To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting a dissertation written by Nicole Adrienne Cobb entitled "Progressing Towards the Implementation of the Tennessee Model for Comprehensive School Counseling Programs: A Study of School Counselor Priorities and Practices." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Learning and Leadership.

_____
Dr. Valerie Rutledge, Co-Chair

_____
Dr. David Rausch, Co-Chair

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

_____
Dr. Carol Dahir

_____
Dr. Ted Miller

Accepted for the Graduate Council:

_____
A. Jerald Ainsworth, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

Progressing Towards the Implementation of the Tennessee Model for Comprehensive School Counseling Programs: A Study of School Counselor Priorities and Practices

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Education Degree
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Nicole Adrienne Cobb
May 2011

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my grandmother, Constance Garcia Cobb, who not only inspired me to pursue the doctorate, but also encouraged me to achieve excellence in every endeavor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is the culmination of one of the more memorable chapters in my life. The Learning and Leadership doctoral program represents an inner journey, a constant reflection upon past assumptions and beliefs and at the same time, an opening to new knowledge as well as shared experiences with my professors and peers. This doctoral program helped me to better understand myself and has profoundly influenced how I approach every aspect of my professional and personal life.

I first and foremost must thank the school counselors of Tennessee who were involved in this study, for without them, this endeavor would not be possible. I stand in awe of their enduring spirit and dedication to making their voices be heard. This final product is a testament to them. I encourage all school counselors to continue to stand up for the appropriate role of a professional school counselor knowing that our fight is not for ourselves but for the precious lives we serve.

Much gratitude is due to my dissertation committee who nurtured my academic, social and personal development as a student, scholar, and professional. To my chair, Dr. Valerie Rutledge, thank you for encouraging me to apply to the doctoral program and for being at my side each step of the way. I appreciate your constant positive attitude and your invaluable direction and support throughout this entire journey. Dr. Ted Miller, thank you for always making me feel as if I was your number one priority. I appreciate the way you pushed and challenged me throughout the doctoral program. You have made me a better researcher, thinker, writer, and person. Dr. David Rausch, your timing could not have been more perfect! I appreciate your tireless efforts to expose me to new ideas, awaken my curiosity and take a real, personal interest in me along the way. Dr.

Carol Dahir, thank you for your endless time reviewing drafts, asking tough questions and continuously challenging the way I look at our profession. I truly respect your scholarship and hope I will have the opportunity to mentor in the caring and loving way you have done with me for so many years. I would not be where I am today without your dedication to me and my career. It has been an honor to have you on my committee but even more so to now be able to call you friend.

To all my colleagues, peers, our program director, Becca McCashin, and especially cohort four, thank you. You each have touched my life in a very special way. Thank you for making this journey full of laughter, surprises, and memories I will treasure for a lifetime. Finally, I must thank the countless system of support I have received from other mentors and professionals in the field including: Joy Burnham, Mary Simmons, Tish Garrett, Carolyn Stone, Christine Schimmel, Dawn Stevenson, Kellie Hargis, Kate Donnelly, Katie Brock, Mike Herrmann, Rene Love, Sheryl Margolis, Caroline Wylie, Meghan Brenneman, Jonathan Steinberg, Michael Nettles, and Katherine Bassett. Your constant mentorship, support, advice, and encouragement have anchored me throughout my career and particularly this doctoral endeavor.

To those who have been with me from the *very* beginning: Mom, thank you for instilling in me your work ethic, persistence, and endurance without which this doctorate would not be possible. Words cannot express my gratitude for all the sacrifices you made in order for me to know this success. Dad, thank you for your constant praise and support. You have always encouraged me to go above and beyond my wildest dreams. Morgan, the best big brother a girl could ever have, and your beautiful wife, Jenny, you both serve as anchors and role models in my life. Without the two of you, I'd never have

made it past statistics, not to mention the many obstacles you both have helped me navigate over the years. I will forever hold the late nights, giggles, and vacation escapes close to my heart. Lori, my VBFWWW, I owe you so much. You wiped away many tears, gave endless encouragement, and supported me every step of the way. Your love and friendship is truly priceless. I am so thankful to have *all* of you in my life.

I must also give a special thanks to my "dissertation spouse," James Witty. Thank you for the endless hours you spent supporting me through the program and reading and re-reading my dissertation drafts. I have spent more time with you over the last year than anyone, and I am truly grateful for the friend and brother I acquired as part of this process. I would not have been able to complete this journey without you. Professionally and personally you have changed my life---I am forever beholden.

