within the entire network of school counseling preparation programs in the state of Georgia, the majority of work is through the Department of Counseling and Human Development at the University of Georgia. Given this fact, compliance would reasonably begin with this department in this university. Further considering that many of the members of the School Research Group, who have been instrumental in the development and implementation of this study, are members of the faculty or administration of the school counseling preparation program at the University of Georgia, it does not seem unreasonable to expect that they will be invested in its implementation upon completion. Again, future complications cannot always be foreseen, however enough evidence exists at this point to affirm that sponsors seem prepared to implement proposed changes when appropriate.

**Phase Three – Evaluation of the Program**

**Step One – SCOPE CEF Feedback Form – Administration I.**

Qualitative responses were obtained from students within the Education Specialist (Ed.S.) program to assess initial impression of utility and feasibility of the format of the prototype Counselor Evaluation Form. From these groups, responses were generated and recorded and are presented in tables 7 – 10.
Table 7. Qualitative responses generated by ED.S. focus groups in regards to SCOPE CEF

Feedback Form Question 1 (Is this instrument feasible for pre-service preparation?).

| Response #1: yes – provides clear guidelines for program development and skills students must acquire before going into the field. |
| Response #2: yes, it is feasible when students are given the opportunity to do ind (sic), group, and classroom guidance within their academic program |
| Response #3: yes – concerned that focus may be more on technology and data than interpersonal skills or clinical school (sic). |
| Responses #4: yes |

Table 8. Qualitative responses generated by ED.S. focus groups in regards to SCOPE CEF

Feedback Form Question 2 (Is this instrument feasible for in-service evaluation/accountability?).

| Response #1: yes – a little more difficult b/c it is harder to document things are doing (emphasis added by respondent) – mastery at the pre-service level makes implementation easier in-service. |
| Response #2: yes – if UGA is careful about matching students with well-prepared sites – staff development for supervisors is key. |
| Response #3: student evaluations may be necessary |
| Response #4: yes |
Table 9. Qualitative responses generated by ED.S. focus groups in regards to SCOPE CEF Feedback Form Question 3 (If not, what other method would you suggest?).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response #1: possibly more specific to grade level, lay out the rubric in a way that is not so confusing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response #2: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response #3: peer supervision within the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response #4: N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Qualitative responses generated by ED.S. focus groups in regards to SCOPE CEF Feedback Form Question 4 (What would a candidate or counselor have to document to demonstrate competence?).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response #1: program implementation data (success/failure): effectiveness in classroom guidance, small group &amp; individual counseling environments (sample lessons, pre/post-test data), professional organization involvement &amp; contributions (i.e., presentations, etc), demonstration of ethical decision-making (comps, Praxis, anecdotal), feedback related to rapport, supervisor evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response #2: Guidance plan documenting program &amp; activities to address competency; reliability; confidentiality; time spent in competency; agreement between supervisee and supervisor about tasks to be completed and actual outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response #3: student surveys, supervisor and peer evaluation, self-evaluation, continuing ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response #4: Data showing effectiveness (pre-post tests, attend. Rates, test scores); Monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reports indicating where/how time spent; Faculty, student, parent evaluations of counseling program, counselor lessons; Good clinical skills, professionalism, empathy

---

**Step Two – SCOPE Preparation Program Assessment Form (PPAF).**

Of the twelve school counselor candidates asked to complete the SCOPE PRAF (Appendix C) twelve were completed (100%). Candidates responded on a Likert rating scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Not at All; 2 = Somewhat; 3 = Quite A Lot; 4 = Completely) across three questions regarding their preparation as school counselors and their access to relevant supporting documentation. The questions were presented as follows: (a) question 1: Please rate the degree to which you believe that your preparation program has presented you with a clear understanding of the meaning of the principle and its importance as a competency for school counselors; (b) question 2: Please rate the degree to which you believe that your preparation program has designed learning experiences to help you gain exposure and mastery over the competencies involved.; and (c) question 3: Please rate the degree to which you believe that you have/will have access to supporting documentation required to verify knowledge of the required competency. Results for each question are presented in Table 11.

---

**Table 11. Mean of school counselor candidate responses on SCOPE PRAF across Georgia Board of Regents 2004 Principles for the Preparation of School Counselors.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Question 1 Mean</th>
<th>Question 2 Mean</th>
<th>Question 3 Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examining the values equated with each response, candidates have an understanding between the “Quite A Lot” and “Completely” categories concerning the extent to which they understand the meanings of the competencies for school counseling candidates (Question 1 Mean = 3.20). Their responses suggest that they believe that they have the opportunities to practice the established competencies at nearly the “Quite A Lot” category (Question 2 Mean = 2.95). In responding to their belief that supporting documentation will be able to be procured in verifying their knowledge, candidates responded in between the “Somewhat” and “Quite A Lot” categories.

In comparison their responses, candidates responses suggest that they feel more confident that the preparation program has presented them with an understanding of the importance and meaning of each principle for the practice of school counseling than they do for the rate to which they believe the preparation program exposes them to learning experiences that help them gain necessary mastery (Question 1 Mean = 3.20 > Question 2 Mean = 2.95, p<.05). Further,
candidates feel less confident that they will have access to supporting documentation required to verify knowledge of the required core principles that were presented to them by the preparation program (Question 3 Mean = 2.54 < 3.20 & 2.95, p<.05).

Looking at a more detailed analysis of candidates’ responses (for complete table see Appendix G), candidates were significantly less confident that the preparation program had presented a clear understanding of the meaning of the third principle established by the Georgia Board of Regents: “School counselor candidates coordinate a school to career transition plan for each student” (Question 1, Principle 3 Mean = 2.25 < Question 1 Mean 3.20, p<.05).

Although candidates perceived a significant decline in confidence in the preparation program’s capacity to provide adequate learning opportunities for mastery of the identified areas, their responses suggest that the perceived a greater confidence in their exposure to activities involved with the sixth principle: “School counselor candidates provide individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students.” (Question 2, Principle 6 Mean = 3.66 > Question 2 Mean 2.95, p<.05).

In responses to the third question, candidates expressed greater confidence in their ability to obtain effective supporting documentation in the area of the sixth principle: “School counselor candidates provide individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students” (Question 3, Principle 6 Mean = 3.08 > Question 2 Mean 2.54, p<.05). They also expressed less confidence in their ability to procure documentation in the area of the seventh principle: “School counselor candidates collaborate with other professionals in the development of staff training,
family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs” (Question 3, Principle 7 Mean = 2.08 < Question 2 Mean 2.54, p<.05).

**Step Three – Individual Interview.**

As part of the program evaluation, the twelve school counseling candidates in the previous phase were provided the opportunity to volunteer for an in-depth interview concerning school counselor competencies as presented to the preparation program coordinator. One candidate volunteered and was interviewed for approximately forty-five minutes with the conversation transcribed and the salient points described in this section. The candidate was made aware that the identity of the student would be kept private among the student, the interviewer, and the program coordinator. As no other candidates were interviewed in this manner, the content of the responses could not be considered anonymous to the program coordinator. As such, complete frankness concerning questions about preparation and supervision within the preparation program could not be assured. The candidate was informed of the right not to answer any questions that person felt uncomfortable answering.

The following recommendations and concerns raised by the candidate are presented here. These responses represent the most salient points that are applicable to the progressive development of the SCOPE system and are organized according to themes salient to the evaluation of the program.

*In regards to principle one:* “I think for that one it was easier for me to brainstorm ways I was doing it, and found it more difficult to say, ok, here is the actual data that I am advocating for a program… I think for that one it’s easier to brainstorm avenues rather than data…”

“One thing that was brought up at the ACA (American Counseling Association) conference is that it is difficult to really define advocacy or to come to a conclusion on what
exactly it means, so that is something I would love to see more of in our program - actually coming together to talk about what it looks like and what it... challenges you would face in being an advocate.”

In regards to outcome data collection for above intervention: “I have for this one, academic performance in the ESOL course in comparison to the regular English course, or performance in all classes before placement in this ESOL class, because you would think that an English course is the foundation for all other courses.”

In regards to principle two: “This is my schools strategic plan, so there are only 7% of African American students achieving at ... so that was my rationale for an intervention... a study-skills workshop and then I’d compare the scores from the first administration of the test to the second administration of the test... maybe a curriculum of the study skills group and then outcome data... because to me that would be the goals for me, to be able to walk out of the program and have ‘problem – intervention – outcome.”