Through my parents, teachers, and many mentors along the way, I was socialized to believe that education was the most important tool in achieving success. I was fortunate enough that college was never a choice for me, it was the expectation. Due to this influence, I have spent the greater part of my adult life embedded in academe and relentlessly advocating for school counselors and students. My background and experiences have shaped how I come to understand the world, make critical decisions, and consequently what I have established as my research agenda. Through my research, I have realized how many challenges school counselors face in trying to support the students they serve. Words are not adequate to describe the challenges and obstacles they struggle with on behalf of students every day; be it having to balance creating master schedules, developing four-year plans, writing college recommendation letters, deescalating parents, keeping snack stashes in their offices and wiping away endless

streams of tears, Tennessee school counselors are the consummate professionals juggling these many duties with expertise, grace, patience, and love for students and the profession. These school counselors inspire me to understand how transformation occurs and what we must do to propel our profession into this new era in education. I hope my work serves as a platform for school counselors who typically are not asked about the specifics of their work and the great impact they have on students day in and day out. It is my hope that through my work, I will help others create a stronger understanding of the importance of the school counseling profession and the need to utilize our school counselors to their highest potential.

ABSTRACT

The profession of school counseling is rapidly changing from one often characterized by indirect local administrative accountability to one characterized by accountability for student outcomes. School counseling leadership has led a movement for role transformation (ASCA, 2003; 2005; Education Trust, 2007) that has initiated significant changes in the priorities and practices of school counselors across the nation. In line with a continued national focus on educational reform targeted mainly at increasing student achievement, school counselors are now expected to align professional goals and activities with expectations set forth by policymakers (Hines & Fields, 2004). These expectations are largely directed at measurable results in student learning outcomes. Following Tennessee's recent receipt of the Race to the Top (RTTT) funds (USDOE, 2009), school counselors in Tennessee will soon be evaluated and held accountable for contributing to student achievement. This responsibility is clearly articulated in the Tennessee Model for Comprehensive School Counseling (TMCSC) and, therefore, school counselors must be committed to the implementation of the TMCSC. Accordingly, this dissertation examined: (a) the degree to which Tennessee school counselors have acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC, (b) the degree to which Tennessee school counselors are directly collaborating with administrators and teachers toward improving student achievement, and (c) the challenges and obstacles school counselors experience in implementing the TMCSC. The structure of the TMCSC was used as the foundation for the study. The results revealed a deeper understanding of the factors which influence the degree to which the TMCSC is utilized in local districts and schools and established a baseline which reveals

which areas of the TMCSC are embraced by the counseling profession and which areas need support. Specifically, findings revealed significant differences among elementary, middle, and high school counselors in the TMCSC subscales of School Counseling Priorities, School Setting Perceptions, Career and Post-Secondary, Personal/Social Development and District Expectations/Program Management. Significant differences were also found among rural, urban, and suburban school counselors in the TMCSC subscales for School Counseling Priorities and School Setting Perceptions. The results provide implications for meeting Tennessee's goals for RTTT and for improving school counseling in Tennessee and across the nation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The profession of school counseling is rapidly changing. School counseling leadership has led a movement for transformation (ASCA, 2003; 2005; Education Trust, 2007) that has initiated significant changes in the priorities and practices of school counselors across the nation. With a continued national focus on educational reform, targeted mainly at increasing student achievement, school counselors are expected to align their goals and activities with these new expectations set forth by policymakers (Hines & Fields, 2004).

This new era in education reform began in 1983, when the federal government released a report from the National Commission of Excellence in Education entitled, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. This report identified a "rising tide of mediocrity" that threatened the future of education (USDOE, 1983, p. 2). The report detailed America's poor academic performance relative to other countries, decreasing student academic achievement, the rise of enrollment in college remedial courses, and weak curricula found in many public schools. The report stated that "for the first time in U.S. history the educational skills of one generation would not surpass those of its predecessors" (USDOE, 1983, p. 2). *A Nation at Risk* spurred the evolution of standards-based education reform. This movement toward standards-based education spread rapidly with the passage of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (IASA). IASA reauthorized the initial Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), which included funding for school counseling positions (USDOE, 1996). ESEA required the needs of all students be addressed, not just disadvantaged students or students at risk

of school failure. Simultaneously, the call for school reform proposed in America 2000 (USDOE, 1990) was further promoted in Goals 2000: The Educate America Act (USDOE, 1994). This legislative re-authorization financially supported the development of national standards and world-class benchmarks across all academic disciplines, including school counseling, to ensure that all graduates of our high schools and post-secondary institutions can fully participate in the 21st century economy.

Building on the infrastructure of this education movement, on January 8, 2002 President George W. Bush signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) reauthorizing ESEA in dramatic ways. The national reform initiative had a firm commitment to "harnessing the power of standards, accountability, and school choice options" (Commission on NCLB, 2007, p. 22). The ESEA Reauthorization Policy Statement published by the Council of Chief State School Officers (2006) promised that "if we follow through, standards-based reform has the potential to dramatically improve student achievement and meet our education goals" (p. 4). NCLB continued the push to make improving student achievement and closing achievement gaps a national priority.

Despite the years of dedication and focus on educational reform, the state of America's public schools appears to still be on a downward trajectory (Darling-Hammond, 2010). As a result, there has been another call to action issued by the current presidential administration. President Obama announced his administration would sponsor a grant competition called Race to the Top (RTTT) (USDOE, 2009). Never before has such a sum of money been made available to reenergize the public educational system. The $4.35 billion RTTT Fund is an unprecedented federal investment in education reform.