In regards to principle three: “A career transition for each student... I feel like you could show career transition plans, or activities, or career fairs... but for each student would be difficult at any level.”

In regards to principle four: “Even visibility in the school, being involved in many facets of the organization, I think that can be covered in leadership.”

“It may be difficult as an intern or a first year counselor to provide leadership, I know that you can be involved in committees and active in meetings with your department... but that would be difficult to find outcome data... unless you could say, the committee, the intervention we had here is how it was effective.”
In regards to principle six: “...I think a lot of these opportunities that you would have to intervene on a wider level than just individual counseling are not as available as in a middle school or a elementary school. So you have fewer opportunities to do a classroom guidance.”

“Would that be individual academic, individual social? I think we need to set guidelines about if you need one of each, like individual, group, and classroom guidance.”

In regards to principle seven: “How do you show collaboration? How would you…you could keep a log for the number of times you meet with families, or social workers, etc…how do you show your collaboration is effective...?”

In regards to principle eight: “That was one where a possible intervention could be working with a school social worker to intervene with chronic absenteeism, implement a program like that and look at attendance before and after…but how to show that the referrals I was making with data...”

In regards to outcome data collection in general: “I think that it should come down as many times as it can, because there is such an academic focus in schools, that we really need to get to a point where we can say ‘this is how it impacts someone’s grades, test scores, discipline referrals, attendance. So I think that pre and post tests, what did you learn through this session, what do you know now that you didn’t know before is sort of the first step...”

“I think that because our administrators are so data driven …I believe that I am one of the only counselors using data, so she (the administrator) was really psyched about that. So I thought not only would it help me complete a requirement, but its also good for the department as a whole to present something that says ‘here’s what we’re doing and here’s how its effective.”

“I would really like to see the program make an emphasis on actual ways to measure data... I don’t think its addressed that much here – there’s a statistics gap, but I feel as though
there’s a gap between the school counseling and the general testing statistics data. If we are going to be asking school counselors to be doing much more outcome research that we need to teach them how to do it, specific to being a school counselor. This is all …we all know that we need to do it…”

*In regards to ease of access to relevant student data:* We’re given…in my county we are considered administrators so we are given administrative access so we can see pretty much anything and everything we want to.”

*In regards to portfolio introduction and use:* “I would definitely recommend for future classes…to have some sort of… to see a list of what …exactly what I would benefit from having as a compilation of data…to delineate early on exactly what should go into a portfolio and what is ancillary. I think that just to have all that information (supporting documentation on the SCOPE CEF) would just be so helpful to me.”

“To have a format of what each example should look like, that would be effective for me.”

**Step Four – SCOPE Supervisor Evaluation Form (SEF) Fall 2004 Administration.**

Of the twelve supervisors asked to complete the SCOPE SEF (Appendix D) at the end of the Fall 2004 semester, all twelve were returned to the Program Coordinator. However, one evaluation was not available to the program evaluation and the eleven available (92%) were analyzed. Supervisors evaluated whether or not specific opportunities to demonstrate areas designated by the Georgia Board of Regents are presented in Table 12.

| Table 12. Supervisor responses (yes vs. no) concerning availability of on-site training opportunities for Fall 2004 semester. |
In addition to evaluating their site for opportunity to develop skills in the areas presented by the Georgia Board of Regents, supervisors also assessed candidates’ level of competence across each principle (Table 13). Of the eleven SEF’s returned ten supervisors responded to the level of competence evaluations, while one supervisor did not.

Table 13. Supervisor evaluation of candidate competency across Georgia Board of Regents Principles for Fall 2004 semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Number of “yes” responses</th>
<th>Number of “no” responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Highly Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisors provided qualitative responses on the SCOPE SEF that fell into one of two categories: (a) justification for “no” or “N/A” responses, and (b) description of the candidates’ competency. Of the 13 “no” responses, indicating that opportunities for development in specific areas of development were not available, 9 were followed by qualitative responses stating that opportunities were planned or expected for the upcoming spring semester. On two evaluations, supervisors identified a lack of opportunity for principle IV (leadership in development…of a comprehensive school counseling pan…) and principle V (use [of] student outcome data) within the on-site training parameters.

The second theme in supervisor responses included overwhelmingly positive responses regarding the candidates’ competency as school counselors. Although not necessarily pertinent to this SCOPE system development, the high rate of positive remarks from supervisors is a testament to the quality of the school counselor preparation program at The University of Georgia.

**Step Four – SCOPE Supervisor Evaluation Form (SEF) Spring 2005 Administration.**

Of the twelve supervisors asked to complete the SCOPE SEF (Appendix D) at the end of the Spring 2005 semester, twelve were returned (100%) to the Program Coordinator. All twelve returned SEF’s were made available for this program evaluation. Feedback requested of the

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supervisors was identical to feedback requested during the Fall 2004 administration and are presented below in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 14. Supervisor responses (yes vs. no) concerning availability of on-site training opportunities for Spring 2005 semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Number of “yes” responses</th>
<th>Number of “no” responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the Fall 2004 administration, supervisors again assessed candidates’ level of competence across each principle (Table 15). Of the eleven SEF’s returned ten supervisors responded to the level of competence evaluations, while one supervisor did not.

Table 15. Supervisor evaluation of candidate competency across Georgia Board of Regents Principles for Spring 2005 semester.
Overall, candidates were rated in the “Highly Competent” and “Satisfactory” categories across all the principle areas presented. In each principle, with the exception of principle III, eleven or all twelve of the twelve candidates were rated in this range of proficiency. Supervisor responses continued to included overwhelmingly positive responses regarding the candidates’ competency as school counselors. Throughout the twelve evaluations examined, no candidates were rated as “needs improvement” in an area of development available at that site. Five of the twelve evaluations were “perfect” indicating opportunities for learning across each principle and “highly competent” rating of candidate performance across each principle. These ratings suggest that at the present time, the preparation program is effectively training candidates to be competent in the areas established by the Georgia Board of Regents at the time of completion of the internship requirement.

Noticeable trends arise in an analysis of the supervisor evaluations between the Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 administrations. In the Fall 2004 evaluations, supervisors provided 13 “no”
responses, indicating that at that time opportunities for development in specific areas of development were not available, 9 of which were followed by qualitative responses stating that opportunities were planned or expected for the upcoming spring semester. However, even after the completion of the internship year at the conclusion of the Fall 2005 semester, 10 “no” responses were given, indicating a continued problem in at least one skill area in providing learning opportunities. From the Fall 2004 semester to the Spring 2005 semester, only opportunities for learning in regards to principle III (coordinate a school to career transition plan for each student) significantly increased (6 to 3) across that time frame.

**Step Five – Graduating Student Exit Survey.**

Of the twelve students who were asked to complete the Graduating Student Exit Survey by the Program Coordinator, twelve were completed (100%) and all twelve made available for this evaluation. One candidate did not follow the instructions correctly and that individual’s responses were excluded from evaluation. The quantitative results of the students’ ratings of importance and quality for the ten courses presented are presented in Table 16.

---

**Table 16. Average student rating on a scale of 1 – 5 (5 representing highest level and 1 representing lowest level) of importance and quality of completed course.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Average Rating of Importance</th>
<th>Average Rating of Quality of Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundations of School Counseling</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural Counseling</td>
<td>4.90*</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Principle Mean</td>
<td>Corresponding Question Average Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>3.54*</td>
<td>3.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar in School Counseling</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>4.90*</td>
<td>4.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Counseling</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Significant difference (p<.05) between principle mean and corresponding question average mean.