As a result of NCLB (2001) and RTTT (2009) there is an intense focus on the use of standardized test scores in measuring student academic achievement and educator contribution to the production of measurable achievement gains by students. For the first time in history all educators, including school counselors, are being called upon to quantitatively demonstrate they contribute to students' academic achievement and are preparing all students to be college and career ready. Critical to contributing to improving student achievement is the ability of the school counselor to implement a comprehensive school counseling program, use data to inform their practice and address inequities in educational opportunity; connect their work with students to the goals of school improvement, and engage in meaningful collaborative partnerships with administrators and teachers. In order to assist and support Tennessee school counselors in transforming their role in schools to meet the accountability pressures dictated by NCLB and RTTT, it is important to review the historical background of the school counseling field.

Background to the Problem

Historically, the role of the school counselor has been ambiguous. This lack of clear focus and direction made it difficult for school counselors to show the impact of their work with students (Baker & Gerler, 2004). In response to the call for accountability by all educators, in 1997 the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) developed standards for school counselors (Bowers, Hatch, Schwallie-Giddis, 2001). As a result of standards development, ASCA joined the ranks of the academic disciplines by providing a content framework to better define the role of school counselors, the expectations for students, and the structure of school counseling

programs. The publication of the *ASCA National Standards for School Counseling Programs* (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) propelled the school counseling profession into the age of accountability by detailing what students would know and be able to do as a result of comprehensive school counseling programs (CSCP) (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Stone & Dahir, 2007). ASCA published a follow-up document to the national standards, the *ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* (2003; 2005), which focused specifically on the design of a CSCP. Since the publication of the ASCA National Standards and the ASCA National Model, every state school counselor association has encouraged practitioners to develop and implement CSCP's based on the national or state iteration of the ASCA National Model. The primary purpose of this unified effort is to align the goals of school counseling programs with the primary mission of today's schools, namely increasing the academic achievement of all students.

In 2001, the Tennessee State Board of Education adopted school counseling career and guidance standards. These standards were the first of their kind in Tennessee and promoted school success through a focus on academic, personal/social, and career development. The organizational design of the standards reflected the nine standards found in the ASCA National Standards. In 2005, Tennessee responded to the national call and developed a state specific model, the *Tennessee Model for Comprehensive School Counseling* (TMCSC) (TDOE, 2005) that aligned Tennessee school counseling standards with those of ASCA. Both the ASCA and TMCSC models have a strong accountability component, giving school counselors a vehicle by which to demonstrate how their work impacts student achievement. Although many educators, policymakers, students and parents may believe that school counselors impact students and their

achievement, limited data to prove this point is currently available. Hence, there has been a call for more rigorous research that clearly demonstrates how the work of school counselors is tied to increasing student achievement (Brigman, Campbell, & Webb 2004; Dahir & Stone, 2009; Dimmitt, Carey, & Hatch, 2007; Poynton & Carey, 2006; Rowell, 2006). Davis (2005) argues that school counselors must meet the challenge by fully implementing a CSCP and by collecting data to demonstrate how and why they implement their programs. Carey, Dimmitt, Hatch, Lapan, and Whiston, (2008) maintain that school counselors must shift to a results-based school counseling practice that clearly shows how their work impacts student achievement. Based on the current researcher's review of the literature, there has been little research in Tennessee on school counselor readiness to embrace and implement this new way of work. With these assertions in mind, this dissertation study examined (a) the degree to which Tennessee school counselors have acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC, (b) the degree to which Tennessee school counselors were directly collaborating with administrators and teachers around improving student achievement, and (c) the differences in challenges and obstacles school counselors experienced in implementing a CSCP.

Statement of the Problem

Even though the Tennessee State Board of Education has adopted a professional framework to guide the work of school counselors, challenges persist with the shift from the traditional role of school counseling, which typically provides discrete counseling services to a small proportion of the student population, to that of a systemic and developmental service delivery model (Akos & Galassi, 2008). The ambiguous role

definition of actual practice for school counselors is defined and controlled by the local school district administration in Tennessee rather than by the components of the TMCSC. Many administrators perceive school counselors as providing an ancillary service rather than being an integral part of the school's learning-community that directly impacts student achievement (College Board, 2009).

With student achievement remaining at the forefront of federal and state education reform agendas, it is imperative for school counselors to demonstrate how they are connected to these efforts. One way in which school counselors can link their contribution toward improving student achievement is through the implementation of a CSCP. Sink, Akos, Turnbull, and Myududu (2008) found that school counselors can likely impact student achievement if they carefully design and deliver strategic interventions aimed at these specific goals. In turn, successful delivery of the ASCA National Model requires knowledge and understanding of CSCP's, the state or local school counseling program models, and state academic standards as well as the skill set to implement the program. The support and involvement of school administrators and teachers in achieving the goals set forth in a CSCP is obviously essential.