The data from the school counseling candidates Graduate Student Exit Survey (Appendix F) suggests that candidates consider the courses provided both of high importance and of high quality instruction. Overall, candidates rated the courses with a mean importance of 4.49 and a mean quality of instruction of 4.36, with 5 representing the highest level of importance and 1 representing a lack of importance. It is notable that four of the nine courses were rated significantly different (at the .05 level) than the overall mean in regards to level of importance, and seven of the nine courses were rated significantly different (at the .05 level) than the overall mean in regards to level of quality. This suggests that candidates perceive significant disparity in their evaluations of which courses are most crucial to their training and which courses are of the highest quality in that training, despite an overall indication of high quality and importance overall.
Summary

The evaluation of the school counselor preparation program at the University of Georgia suggests the following: (a) candidates believed that documentation of school counselor candidate development must take into account the wide range of tasks the school counselor engages in and incorporate a wide range of documentation; (b) candidates prepared at the University of Georgia described positive accounts of their understanding of the principle areas of competency, their ability to develop competencies at field-site placements, and their ability to procure supporting documentation – however their responses suggested a difference in the level of that confidence in the following stepwise progression: Understanding > Opportunities > Documentation; (c) according to their supervisors, candidates were widely proficient at the expected level across the principle skill areas; (d) although each field site provided opportunities in nearly every principle area of development during the internship year, not every site offered opportunities in every area of development; and (e) candidates reported high average levels of both importance and quality of instruction in regards to required courses.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The goal of this chapter is to synthesize the research and feedback obtained throughout the first four chapters of this study. This dissertation has described a process-oriented program evaluation of the Masters of Education in School Counseling at the University of Georgia. The methods by which this program evaluation has been undertaken are also described as a feasible and utilitarian system by which future program evaluations of similar public institutions of higher education in the state of Georgia can create or reorganize school counselor preparation programs to be in compliance with movements in school counselor transformation and standards established in 2004 by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

This evaluation has been organized around a model of program evaluation established by Posovac and Carey (2003) specific to process evaluation for the provision of human services. This chapter represents the last step in that model – a formal presentation of the results and recommendations to enhance the feasibility and effectiveness of the targeted program. This study has described the School Counseling Outcome & Program Evaluation (SCOPE) system used by the Masters of Education in School Counseling in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services in the College of Education at the University of Georgia as a model for evaluation. Stakeholders in the preparation of school counselors were identified and queried in regards to the development of a system by which school counselors would be introduced, trained, and placed into the professional field of today’s education landscape. In doing so a system was devised, the School Counseling Outcome & Program Evaluation
(SCOPE) was refined and retooled with feedback from these stakeholders. The SCOPE system is presented in this chapter as a stepwise process by which higher education school counselor preparation programs can plan, evaluate, and execute a transformation in the manner in which they prepare their candidates.

In this section of this chapter, an outline for the manner in which the program evaluation was conducted. The SCOPE system is implemented through the following five steps:

(a) Establishing the goal
(b) Communicating the goal
(c) Evaluating how close you are to the goal
(d) Working on achieving the goal
(e) Evaluating your progress toward the goal

Having used the application of the SCOPE system to the school counselor preparation program at the University of Georgia as a prototype, the steps outlined above and described in depth in the following section are designed to allow programs that have previously used different systems to prepare candidates to move toward a standardized system efficiently.

**Step 1. Establishing the Goal**

The focus of the first step is the establishment of the basis for the SCOPE system. In this step the foundation for the ideals of the SCOPE system are presented. Based on the literature research done in this study, understanding of four main themes is necessary in order to effectively engage in the implementation of the SCOPE system. These themes are: (a) understanding the history of school counseling; (b) understanding the climate of educational reform; (c) understanding the new vision of school counseling; and (d) understanding the call for accountability.
By presenting an introduction of the climate of school counseling within the broader face of current educational reform through accountability, the first step of the SCOPE system aims to create a foundation from which standardized preparation program reform can begin - all stakeholders involved need to be “working from the same page” if they are to implement similar initiatives across sites. In this dissertation, the content of the information presented in step one is found in chapters one and two. Though beyond the scope of what was completed for this evaluation, the development of a SCOPE Mission Statement & Introduction is proposed. This SCOPE Mission Statement & Introduction would be developed from the material presented in this literature review regarding national initiatives in school counseling transformation.

The establishment of the foundation provided by the SCOPE system through the introduction and mission statement is intended for the preparation program faculty and administration. The faculty and administration of the preparation program represent the starting point for the dissemination of the SCOPE system. The stakeholders within each preparation program must effectively “buy in” to the proposed system, beginning with the foundation – including the nature of the transformations in school counseling, a recognition of the recent emphasis on accountability in education, etc. Agreement on these ideas is necessary as they are building blocks for the principles established by the Georgia Board of Regents in 2004 that guides the SCOPE system from this point on.

*Step 2. Communicating the goal*

The second step in the SCOPE system, after setting the philosophical foundation in step one, is to actively communicate the expected changes to involved stakeholders. As presented in the literature review of this study, different stakeholders in the development of school counselors often have very disparate ideas about what school counselors do or how they are trained. The
purpose of this step is to ensure that these stakeholders are presented with a clear understanding of the how and why school counselors are trained in the manner they are trained.

When this understanding is clear and generalized across each stakeholder in the process of preparing the school counselor, it creates shared expectations for success and shared ideals for how to reach that success. The early steps of the SCOPE system are based in the idea that the more effectively theory and methods are shared among stakeholders, the more effective and efficient change in programmatic procedures can be. These stakeholders include the following individuals: school counseling preparation program faculty, existing school counselors, school counseling candidates, school counselor candidate on-site supervisors, school counseling preparation program administrators, and non-supervising administrators.

Throughout the implementation of the SCOPE system, these stakeholders are involved in multiple interventions in the steps to follow. What is critical at this point is to communicate to these individuals the appropriate expectations for the transformation of the manner by which school counselors are prepared. The key element in doing this, having laid the foundation of school counselor preparation and educational reform in step one, is to educate the stakeholders concerning the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia’s “Regent’s Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors” implemented in 2004.

Presented in the third chapter of this study, the nine principles of the “Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors” (Georgia Board of Regents, 2004) guide the new vision for how competent school counselors practice in the state of Georgia. By presenting these principles at this stage, the stakeholder is able to solidify the direction of the system development and guide implementation from a set of expectations for competency shared by all.
Research shows that at the present time, there can be great disparity in ideas of how a school counselor is prepared and what a school counselor is qualified to do among the novice candidate, the practicing counselor, the on-site supervisor, the district-level administrator, and the legislative policy maker. A system such as this cannot possibly work efficiently or effectively, as all the players are not “on the same page”. Imagine however, a system in which an individual is presented with one set of ideas and expectations from the moment of perusing a university’s promotional materials for their school counseling program to seeing those ideas and expectations throughout course curriculum, throughout their on-site fieldwork in agreement with their on-site supervisor, and expressed in administrative and legislative policy. That is the goal of the SCOPE system – a seamless design of ideals and expectations shared by every person involved. This goal begins in the first two steps of the SCOPE system by addressing to each level of stakeholder (candidate, counselor, faculty, supervisor, administrator) the necessary expectations of the school counselor prepared and practicing in the state of Georgia.

At this time the preparation program faculty and administration must disseminate the philosophical foundation of the preparation program in combination with the principles established by the Georgia Board of Regents (2004) to those stakeholders who operate outside the preparation program. These stakeholders include administrators and supervisors at field sites in which candidates are currently or are likely in the future to be placed, local school district administrators who may be responsible for setting policies pertaining to school counselors, and incumbent school counselors who serve together with novice school counselors and candidates in training who have come through the preparation program at an earlier time (and therefore under different guidelines) or have been prepared from other institutions.
In step two the preparation program begins to disseminate the foundation and principles of the new SCOPE system as a spider spins a web outward. The system is designed to slowly spread outward, reaching numerous points (stakeholders) and therefore becoming stronger. Eventually, as more and more stakeholders become familiar with the system, it spreads to eventually connect with other preparation programs that have spun similar webs. Ideally, over time the system becomes standardized throughout the state and each school counseling candidate, supervisor, administrator, and faculty member share the same vision for school counseling.

In addition to the mission statement and introduction, also proposed is a description of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia’s “Regent’s Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors” (2004) to be presented to the relevant stakeholders outside the preparation program. The second step, in combination with the first, encompasses the initial process of communicating the information necessary to establish a common foundation upon which the subsequent steps of action and evaluation of process change are laid.

**Step 3. Evaluating how close you are to the goal**

In the second step of the evaluation of this program (phase three), the attitudes of the current candidates in school counseling in the Masters of Education program at the University of Georgia were explored using the SCOPE Preparation Assessment Form (PRAF, Appendix C). In analyzing these responses, candidate beliefs about their understanding and practice of the principle areas of competency established by the Georgia Board of Regents could be better understood. This type of feedback can be a guiding force in the manner in which the faculty and administration look to modify their preparation program as they move through the SCOPE system.
The PRAF also allows for feedback on how students feel concerning the introduction and training of competencies involved in each principle. For each principle presented in the PRAF, candidates felt significantly more or less confident in at least one area in regards to introduction, opportunity to practice, and availability of supporting documentation. Based on the idea that different preparation programs have diverse school counseling preparation programs at the current time, it is likely that each program will have varying outcomes on this instrument. The PRAF allows for an initial analysis of the weaknesses and strengths of the preparation program in presenting the Board of Regents Principles using their current curriculum and training. By doing so, the training program can determine the areas that require the most attention and resources in order to consistently enhance skill mastery.