As noted above, the Tennessee State Board of Education approved the TMCSC for implementation into all Tennessee public schools in 2005. The Tennessee legislature has also passed Tennessee Code Annotated (TCA) 49-5-302 defining the role of the school counselor that aligns with the TMCSC. To determine to what degree TMCSC impacts student achievement, educators must first have a clear picture of the extent to which it is now being fully implemented. If school counselors are prohibited from engaging in the tasks associated with the implementation of TMCSC and principals

expect or mandate them to provide non-counseling, quasi-administrative functions, then it may stand to reason that the students of Tennessee are not being fully served by school counseling programs and will not graduate from Tennessee high schools college and career ready as expected in the parameters of RTTT.

The essential problem leading to the development of this study is that Tennessee school counselors are struggling to define their roles and demonstrate how their programs contribute to student achievement and growth as they begin to implement the TMCSC. In today's education landscape, school counselors must demonstrate their work is contributing to student achievement (Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009). Tennessee's receipt of RTTT increases the urgency around this problem since 50% of school counselors' performance evaluation will be linked to student achievement and growth beginning in July 2011 (TDOE, 2010).

Purpose of the Study

According to Walsh, Barrett, and DePaul (2007), full implementation of a CSCP allows school counselors to better identify the needs of students, align the school counseling program with the mission of the school, evaluate the program's success, and reflect and revise the program for future implementation. The Tennessee State Board of Education adopted the TMCSC in an effort to define the appropriate role of the school counselor and to align the work of Tennessee school counselors with the ASCA National Model. The intent of the Tennessee State Board of Education and the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) was that this policy would provide administrators and school counselors with a framework to encourage continuity and consistency in the way school counseling programming is delivered across the state to all students.

Implementation tacitly supported the belief that if school counselors implemented the TMCSC with fidelity, student achievement and growth would be positively impacted.

The purpose of this study is to examine the degree to which Tennessee school counselors have acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC, the degree to which they were directly collaborating with administrators and teachers around improving student achievement, and the differences in challenges and obstacles many school counselors experienced in implementing the TMCSC. This research study presents a snapshot of the current priorities and practices of Tennessee school counselors. The results acquired from this study provide important insight to the TDOE as it seeks to continue to provide meaningful and relevant professional development and support to school counselors.

Rationale and Significance of the Study

Implementation of the TMCSC model gives Tennessee school counselors the opportunity to demonstrate the integral role they play in Tennessee's educational reform initiatives. The TMCSC model is endorsed by ASCA and is designed to be used as a guide for local school districts in how to best utilize school counselors and school counseling programs. The TDOE intended for this model to serve as a catalyst of change, empowering and uniting Tennessee school counselors as they fulfill their mission of preparing Tennessee students to be college and career ready. The TMCSC cannot be successfully implemented without the full commitment and cooperation of Tennessee school counselors, administrators, teachers, students, and other stakeholders. No longer can school counselors depend on the assumption that solid graduate level training, good intentions, and strong motivation to help students will be enough to validate their work in

a school (Johnson, Johnson, & Downs, 2006). In today's education world, school counselors must be able to articulate how their program is connected to student achievement and success (Kuranz, 2003). The TMCSC, if properly implemented, will promote a visible paradigm shift from "What do school counselors do?" to "How are students different as a result of what we do?" (ASCA, 2003, p. 9). This change will also align Tennessee school counselors to the current goals and benchmarks of RTTT (USDOE, 2009). By using the TMCSC as the foundation for the study, this researcher obtained a better understanding of the priorities and practices of Tennessee school counselors and the current conditions for implementing the TMCSC in local districts and schools.

Several research studies have shown a consistent relationship between academic achievement and the full implementation of CSCP's (Brigman & Campbell, 2003; Fitch & Marshall, 2004; Lapan, Gyspers, & Petroski, 2001; Legum & Hoare, 2004; Sink & Stroh, 2003; Webb, Brigman, & Campbell, 2005, DeVoss & Andrews, 2006). However, more empirical research in this area nationwide and in the state of Tennessee is needed (Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Chandler, 2006; Coll & Freeman, 1997; Lieberman, 2004). The TMCSC represents the essential elements that the school counseling field believes to be important for best serving the needs of all students. Thus, this study is significant because it will demonstrate the degree to which school counselors have acquired the attitudes and skills necessary for successful TMCSC implementation. This study will also lay the groundwork for future research to measure the direct relationship between TMCSC implementation and student achievement. Although little research exists concerning the role or contributions of the school counselor in Tennessee, the results of

one recent study indicate the likelihood of continuing role ambiguity in the state (TDOE, 2008). In 2007, all public school counselors in Tennessee were asked to participate in a study. A total of 999 school counselors responded, representing 57% of the school counselor population. Tennessee school counselors indicated significant involvement in many activities that appear to be unrelated to their training and the Tennessee Code for the Role of the School Counselor. Although 41.4% claimed to have a comprehensive program in place, other responses failed to support a high level of implementation. Forty-seven percent were involved with clerical duties such as transferring records, posting grades, and managing transcripts. Fifty-nine percent were involved in the coordination of statewide assessments. Forty-five percent indicated they performed fair-share duties above and beyond what was expected of other certified staff at their school. Critical to school counselors fulfilling their responsibility to support every student's success in school is a working relationship with faculty and administration that understands and supports the transformed school counselor role and involvement in student development and the goals of school improvement (Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009). When school counselors become more cognizant of where they are in the implementation process, they can identify and reflect on the skills and knowledge essential to move forward (Carey, Harrity & Dimmit, 2005). The data suggested many school counselors deemed themselves powerless as they struggled between crisis intervention, administrative directives, non-counseling duties, and their desire to help every child succeed (Chandler, Burnham, & Dahir, 2008) despite the response that 41.4% of the school counselors were implementing TMCSC. Based on this TDOE report, it appears that Tennessee administrators saw traditional non-counseling roles as appropriate