As part of the program evaluation process an in-depth interview between a school counselor candidate who completed the PRAF and the Program Coordinator was evaluated. Described in the third step of the evaluation of the program (phase three), the interview provided additional feedback on how the University of Georgia’s preparation program currently addressed the Georgia Board of Regents principles. The interviewee’s following statement demonstrates an area that the preparation program may use in changing curriculum to address the needs placed upon candidates with the emphasis on accountability and outcome evaluation in the SCOPE system.

“I would really like to see the program make an emphasis on actual ways to measure data…like a qualitative survey, a quantitative survey, I don’t think its addressed that much here (the University of Georgia) – there’s a statistics gap, but I feel as though there’s a gap between the school counseling and the general testing statistics data.”
The primary focus of the interview was to gain feedback on the creation of the SCOPE CEF, which is discussed in the following section. However as shown in this example, it can also be used to gain ideas on areas of deficiency unique to the program, before the impetus for change begins. By identifying early on the concerns that hamper the ability of candidates to understand, implement, or evaluate the competencies established by the Georgia Board of Regents efficient and effective plans of action can be devised from the start of the process.

The SCOPE system is a process that is likely to be most effective when undertaken in a collaborative manner. The current school counseling candidates are able to provide invaluable feedback to the preparation program faculty and administrators who are committed to a new system of school counselor preparation. While the procedures previously outlined in the first two steps of the SCOPE system are standardized across the state of Georgia, each preparation program will have its own strengths and weaknesses that only it can truly appreciate. Current candidates can provide invaluable insight into the specific areas that will be targeted for process change.

In this example candidates expressed the opinion that the University of Georgia is weak in providing a clear understanding of the meaning and importance of coordination of a career plan for each student in comparison to other established rubric areas. The program may also be weak in providing candidates with the knowledge in how to obtain supporting documentation to show that they collaborate with other professionals in the development of initiatives that address student needs.

Conversely, candidates feel as though it is a strength of the University of Georgia preparation program in providing learning experiences in the development of mastery in providing individual / group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic /
emotional success and career preparedness. The program is also strong in providing candidates with the knowledge in how to obtain supporting documentation to show that they provide individual / group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic / emotional success and career preparedness.

**Step 4. Working on achieving the goal**

After laying the foundation, communicating ideals, and evaluating current strengths and weaknesses, the preparation program in step four is prepared to begin making changes. This occurs through two processes: (a) using the SCOPE CEF to track the progress of each school counselor candidate from initiation through graduation across the nine principles of development established by the Georgia Board of Regents, and (b) altering preparation program curriculum and practices in order to provide candidates with access to supporting documentation needed in tracking their progress across the nine principles.

The prototype SCOPE CEF (Appendix A) was developed in the earlier stages of this study by the School Research Group and School Counseling program faculty. As the study was carried out, feedback was received on ways to make the SCOPE CEF clearer, easier to use, and relevant to the stakeholders for which it is intended. From this feedback revision were considered for the future development of a revised SCOPE CEF.

The SCOPE CEF is a document that follows the candidate from acceptance into the school counseling preparation program, documenting their progress in the development of established skill areas. A faculty advisory or preparation program administrator maintains the SCOPE CEF in cooperation with the candidate as new curriculum is presented and new field site opportunities are provided. The SCOPE CEF is a portfolio-based tool, meaning that it is designed to facilitate the collection of materials that evidence the progress of the candidate. For each of
the nine principles established by the Georgia Board of Regents, the responsibility for
demonstration of competency at the first two levels (1 = Inclusion of competency in preparation
program curriculum; and 2 = Inclusion of competency in field-placements [e.g., practicum &
internship sites]) is with the preparation program.

The first level of competency requires the delineation of how the Georgia Board of
Regents principles are infused into the curriculum. This can be achieved by first rewriting
statements made in promotional materials that are available to individuals considering entering a
school counseling program, i.e., the program description and mission statement made on
program websites, program handbooks, and other promotional or advertising materials.

To account for the first level of competency, preparation programs should also include
within each course syllabi the relevance of materials to applicable rubric areas. An example of
this is presented in the following section. In the example, a section was added to the course
description that allows for both the preparation program and the candidate to identify how this
course’s activities fit in with the SCOPE system and the Georgia Board of Regents principles.
Generalizing this example, it would be the task of the preparation faculty and administration to
add similar sections to each course syllabus involved with the preparation of school counseling
candidates. Once completed, a copy of the syllabi, on file in the records of the preparation
program and held in the personal files of the candidate provide evidence of candidate
competency at the first level across the nine skills areas.

Considering that it is reasonable to assume that each school counseling preparation
program across the institutions of higher education in Georgia has to some degree a differing
curriculum, there may be gaps in coverage of the rubric areas. It is the responsibility of the
preparation program faculty and administration to evaluate the extent to which each rubric area is
mentioned in their syllabi descriptions to ensure that candidates are exposed to all necessary skills required to be an effective school counselor.

The preparation program is also the primary agent for establishing the second level of competency according to the Georgia Board of Regents principles (2 = Inclusion of competency in field-placements), however it cannot be done solely by the preparation program. In demonstrating compliance with this level of competency, the preparation program must produce a contractual Memorandum of Understanding between the program and the field placement that specifically outlines the manners in which candidates are provided opportunities to develop competency in the skill areas.

Through this evaluation, the Memorandums of Understanding between the School Counseling Masters degree program University of Georgia and its practicum and internship field sites were evaluated. Although these Memorandums exist, in their current form they are not specifically tailored to each site to address the ways in which opportunities for the development of necessary skills are provided. Considering the likelihood that each field site (e.g., elementary, middle, high school) offers different experiences to some degree, it cannot necessarily be assumed that each field site necessarily offers opportunities in every skill area. As seen in the results of the SCOPE SAF presented in chapter 4, seven of the eleven supervisors identified at least one skill area a candidate was not currently being provided the opportunity to gain competency in. Five out of the nine competency areas were included in that neglected set, showing that it is not the case that one skill area is difficult to provide opportunities for across all sites, but that each site differs in the opportunities it struggles to provide. Further, even though many supervisors stated on the Fall 2004 administration of the SCOPE SEF that opportunities
would be provided during the upcoming semester, responses on the Fall 2005 SCOPE SEF demonstrated continued problems with availability of necessary opportunities.

The development of the Memorandum of Understanding should attempt to utilize a standardized format that is used across field-sites. Initial conversations between the field sites and the preparation program should include a listing by the field site of the ways in which it provides opportunities to candidates to gain competency in each skill area. Those opportunities are then reviewed by the preparation program, stated in the final Memorandum of Understanding and agreed upon by both parties. The final Memorandum of Understanding should be available to candidates, faculty and administrators as candidates select sites. This allows for all involved stakeholders to be aware of any strengths or weaknesses that will need to be addressed by the candidate or the preparation program to ensure that the candidate is given the necessary opportunities before completion of the program.

After the first two levels of competency are established and documented by the preparation program, and in place to be communicated effectively to candidates, field-site supervisors and administrators, the third and fourth levels of competency can begin to be addressed. At this stage in candidate competency, documentation is the responsibility of both the preparation program and candidate cooperatively. The candidate must conceptualize, undertake, evaluate, and record specific interventions that demonstrate their competency in the skill areas spelled out by the Georgia Board of Regents. Throughout this study the ideas and concerns of candidates, counselors, educators and supervisors was obtained in an attempt to find the most feasible and efficient ways in which to do this.

In the prototype SCOPE CEF (Appendix A) examples of supporting documentation were uniform across all nine principles. As feedback was collected, themes arose that indicated that if
the CEF listed documentation and examples specific to each principle, that would lead to a more utilitarian document. For example, on the prototype SCOPE CEF, supporting documentation for principle I (school counselor candidates advocate for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students) at this level read as such:

“3 = Description of class assignment or field case study in which candidate engaged in advocacy that addressed cultural achievement gaps in student success. Log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees, and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio” (prototype SCOPE CEF, Appendix A).

Taking into account feedback obtained throughout this study from students in the Education Specialists program, masters’ level candidates in School Counseling, and school counseling educators and supervisors, a more detailed and principle-specific description was formulated.