job expectations for school counselors and were unaware of changes in the profession that have existed nationally for the past 10 years. This study confirmed Tennessee school counselors continued to experience role ambiguity as a result of administrative expectations of non-counseling duties and clerical tasks interfering with the goals of the TMCSC.

Research Questions

Despite the influence of the ASCA National Model, results from previous research studies suggested that there were significant differences in the level of implementation of a CSCP when the following variables were analyzed: the grade level work setting of the counselor (elementary, middle, or high school) and the location in which service is provided (rural, urban, or suburban) (Chandler, 2006; Coll & Freeman, 1997; Dahir, 2004; Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009; Hardesty & Dillard, 1994; Lehr & Sumarah, 2002). The following are the research questions addressed in this study: (See Appendix A for alignment of research questions to data sources.)

1. Based upon grade level served and location of service, to what degree have Tennessee school counselors acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC?
2. Based upon grade level served and location of service, to what degree were Tennessee school counselors directly collaborating with administrators and teachers to improve student achievement?
3. Based upon grade level served and location of service, what were some of the differences in challenges and obstacles school counselors have experienced in implementing the TMCSC?

These questions provided the general framework for the research study.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions apply to this study:

1. Academic development: The process by which school counselors help students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that facilitate effective learning throughout their school career.
2. American School Counselor Association (ASCA): The national, professional organization which represents the field of school counseling.
3. ASCA National Model: A model for school counseling programs developed by the American School Counseling Association in response to the education movement in which standards-based education focuses on performance as opposed to entitlement (American School Counselor Association, 2003; 2005). This model is built around four elements: (a) the foundation, (b) the management system, (c) the delivery system, and (d) accountability. The elements revolve around the themes of advocacy, leadership, collaboration, and systemic change.
4. Career development: The process by which school counselors help students acquire the knowledge and skills that aid them in career/educational planning and aid their transition from high school to post-secondary education.
5. Comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP): The term used by ASCA which refers to a school counseling program that is comprehensive in scope, preventive in design, and developmental in nature (ASCA, 2003; 2005).
6. Fair-Share responsibilities: The activities which are related to school operations, such as playground duty, bus duty, and selling tickets at extracurricular events,

which are supposed to be shared equally among all certified staff members in the school.

7. Individualized Education Plan: An IEP is a legal document that delineates special education services for special-needs students. The IEP includes any modifications that are required in the regular classroom and any additional special programs or services.

8. Non-counselor roles: The non-professional school counselor roles that are administrative or clerical in nature, and may include tasks such as scheduling, administering tests, substitute teaching, student registration, lunch supervision, and enforcing discipline.

9. Personal/Social development: The process by which school counselors assist students in their development of positive interpersonal skills.

10. Professional School Counselor (PSC): Professional school counselors are certified/licensed professionals with a master's degree or higher in school counseling or the substantial equivalent and are uniquely qualified to address the developmental needs of all students. Professional school counselors deliver a comprehensive school counseling program encouraging all students' academic, career, and personal/social development and helping all students in maximizing student achievement.

11. Role Ambiguity: The lack of clarity on behalf of the school counselor as to the appropriate job responsibilities versus the assignment of tasks unrelated to the profession.

12. Role of the school counselor: Today's school counselors are vital members of the education team. They help all students in the areas of academic achievement, personal/social development, and career development, ensuring today's students become the productive, well-adjusted adults of tomorrow.

13. Tennessee Model for Comprehensive School Counseling (TMCSC): Directly aligned to the ASCA National Model, the TMCSC is the mechanism with which Tennessee school counselors and school counseling teams will design, coordinate, implement, manage, and evaluate their programs for students' success. It provides a framework for the program components; the school counselor's role in implementation; and the underlying philosophies of leadership, advocacy, and systemic change (TDOE, 2005).

14. 504 Plan: A 504 plan refers to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act which specifies that no one with a disability can be excluded from participating in federally funded programs or activities, including elementary, secondary or postsecondary schooling. Disability in this context refers to a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more major life activities.

Methodological Assumptions and Delimitations of the Study

Delimitations are those decisions that the researcher made to narrow the study (Creswell, 2009). Participation in the study was delimited to Tennessee public school counselors who were subscribed to the TDOE electronic mailing list; generalization to school counselors in private schools or outside of Tennessee may not be warranted.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations are those potential weakness or problems with the study (Creswell, 2009). The primary method for data collection was survey research. A survey approach allows for the potential of participants to misinterpret survey items and there was no obvious way to determine if this occurred (Creswell, 2009). Although all respondents' answers were anonymous, there is no guarantee of respondents' honesty in responding or possible attempts to respond in a manner they believed to be socially desirable. Since all responses were anonymous, there is no way to verify or explore the priorities, practices, or perceptions rated in the survey. Therefore, the results of this study may not be able to be generalized to school counselors working in private schools, other states, or other countries.

Organization of Dissertation

This dissertation is organized in five chapters. Chapter One introduces the research study. This includes an introduction and background to the problem, statement of the problem and purpose, research questions, overview of the methodology and rationale, and significance of the study. Additionally, the researcher defines key terminology, notes the basic assumptions and includes the delimitations and limitations of the study. Chapter Two reviews the relevant literature regarding the early years of school counseling, role ambiguity, current trends in the field, and the role NCLB and RTTT is playing in transforming the profession. Chapter Three outlines the methodology and research design of the study. This includes the identification of the research design, participants, instrumentation, procedures used and analysis of data, as well as the role of the researcher in limiting bias and procedures to protect human subjects. Chapter Four

presents the results of the study. Finally, Chapter Five discusses the research findings, summarizes the dissertation study, and offers recommendations for future studies.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Historical Background of School Counseling

The history of school counseling formally began at the turn of the 20th century. The factors leading to the development of guidance and counseling in the United States began in the 1890's with the social reform movement. The difficulties of people living in urban slums and the widespread use of child labor outraged many. One of the consequences was the compulsory education movement, and, shortly thereafter, the vocational guidance movement, which, in its early days was concerned with guiding people into the workforce to become productive members of society. Guidance and counseling in these early years was considered mostly vocational in nature. The 1920's and 1930's saw an expansion of counseling roles beyond working only with vocational issues. Social, personal, and educational aspects of a student's life also needed attention. At the same time, because there was a lack of a formal program and curriculum, principals were free to assign other duties to the guidance counselor that no one else had time to do. In this era, assigned duties included serving as social committee chair, classroom teacher, cafeteria monitor, or assistant principal (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). Based on this literature (Gysbers and Henderson, 2001; Whitson, 2002), it is clear that non-counseling duties have been a professional concern for a long time. In 1923, Myers described the problematic situation school counselors struggle with to this day. Myers (as cited in Gysbers & Henderson, 2001) wrote:

> Another tendency dangerous to the cause of vocational guidance is the tendency to load the vocational counselor with so many duties foreign to the office that little real counseling can be done. The principal, and often the counselor himself,

> have a very indefinite idea of the proper duties of this new office. The counselor's time is more free from definite assignments with groups or classes of pupils than is that of the ordinary teacher. If well chosen he has administrative ability. It is perfectly natural, therefore, for the principal to assign one administrative duty after another to the counselor until he becomes practically assistant principal, with little time for the real work of a counselor (p. 247).

In 1958, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was enacted. This was the first federal legislation that provided funding for school counseling positions in public schools. It was also during this time that the American School Counselor Association was created. In the 1970's, the school counselor was beginning to be defined as a deliverer of a program similar to other educational programs as opposed to being perceived as a service provider. There was an emphasis on accountability of services provided by school counselors and the benefits that could be obtained with structured evaluations. This decade also gave rise to the special education movement. The educational and counseling needs of students with disabilities were addressed with the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975. In order for schools to provide adequate educational opportunities for individuals with disabilities, school counselors were trained to adapt the educational environment to student needs. School counselors found themselves serving in new roles as gatekeepers to Individualized Education Programs (IEP) and Student Study Teams (SST), as well as consultants to special education teachers, especially after passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990 (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006).

As the number of school counselors and school counseling services continued to expand, a move toward recognition as a distinct profession was initiated. In 1971, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) revised its standards for preparing guidance workers. NASDTEC required a preparation program to provide competence in the following areas: psychological and educational assessment; counseling; group processes; personal, social, educational, vocational development, and career planning; administration of counseling programs, including faculty and public relations; performance, interpretation, and utilization of educational research; and laboratory and practicum experiences. The new standards also required separate and distinct experiences for preparation of elementary and secondary counselors (Boser, 1985). In 1976, Virginia issued the first counseling license, with other states soon to follow (Gladding, 2009). The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) was founded in 1981 in order to ensure consistency in the training of school counselors (Sweeney, 1995).