“3 = This school counselor has demonstrated competency in advocacy for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences. Evidence includes narrative description of the design (what the candidate set out to do & why it was necessary) and implementation (what actions the candidate undertook) of an intervention necessary to address inequity in student success affected by cultural differences. **EXAMPLE** – A primarily Spanish-speaking student was improperly placed in a non-ESOL English class, candidate advocated for proper placement of student in an appropriate ESOL English class. Provided as supporting documentation is a description
of the candidate’s plan and rationale for undertaking the advocacy and the specific actions taken by the candidate.

In the conceptualization of the revised SCOPE CEF supporting documentation sections, examples will be provided in order to give the candidate a benchmark for how the necessary information can be collected. Based upon the feedback in this study, the more principle-specific the supporting documentation and examples that are listed on the SCOPE CEF, the more helpful it is to candidates when compiling the documentation. At this point, further feedback from stakeholders is required to provide useful and realistic examples across all principles for use in the revised SCOPE CEF.

At the fourth level, the specificity of the third level is continued. As the fourth level is inclusive of the third level with the addition of confirmatory data evaluation, the examples of supporting documentation are built on the previous level. Continuing the example of Principle I, the description of the fourth level of supporting documentation was presented uniformly across all principles.

“4 = Record of completion of class assignment or field case study, with inclusion of outcome data (i.e., student evaluation, retention statistics) that has been evaluated by preparation program faculty/administrative supervisor and demonstrates effective positive outcome. Supervisor’s evaluations (preparation program & on-site), compilation of student data evaluated for effectiveness, and/or record of successful completion of all course requirements available in student portfolio” (prototype SCOPE CEF, Appendix A).

In the revised SCOPE CEF supporting documentation sections, again more specific examples are presented in order to enhance the utility of the item. Also, the example provided
expands on the previous example, demonstrating the movement from action to action with evaluation as a progression in level of competency established by the Georgia Board of Regents.

“4 = This school counselor has demonstrated competency in advocacy for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences that has been evaluated by data analysis and demonstrated positive outcomes. Evidence includes data from sample of advocated student/students performance prior to the intervention (i.e., academic performance, attendance rates, discipline referrals, standardized test scores) that shows significant improvement after the intervention. This data has been compiled by the advocate and reviewed by a supervisor. **EXAMPLE** – A primarily Spanish-speaking student was improperly placed in a non-ESOL English class, candidate advocated for proper placement of student in an appropriate ESOL English class. After the advocacy intervention, the student’s grades have increased and attendance rates have improved.

At this point in the development of the SCOPE system, it may be unrealistic to believe that these changes from the prototype to the revised SCOPE CEF language represent the most effective and efficient examples for candidates, educators, and supervisors to use. However the idea of more focused specificity across the levels should enhance the utility of the document by providing candidates with more concrete examples to build their portfolio. In developing the document through future work and the provision of more specific examples, it is expected that the SCOPE CEF format will be refined to greater effectiveness as its use and opportunities for feedback increase.
Step 5. Evaluating your progress toward the goal

The SCOPE CEF is the centerpiece of the SCOPE system – it is designed to allow for a tracking of each skill area over time from introduction to competency to mastery. As the document is useful in providing candidates with a guideline for building a comprehensive portfolio of examples of their competencies, it simultaneously allows preparation programs to track the development of their candidates, assuring that the preparation program provides adequate opportunities for learning across all skill areas.

The SCOPE SEF is an ancillary document to the CEF that allows for field-site supervisors to provide feedback to preparation program faculty and administrators on candidate competency development. The SCOPE SEF allows the preparation program to monitor the degree to which field sites honor initial agreements made in Memorandums of Understanding by providing the agreed upon experiences across skill areas. By structuring the SCOPE SEF around the nine skill areas, it allows for a more efficient incorporation into the SCOPE system. As mentioned before, by delivering a consistent foundation of what is crucial in the development of school counselor candidates, stakeholders are able to “work from the same page” from the initial to final phases of the candidate’s development.

Progress toward the goal of having all school counselors moving from competency to mastery across the nine skill areas delineated by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia’s 2004 “Regent’s Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors” can be achieved by continued use of the SCOPE CEF to collect candidate materials and the SCOPE SEF to evaluate their performance in the professional field. Both the preparation program and individual candidate are able to track the development of competency over time by using these documents and collecting the data they describe. Preparation programs strive
towards having each candidate in their program master each skill area, and candidates strive to develop mastery in each competency and collect the appropriate data.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this program evaluation has been to design a system by which school counselor preparation programs in the state of Georgia can reorganize themselves to efficiently demonstrate how they train school counseling candidates who are competent across the nine skill areas defined by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia’s 2004 “Regent’s Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors”.

Future work, which was beyond the scope of this study, involves operationalizing this system into a more “electronic-friendly” method that is technologically savvy. Throughout the implementation of the SCOPE system, data needs to be organized and stored in a format that is easily retrievable and shared among stakeholders. Candidates will need a way to easily manage a portfolio of documentation that includes documentation provided by the preparation program, the filed site, and their own practice. This data will need to be easily managed and stored over time. It stands to reason that given the trends in information technology web-based or electronic-based portfolio management is the most appropriate standard for the delivery of the SCOPE system.

Within the broader scope of national educational reform and calls for accountability in education, the school counselor is a figure who is uniquely positioned to contribute to the academic, social, and emotional success of every student. However, the school counselor, previously forgotten in most discussions of educational reform, will not be exempt from the need to demonstrate effectiveness in practice through the accumulation and evaluation of statistical
data relevant to student success – i.e., academic performance, attendance rates, discipline referrals, and standardized test scores.

National initiatives have recently begun promoting a new vision for school counseling – initiatives such as the Transforming School Counseling Initiative, the American School Counseling Association, and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. These initiatives have undertaken the task of changing the face of modern school counseling by updating curriculum, recruiting a diverse counseling student population, redesigning practicum experiences, and strengthening partnerships with local school districts and state education agencies (CAREI, 2002c). These initiatives are driving for a new paradigm in the philosophical foundation, delivery system, management systems, and accountability designed to lead to systemic change in the reform of school counseling (ASCA, 2003).

The goal of the SCOPE system to create a collaborative venture that requires all stakeholders to work from the same shared vision for the competent practice of school counseling and produces concrete examples of competent practice for use by both the preparation program and the candidate. The preparation program uses the data to track its effectiveness in training competent school counselors; the candidate uses the data to demonstrate their effectiveness as a professional vital to the success of their students.

This program evaluation was designed from the onset to yield lessons that would contribute to future evaluations of similar programs. One of these lessons involves the manner in which candidate and supervisor evaluations are gathered. For example, on the SCOPE PRAF, candidates were asked to describe their opinions based on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 4 with a wide range of qualitative descriptions (1 = Not At All, 2 = Somewhat, 3 = Quite A Lot, 4 =
Completely). Noticing the wide range of evaluation between the categories, it would be more appropriate to provide candidates with more variability in their ability to describe their beliefs. Similar change could be made with supervisor evaluations on the SCOPE SEF. On the form used in this evaluation, supervisors were forced to utilize another four point Likert scale rating system that used very basic terminology (Not Available, Needs Improvement, satisfactory, Highly Competent). It is recommended that a more detailed system of evaluation that takes into account the developmental level of the candidate be implemented, for example – Level 1 = Candidate is not able to perform this activity satisfactorily, functioning below the expected level, and remedial work recommended; or, Level 4 = Candidate performs this activity independently and with more than acceptable quality; comparable to an entry-level school counselor. By using an evaluation system such as this, supervisor could take into account the developmental level of the candidate, likely providing a more accurate assessment of the candidates’ competencies.

From this evaluation, it is also recommended that the rubrics established by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia’s “Regent’s Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors” (2004) be re-evaluated for appropriateness in their current format. Throughout the evaluation, stakeholders raised issues concerning the broad nature of certain principles, stating that refinement may be needed in order to make evaluation of the principle feasible. Presented as examples of this were principles IV (School counselor candidates provide leadership in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan that contributes to school renewal by promoting increased academic success, career preparedness, and social/emotional development for all students) and principles VI (School counselor candidates provide individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career
preparedness for all students). These principles, presented as they are currently, detail a wide range of activities across multiple skill sets. Candidates may have the ability to document competency in some aspects, but not the entirety of activities described. It is recommended that the principles be re-evaluated and broken down when appropriate to be monitored and evaluated in a more feasible manner by both candidates and supervisors.

The final recommendation, based on this program evaluation, is to consider revising documentation expectations based on the type of field-site the candidate is placed in. Depending on elementary, middle, or high school field site placement, differences in services provided would be expected. The documentation of the principle III specifically (School counselor candidates coordinate a school to career transition plan for each student) was raised by multiple stakeholders as contingent upon the placement of the candidate. By altering the verbiage used in evaluations based on placement level, both the candidate and supervisor should be able to provide the most relevant documentation required to demonstrate competency.

In conclusion, the preparation program evaluated in this work appears to be producing candidates who are generally well versed in their understanding of, ability to practice, and ability to document competency in established skill areas. These school counseling candidates are likely well prepared for the type of professional work called for by the recent transformations in school counseling and required by recent demands for accountability in education. There are strengths and weaknesses that became evident during the course of this evaluation that generated recommendations for the preparation program to consider in the evolution of its curriculum.
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Appendix A

School Counseling Outcome & Program Evaluation (SCOPE)

Candidate Evaluation Form (CEF)

The School Counseling Outcome and Program Evaluation instrument is designed as a comprehensive evaluation for school counselor preparation programs in the State of Georgia. Based on the standards for counselor preparation adopted by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia in 2003, this instrument is designed to evaluate the development and implementation of essential skills and abilities of school counselor candidates.

Each school counselor is expected to be prepared to be able to increase their students’ social/emotional development and career preparedness, as well as enhance their students’ academic success. In the achievement of these goals, school counselors engage in numerous diverse activities with students, staff, administration, parents, and community agents. Upon completion of a certified training program, each school counselor is expected to be able to demonstrate their ability to meet the expected competencies.

In completing this evaluation instrument the counselor preparation program, school counselor, and field site school administration, will provide appropriate documentation and evaluation across the presented principles. The principles presented in this program are based on the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia 2003 rubrics for counselor preparation. The methods for data collections are based on input from school counselor preparation faculty, school counselor preparation program candidates and graduates, and school counselors currently employed in the state of Georgia.

Instructions:

For each principle presented below, the school counseling preparation institution should examine the development of the overall counseling/guidance skills and register the progress for each candidate according to the appropriate level. When appropriate documentation is required, it should be provided with this evaluation, or be made available as needed. Documentation is required from the preparation program, the school counselor candidate, and the student’s field/internship site administration.
I(A) Principle I. School counselor candidates advocate for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.

__ 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment.

__ 1 = Curriculum includes the advocacy role of school counselors for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.

__ 2 = Candidates have opportunities during field-placements to practice advocating for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.

__ 3 = Candidates are assessed on their effectiveness in advocating for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.

__ 4 = Evidence confirms that candidates have demonstrated effective advocacy for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.

I(B) Supporting Documentation

0 = No documentation provided or documentation does not support principle.

1 = Course syllabi documenting lessons/class activities/practicum work requiring understanding of school policies and programs related to cultural differences among students; as well as advocacy actions that address cultural achievement gaps in student success. Above principle evident in course objectives (knowledge, skills attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings available in included course syllabi.

2 = Description of practicum/internship field placement provided by the candidate preparation program and field placement administration detailing activities for learning and participation in advocacy process concerning school policies addressing cultural achievement gaps in student success. Field placements described in program handbook, stated in Memorandum of Understanding between preparation program and field site, and/or opportunities described in field site’s brochure/literature.

3 = Description of class assignment or field case study in which candidate engaged in advocacy that addressed cultural achievement gaps in student success. Log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees, and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio.

4 = Record of completion of class assignment or field case study, with inclusion of outcome data (e.g., student evaluation, retention statistics) that has been evaluated by
preparation program faculty/administrative supervisor and demonstrates effective positive outcome. Supervisor’s evaluations (preparation program & on-site), compilation of student data evaluated for effectiveness, and/or record of successful completion of all course requirements available in student portfolio.

II(A) Principle II. School counselor candidates advocate for rigorous academic preparation of all students to close the achievement gaps among demographic groups.

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment.

1 = Curriculum includes the advocacy role of school counselors for rigorous academic preparation of all students to close the achievement gaps among demographic groups.

2 = Candidates have opportunities during field-placements to practice advocating for rigorous academic preparation of all students to close the achievement gaps among demographic groups.

3 = Candidates are assessed on their effectiveness in advocating for rigorous academic preparation of all students to close the achievement gaps among demographic groups.

4 = Evidence confirms that candidates have demonstrated effective advocacy for rigorous academic preparation for all students to close the achievement gaps among demographic groups.

II(B) Supporting Documentation Included in Portfolio

0 = No documentation provided or documentation does not support principle.

1 = Course syllabi documenting lessons/class activities/practicum work requiring understanding of achievement gaps among demographic student groups; as well as advocacy actions that address academic preparation insuring academic success for all students. Above principle evident in course objectives (knowledge, skills attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings available in included course syllabi.

2 = Description of practicum/internship field placement provided by the candidate preparation program and field placement administration detailing activities for learning and participation in advocacy process concerning achievement gaps among demographic student groups. Field placements described in program handbook, stated in Memorandum of Understanding between preparation program and field site, and/or opportunities described in field site’s brochure/literature.

3 = Description of class assignment or field case study in which candidate engaged in advocacy that addressed demographic achievement gaps in student success. Log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees, and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio.
4 = Record of completion of class assignment or field case study, with inclusion of outcome data (i.e., student evaluation, retention statistics) that has been evaluated by preparation program faculty/administrative supervisor and demonstrates effective positive outcome. Supervisor’s evaluations (preparation program & on-site), compilation of student data evaluated for effectiveness, and/or record of successful completion of all course requirements available in student portfolio.

III(A) Principle III. School counselor candidates coordinate a school to career transition plan for each student.

__ 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

__ 1 = Curriculum includes the role of school counselors in the coordination of a career transition plan for each student.

__ 2 = Candidates have opportunities during field-placements to practice coordinating a career transition plan for multiple students.

__ 3 = Candidates are assessed on their effectiveness in coordinating a career transition plan for each student.

__ 4 = Evidence confirms that candidates have demonstrated effective coordination of a career transition plan for each student.

III(B) Supporting Documentation Included in Portfolio

0 = No documentation provided or documentation does not support principle.

1 = Course syllabi documenting lessons/class activities/practicum work requiring understanding of the role of the school counselor in the coordination of a career transition plan for each student; as well as activities that demonstrate practice coordinating a career transition plan for single/multiple students. Above principle evident in course objectives (knowledge, skills attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings available in included course syllabi.

2 = Description of practicum/internship field placement provided by the candidate preparation program and field placement administration detailing activities for learning and participation the coordination of a career transition plan for each student. Field placements described in program handbook, stated in Memorandum of Understanding between preparation program and field site, and/or opportunities described in field site’s brochure/literature.

3 = Description of class assignment or field case study in which candidate engaged in coordinating a career transition plan for students. Log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees,
and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio.

4 = Record of completion of class assignment or field case study, with inclusion of outcome data (i.e., student evaluation, retention statistics) that has been evaluated by preparation program faculty/administrative supervisor and demonstrates effective positive outcome. Supervisor’s evaluations (preparation program & on-site), compilation of student data evaluated for effectiveness, and/or record of successful completion of all course requirements available in student portfolio.

IV(A) Principle IV. School counselor candidates provide leadership in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan that contributes to school renewal by promoting increased academic success, career preparedness, and social/emotional development for all students.

__ 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment.

__ 1 = Curriculum includes the leadership role of school counselors in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan.

__ 2 = Candidates have opportunities during field-placements to practice providing leadership in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan that contributes to school renewal by promoting increased academic success, career preparedness, and social/emotional development for all students.

__ 3 = Candidates are assessed on their effectiveness in providing leadership in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan that contributes to school renewal by promoting increased academic success, career preparedness, and social/emotional development for all students.

__ 4 = Evidence confirms that candidates have demonstrated effective leadership in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan that contributes to school renewal by promoting increased academic success, career preparedness, and social/emotional development for all students.

IV(B) Supporting Documentation Included in Portfolio

0 = No documentation provided or documentation does not support principle.

1 = Course syllabi documenting lessons/class activities/practicum work requiring understanding of the leadership role of school counselors in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan. Above principle evident in course objectives (knowledge, skills attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings available in included course syllabi.
2 = Description of practicum/internship field placement provided by the candidate preparation program and field placement administration detailing activities for learning and participation in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan. Field placements described in program handbook, stated in Memorandum of Understanding between preparation program and field site, and/or opportunities described in field site’s brochure/literature.

3 = Description of class assignment or field case study in which candidate engaged in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan. Log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees, and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio.