As time progressed, the need for the services of school counselors increased. Societal concerns highlighted gender issues, sexual orientation, and increased ethnic diversity in schools which renewed an interest in the human growth and development needs of students. This focus led to the introduction of the first comprehensive developmental guidance programs, which later become known as comprehensive school counseling programs (CSCP) (Gladding, 2009). Dinkmeyer and Caldwell's (1970) seminal work, *Developmental Counseling and Guidance: A Comprehensive School Approach*, provided early direction for establishing developmental guidance programs. The authors articulated several key philosophical principles as guidelines for program

development: (a) developmental guidance should be an integral part of the overall educational process and consistent with the school's mission and philosophy; (b) developmental guidance is for all students; (c) teachers must be a part of the program delivery system; (d) programs function best when planned as a continuous set of services helping the student accomplish tasks that lead to effective cognitive and affective development; (e) programs include direct counseling, appraisal, and group guidance services as well as the indirect service of consultation; and (f) programs focus on and encourage students' assets. In 1974, Gysbers and Moore wrote *Improving Guidance Programs,* a manual containing detailed comprehensive developmental guidance plans to assist individual states in the development of their own plans. *Improving Guidance Programs* described how to develop, implement, and evaluate a comprehensive guidance program. The program concept described in the manual was evaluation based, focusing both on process and outcome evaluation (Gysbers, 2004). Later work by Myrick (1997) and others (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Wittmer, 2000) continued to support these principles, with additional emphasis on the need for an organized, planned, and sequential guidance curriculum. Gysbers and Henderson (2001) also moved the profession forward from thinking of school counseling as a set of developmental services to a broader emphasis on comprehensive developmental programs. Johnson and Johnson (2003) advocated that programs be organized around specific outcomes, further defined as student competencies. Delivering planned developmentally appropriate curricula and interventions systematically to all students is far superior to offering school counseling services that are reactionary or randomly prescribed. Gysbers and Henderson (2000) affirmed this approach. Baker (2001) described the new direction in this way:

"Developmental guidance seems to be a marriage between career and psychological education principles" (p. 80). Gysbers and Henderson (2006) claimed that CSCP's transformed former position services model of school counseling into systematic programs. CSCP's are defined as "(a) programs with standards for students, resources, and activities to achieve the standards, and methods of evaluation; (b) developmental, comprehensive, and preventative in nature, and for all students on a regularly scheduled basis; (c) based on a team approach with ongoing collaboration and consultation with parents, school and community stakeholders; (d) deliberately designed, implemented and evaluated; (e) integral parts of the educational mainstream; and (f) led by professionally certified and licensed school counselors who are accountable for delivery and management" (ASCA, 2003, p. 9).

CSCP's differ significantly from the traditional school counseling model. Most noticeable is the move away from response-focused programs as well as administrative and non-counseling duties (Lapan, 2001). Instead, sequential, research-based, developmentally appropriate programs designed to meet the needs of all students are encouraged. A second difference is with program goals. Program goals should be aligned to the school's mission statement and school improvement plan goals. The CSCP should have an accountability component that allows school counselors to demonstrate their impact on student learning and growth with observable, measurable outcomes (Hughes & James, 2001). In addition there is a strong emphasis on the importance of collaborating with administrators, teachers, parents, students, and the community as programs are being implemented (Baker & Gerler, 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 1997; Johnson & Johnson, 2003). Herr (2001) affirmed that extensive planning and viewing

students in a holistic way were the hallmark characteristics of CSCP's and most differentiated them from the traditional models. Anderson (2002) purported that CSCP's would allow school counselors to no longer just be in a school to serve others but instead to implement a specific program using a professional skill set, knowledge, and expertise only they possessed.

Role Ambiguity in the Field of School Counseling

By the 1980's through the 1990's, standards-based education reform took hold. The school counseling profession was in danger of being eradicated due to its lack of credibility. In response, Campbell and Dahir (1997) led a major national study and developed the ASCA National Standards. The publication of the ASCA standards in 1997 ushered in a distinctive period of professionalization and strengthening of school counseling identity, roles, and programs. Whiston and Sexton (1998) published the first systemic meta-analysis of school counseling, concluding the need for researchers and practitioners to focus on outcome research.

Today the status of school counseling programs and the role of the professional school counselor are in a state of flux (Baker, 2001; Bodenhorn, 2001; Dahir & Stone, 2003; House & Hayes, 2002; Paisley & McMahon, 2001). Debate and controversy over the appropriate role of the professional school counselor continues. Most of the research in the school counseling profession has focused on specific programs usually designed to intervene on a particular issue or problem such as bullying, suicide, drug abuse, and other issues. Limited research has been conducted on the effectiveness of comprehensive school counseling programs in impacting student achievement and success (Gysbers, 2005). In addition, school counselors have not taken the initiative to advocate for their

appropriate roles in schools. In fact, Sears and Coy (1991) stated, "School counselors appear to be reluctant or unable to convince principals that they should perform the duties for which they have been trained" (Sears & Coy, 1991, p. 3). As the literature has revealed, much of the role ambiguity for school counselors can be attributed to the numerous non-counseling duties consistently assigned to them (Borders, 2002; Brown, 1989; Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Dahir, 2004; Galassi & Akos, 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 2006; King, 2003; Kuranz, 2003; Lieberman, 2004; Scarborough, 2005). The literature also demonstrated that school counselors are routinely assigned tasks of test coordination, individualized education plan (IEP) coordination, 504 administration, master schedule design, individual student schedules, registration of new students, discipline reporting, attendance monitoring, bus duty, lunch duty, and maintenance of student records (Aubrey, 1991; Baker, 2001; Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Gysbers & Henderson, 2006; Herr, 2001; Hogan, 1998; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Paisley & McMahon, 2001; Sink & MacDonald, 1998; Sutton & Fall, 1995). All of these tasks take up a considerable amount of time, are above and beyond the expectation of fair-share duties, and prevent the implementation of more appropriate counseling activities (Gyspers & Henderson, 2006). Given the educator accountability requirements of RTTT, it is increasingly difficult for school counselors to remain complacent about the excessive demands on the school counselor's time. Time spent on non-counseling duties takes away the time needed to conduct appropriate counseling activities that have the potential to impact student achievement and growth. If Tennessee school counselor evaluations will be weighted 50% on student achievement and growth, it is imperative school counselors be given the time, support, and other resources needed to implement a CSCP.