4 = Record of completion of class assignment or field case study, with inclusion of outcome data (i.e., student evaluation, retention statistics) that has been evaluated by preparation program faculty/administrative supervisor and demonstrates effective positive outcome. Supervisor’s evaluations (preparation program & on-site), compilation of student data evaluated for effectiveness, and/or record of successful completion of all course requirements available in student portfolio.

V(A) Principle V. School counselor candidates use student outcome data to facilitate student academic success.

___ 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment.

___ 1 = Curriculum includes the use of student outcome data to facilitate student academic success.

___ 2 = Candidates have opportunities during field-placements to practice using student outcome data to facilitate student academic success.

___ 3 = Candidates are assessed on their effectiveness in using student outcome data to facilitate student academic success.

___ 4 = Evidence confirms that candidates have demonstrated effective use of student outcome data to facilitate student academic success.

V(B) Supporting Documentation Included in Portfolio

0 = No documentation provided or documentation does not support principle.

1 = Course syllabi documenting lessons/class activities/practicum work requiring understanding of the use of student outcome data to facilitate student academic success. Above principle evident in course objectives (knowledge, skills attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings available in included course syllabi.
2 = Description of practicum/internship field placement provided by the candidate preparation program and field placement administration detailing activities for learning and participation in the use of student outcome data to facilitate student academic success. Field placements described in program handbook, stated in Memorandum of Understanding between preparation program and field site, and/or opportunities described in field site’s brochure/literature.

3 = Description of class assignment or field case study in which candidate engaged in using of student outcome data to facilitate student academic success. Log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees, and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio.

4 = Record of completion of class assignment or field case study, with inclusion of outcome data (i.e., student evaluation, retention statistics) that has been evaluated by preparation program faculty/administrative supervisor and demonstrates effective positive outcome. Supervisor’s evaluations (preparation program & on-site), compilation of student data evaluated for effectiveness, and/or record of successful completion of all course requirements available in student portfolio.

VI(A) Principle VI. School counselor candidates provide individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students.

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment.

1 = Curriculum includes individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students.

2 = Candidates have opportunities during field-placements to provide individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students.

3 = Candidates are assessed on their effectiveness in providing individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students.

4 = Evidence confirms that candidates are effective in providing individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students.

VI(B) Supporting Documentation Included in Portfolio

0 = No documentation provided or documentation does not support principle.
1 = Course syllabi documenting lessons/class activities/practicum work requiring understanding of individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students. Above principle evident in course objectives (knowledge, skills attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings available in included course syllabi.

2 = Description of practicum/internship field placement provided by the candidate preparation program and field placement administration detailing activities for learning and participation in individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students. Field placements described in program handbook, stated in Memorandum of Understanding between preparation program and field site, and/or opportunities described in field site’s brochure/literature.

3 = Description of class assignment or field case study in which candidate engaged in individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students. Log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees, and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio.

4 = Record of completion of class assignment or field case study, with inclusion of outcome data (i.e., student evaluation, retention statistics) that has been evaluated by preparation program faculty/administrative supervisor and demonstrates effective positive outcome. Supervisor’s evaluations (preparation program & on-site), compilation of student data evaluated for effectiveness, and/or record of successful completion of all course requirements available in student portfolio.

VII(A) Principle VII. School counselor candidates collaborate with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs.

__ 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment.

__ 1 = Curriculum includes the role of school counselors in collaborating with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs.

__ 2 = Candidates have opportunities during field-placements to collaborate with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs.

__ 3 = Candidates are assessed on their effectiveness in collaborating with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs.
Evidence confirms that candidates have demonstrated effective collaboration with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs.

**VII(B) Supporting Documentation Included in Portfolio**

0 = No documentation provided or documentation does not support principle.

Above principle evident in course objectives (knowledge, skills attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings.

1 = Course syllabi documenting lessons/class activities/practicum work requiring understanding of the role of school counselors in collaborating with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs. Above principle evident in course objectives (knowledge, skills attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings available in included course syllabi.

2 = Description of practicum/internship field placement provided by the candidate preparation program and field placement administration detailing activities for learning and participation in collaborating with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs. Field placements described in program handbook, stated in Memorandum of Understanding between preparation program and field site, and/or opportunities described in field site’s brochure/literature.

3 = Description of class assignment or field case study in which candidate engaged in collaborating with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs. Log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees, and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio.

4 = Record of completion of class assignment or field case study, with inclusion of outcome data (i.e., student evaluation, retention statistics) that has been evaluated by preparation program faculty/administrative supervisor and demonstrates effective positive outcome. Supervisor’s evaluations (preparation program & on-site), compilation of student data evaluated for effectiveness, and/or record of successful completion of all course requirements available in student portfolio.

**VIII(A) Principle VIII. School counselor candidates assess student needs and make appropriate referrals to school and/or community resources.**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment.
1 = Curriculum includes the role of school counselors in assessing student needs and making appropriate referrals to school and community resources.

2 = Candidates have opportunities during field-placements to assess student needs and make appropriate referrals to school and community resources.

3 = Candidates are evaluated on their effectiveness in assessing student needs and making appropriate referrals to school and community resources.

4 = Evidence confirms that candidates effectively assess student needs and make appropriate referrals to school and community resources.

VIII(B) Supporting Documentation Included in Portfolio

0 = No documentation provided or documentation does not support principle.

1 = Course syllabi documenting lessons/class activities/practicum work requiring understanding the role of the school counselor in assessing student needs and making appropriate referrals to school and community resources. Above principle evident in course objectives (knowledge, skills attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings available in included course syllabi.

2 = Description of practicum/internship field placement provided by the candidate preparation program and field placement administration detailing activities for learning and participation in assessing student needs and making appropriate referrals to school and community resources. Field placements described in program handbook, stated in Memorandum of Understanding between preparation program and field site, and/or opportunities described in field site’s brochure/literature.

3 = Description of class assignment or field case study in which candidate engaged in assessing student needs and making appropriate referrals to school and community resources. Log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees, and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio.

4 = Record of completion of class assignment or field case study, with inclusion of outcome data (i.e., student evaluation, retention statistics) that has been evaluated by preparation program faculty/administrative supervisor and demonstrates effective positive outcome. Supervisor’s evaluations (preparation program & on-site), compilation of student data evaluated for effectiveness, and/or record of successful completion of all course requirements available in student portfolio.

IX(A) Principle IX. School counselor candidates demonstrate mastery and application of the content knowledge in each of the following eight core areas of counseling recommended by CACREP: 1) Professional Identity and Orientation; 2) Social and Cultural Diversity; 3)

__ 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment.

__ 1 = Curriculum includes content in the eight core areas recommended by CACREP.

__ 2 = Candidates have opportunities during field-placements to apply their knowledge in the eight core areas recommended by CACREP.

__ 3 = Candidates are assessed, using multiple measures, on the mastery and application of their content knowledge in the eight core areas recommended by CACREP.

__ 4 = Evidence confirms that candidates have demonstrated mastery and application of their content knowledge in the eight core areas of counseling recommended by CACREP.

IX(B) Supporting Documentation Included in Portfolio

0 = No documentation provided or documentation does not support principle.

1 = Course syllabi documenting lessons/class activities/practicum work requiring understanding of content in the eight core areas recommended by CACREP. Above principle evident in course objectives (knowledge, skills attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings available in included course syllabi.

2 = Description of practicum/internship field placement provided by the candidate preparation program and field placement administration detailing activities for learning and participation in the mastery and application of the content knowledge in each of the following eight core areas of counseling recommended by CACREP. Field placements described in program handbook, stated in Memorandum of Understanding between preparation program and field site, and/or opportunities described in field site’s brochure/literature.

3 = Description of class assignment or field case study in which candidate engaged in activities that demonstrate mastery and application of the content knowledge in each of the following eight core areas of counseling recommended by CACREP. Log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees, and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio.

4 = Record of completion of class assignment or field case study, with inclusion of outcome data (i.e., student evaluation, retention statistics) that has been evaluated by preparation program faculty/administrative supervisor and demonstrates effective positive outcome. Supervisor’s evaluations (preparation program & on-site), compilation of student data evaluated for effectiveness, and/or record of successful completion of all course requirements available in student portfolio.
Appendix B

School Counseling Outcome & Program Evaluation
(SCOPE)

Candidate Evaluation Form Feedback Form

The purpose of this evaluation is to gather your feedback as a student/professional in school counseling regarding the 2004 “Principles for the Preparation of School Counselors” established by the Georgia Board of Regents. A study is currently underway exploring the most effective manner in which to monitor both the development of the individual school counseling student and the development of the preparation program in complying with new standards for school counseling competence and accountability. This evaluation is designed solely to gather information concerning the SCOPE instrument, not on individual competencies of the respondent.

The SCOPE instrument outlines the nine principles designated by the Georgia Board of Regents as necessary for the school counselor to be able to increase their students’ social/emotional development and career preparedness, as well as enhance their students’ academic success. Five levels of competency define each principle.

0 = Insufficient evidence.
1 = Inclusion of competency in preparation program curriculum.
2 = Inclusion of competency in field placements (e.g., practicum & internship sites)
3 = Assessment of candidates in competency areas by preparation program and on-site supervisors
4 = Evidence confirms that candidates have demonstrated competency in specific area as approved by supervisors

The SCOPE instrument also outlines the supporting documentation necessary for meeting accountability requirements of the preparation program and the school system. For each level of competency defined above, there is a corresponding level of supporting documentation.

0 = No documentation provided or documentation does not support principle.
1 = Course syllabi that explain course objectives (knowledge, skills, attitudes), course assignments, and/or required readings related to stated competency.
2 = Description of practicum/internship field placement in program handbook, in Memorandum of Understanding between preparation program and field site, and/or opportunities described in field site’s brochure/literature providing opportunity to gain proficiency in stated competency.
3 = Examples of class assignment or field case study including log of student activities signed by supervisor, examples of case studies, documented participation in policy committees, and/or copies of presentations of in-service training to teachers/staff/parents available in student portfolio demonstrating acquisition of stated competency.
4 = Record of completion of class assignment or field case study, with inclusion of outcome data (e.g., student evaluation, retention statistics) that has been evaluated by preparation program faculty/administrative supervisor and demonstrates effective positive outcome, including
supervisor’s evaluations (preparation program & on-site), compilation of student data evaluated for effectiveness, and/or record of successful completion of all course requirements available in student portfolio.

The nine principles established by the Georgia Board of Regents represent a state-wide response to calls for accountability both in education and in the specialty of school counseling. The school counselor is now expected to be a vital player in the push for school reform that ensures the success of every student academically, socially, and emotionally. Practicing school counselors, school counseling candidates, school counseling preparation programs, school administrators, and educational leaders are all facing a shift in the preparation and practice of school counseling.

Please take time to answer the questions below concerning the feasibility of the SCOPE instrument from you perspective. The SCOPE system is designed to be helpful to both preparation programs and school counselors from the beginning of training through professional practice. At this stage in the development of the SCOPE system we are seeking as much feedback as possible, so please be free with comments, suggestions, queries, and any and all ideas.

Please check the appropriate title that applies to you –

I am a 

___ First year school counseling graduate student
___ Second year (or more) school counseling graduate student
___ School counselor with less than two years experience
___ School counselor with three or more years of experience
___ School counselor educator
___ School counselor supervisor
___ Other ______________________________

1. Is this instrument feasible for pre-service preparation?

2. Is this instrument feasible for in-service evaluation/accountability?

3. If not, what other method would you suggest?

4. What would a candidate or counselor have to document to demonstrate competence?
Appendix C

School Counseling Outcome & Program Evaluation (SCOPE)

Preparation Program Assessment Form (PRAF)

Question 1. Please rate the degree to which you believe that your preparation program has presented you with a clear understanding of the meaning of the principle and its importance as a competency for school counselors.

Question 2. Please rate the degree to which you believe that your preparation program has designed learning experiences to help you gain exposure and mastery over the competencies involved.

Question 3. Please rate the degree to which you believe that you have/will have access to supporting documentation required to verify knowledge of the required competency.

RATING SCALE:  1 = Not At All     2 = Somewhat     3 = Quite A Lot     4 = Completely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. School counselors advocate for school policies, programs and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. School counselors advocate for rigorous academic preparation of all students to close the achievement gaps among demographic groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. School counselors coordinate a school to career transition plan for each student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. School counselors provide leadership in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan that contributes to school renewal by promoting increased academic success, career preparedness, and social/emotional development for all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. School counselors use student outcome data to facilitate student academic success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. School counselors provide individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. School counselors collaborate with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. School counselors assess student needs and make appropriate referrals to school and/or community resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. School counselors demonstrate mastery and application of the content knowledge in each of the following eight core areas of counseling recommended by CACREP: (1) Professional Identity and Orientation; (2) Social and Cultural Diversity; (3) Human Growth and Development; (4) Career Development; (5) Helping Relationships; (6) Group Work; (7) Assessment and Evaluation; (8) Research and Program Evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

School Counseling Outcome & Program Evaluation (SCOPE)

Supervisor Evaluation Form

ECHD Internship in School Counseling

As you finish the first semester of internship, please meet with your on-site supervisor to consider the degree to which you have had opportunities to demonstrate the following areas designated by the Georgia Board of regents. Additionally, ask your supervisor to determine the level to which you have demonstrated competence in this area if the opportunity has been provided. As requested, space is provided for comments with each section as well as a general section at the end.

I. School counselors advocate for school policies, programs and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.

Opportunities have been provided _____ yes      ______ no

Level of competence (please circle one)
N/A           Needs Improvement      Satisfactory      Highly Competent

II. School counselors advocate for rigorous academic preparation of all students to close the achievement gaps among demographic groups.

Opportunities have been provided _____ yes      ______ no

Level of competence (please circle one)
N/A           Needs Improvement      Satisfactory      Highly Competent
III. School counselors coordinate a school to career transition plan for each student.

Opportunities have been provided _____ yes ______ no

Level of competence (please circle one)
N/A Needs Improvement Satisfactory Highly Competent

IV. School counselors provide leadership in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan that contributes to school renewal by promoting increased academic success, career preparedness, and social/emotional development for all students.

Opportunities have been provided _____ yes ______ no

Level of competence (please circle one)
N/A Needs Improvement Satisfactory Highly Competent

V. School counselors use student outcome data to facilitate student academic success.

Opportunities have been provided _____ yes ______ no

Level of competence (please circle one)
N/A Needs Improvement Satisfactory Highly Competent

VI. School counselors provide individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students.
Opportunities have been provided _____ yes  ______ no

Level of competence (please circle one)
N/A Needs Improvement Satisfactory Highly Competent

VII. School counselors collaborate with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs.
Opportunities have been provided _____ yes  ______ no

Level of competence (please circle one)
N/A Needs Improvement Satisfactory Highly Competent

VIII. School counselors assess student needs and make appropriate referrals to school and/or community resources.
Opportunities have been provided _____ yes  ______ no

Level of competence (please circle one)
N/A Needs Improvement Satisfactory Highly Competent

IX. School counselors demonstrate mastery and application of the content knowledge in each of the following eight core areas of counseling recommended by CACREP: (1) Professional Identity and Orientation; (2) Social and Cultural Diversity; (3) Human Growth and Development; (4) Career Development; (5) Helping Relationships; (6) Group Work; (7) Assessment and Evaluation; (8) Research and Program Evaluation.
Opportunities have been provided _____ yes  ______ no
Level of competence (please circle one)
N/A                Needs Improvement    Satisfactory    Highly Competent
Appendix E

Graduating Student Exit Survey

The School Counseling M.Ed. Program
The University of Georgia
Department of Counseling and Human Development Services

Graduating Student Exit Survey

Month and Year of Graduation _________________________

As you reflect on your experiences here, on the left side please rate the courses you have taken based on the importance of the content for your work as a school counselor. On the right side rate the quality of the instruction provided. Please use a five-point scale with 5 representing the highest level of importance and quality and 1 representing the lowest level of importance and quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Quality of Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundations of School Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-cultural Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar in School Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments or suggestions related to any of the responses above:

Consider the electives you have taken in the program. Which would you recommend to others students?

Recommendations for strengthening the overall curriculum:
Please rate the following using a 5-point scale with 5 being excellent and 1 poor:

Faculty Support
Staff Support
Practicum Experience
Internship Experience
Doctoral Student Supervision

General comments, suggestions, recommendations:

The overall grade I would award the program on a scale of A to F is: __________
## Appendix F

School Counseling Outcome & Program Evaluation (SCOPE)

Graduating Student Exit Survey Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Candidate 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Candidate 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G

School Counseling Outcome & Program Evaluation (SCOPE)

Preparation Program Assessment Form (PRAF) Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significantly different from group mean at the .05 level