School Counselor Role Misconceptions

In an effort to remedy role ambiguity for school counselors, the misconception of the school counselor's role by administrators, teachers, students, parents and the community must be addressed (Anderson, 2002; Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; Bemak, 2000; Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Dahir, 2004; Hart & Prince, 1970; Herr, 2002; Hogan, 1998; King, 2003; Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Lieberman, 2004; Louis, Jones, & Barajas, 2001; Ponec & Brock, 2000; Ribak-Rosenthal, 1994; Sutton & Fall, 1995). Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan, and Jones (2004) compared opinions of school counselors and school administrators concerning the importance of counselor functions outlined in the ASCA National model and the Transforming School Counseling Initiative. The results indicated school counselors and school administrators did not agree on what were appropriate or inappropriate tasks or duties for school counselors. Eighty percent of secondary school principals assigned top priority to tasks such as registration and scheduling, testing, and maintenance of student records, while secondary school counselors rated the same tasks as inappropriate. Elementary school principals rated testing, maintaining school records, and assisting in the principal's office as high priority for school counselors. Elementary school counselors rated these tasks as lowest priority. Clark and Amatea (2004) examined the perceptions of teachers regarding the role of the school counselor. The most highly valued function of school counselors for teachers was the role of collaborating with staff and parents. Small group counseling and large group guidance were rated as second most important duties. The teachers also rated counselor accessibility and visibility as important. Somewhat encouraging, teacher views of the

role of the school counselor appeared to more closely align with the goals of the ASCA National Model.

Lambie and Williamson (2004) noted that role ambiguity exists when (a) an individual lacks information about his/her work role, (b) there is lack of clarity about their work objectives with the role, or (c) there is lack of understanding about peer expectations of the scope and responsibility of the job. Burnham and Jackson (2000) studied the role of professional school counselors in Alabama, comparing actual and prescribed tasks as related to the Alabama Model for Comprehensive School Counseling. Burnham and Jackson (2000) also found that too often school counselors were involved in non-counseling related activities. School counselors have not been able to concretely provide a clear definition of what they should be doing nor have they been able to show the impact of their work/programs on student achievement and success. Hart and Jacobi (1992) advocated that the vision for school counseling cannot be separate from the vision for the educational system. It is important that school counselors look to the future in terms of the impact of school reform on their work in schools.

The ASCA National Model

Introduced in 1997, ASCA's National Standards for School Counseling Programs has served to provide a foundation for CSCP's throughout the nation (Bowers, Hatch, & Schwallie-Giddis, 2001). ASCA determined its National Standards offered a foundation to the CSCP and defined the role of the school counselor and what students should know and be able to do as a result of participating in a CSCP (Dahir, 2001). In 1999, ASCA conducted a survey of 2,000 school counselors to determine if they believed the development of national standards would help them define their role and work in schools.

The survey results indicated school counselors wanted and needed a formal document outlining the focus of their work with students and of their CSCP's that would articulate a professional mission and would provide momentum for the future of school counseling (Dahir, 2001). Campbell and Dahir (1997) then conducted a thorough review of the literature specifically examining state models of comprehensive school counseling to form the basis of the ASCA National Standards. They concluded comprehensive school counseling programs should focus on three areas of student development: (a) academic, (b) career, and (c) personal/social. Within each of these three domains, content standards were designed to promote and support student achievement and success.

From the development of the National Standards evolved the need to provide a structure organizing school counseling into a programmatic structure with these standards as the program's foundation. As the education accountability movement progressed, it became critical for ASCA to develop a more comprehensive model to encompass both student outcomes and program design, management, and accountability.

The ASCA National Model (2003; 2005) builds on the solid foundations of the Comprehensive Developmental Guidance Model (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001), the Results-Based Model (Johnson & Johnson, 2003), and the National Standards (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Dahir, Sheldon, & Valiga, 1998). The model was specifically developed to address the growing need for standardization and accountability in school counseling programs.

The ASCA National Model (2003; 2005) has four components: the foundation, the delivery system, the management system, and the accountability system. The foundation is the basis of the model and addresses the philosophical underpinnings of the

school counseling program. Foundation consists of concise, reflective statements about beliefs, program philosophy, and mission and is linked to the mission and goals of the school. The foundation also contains information about the expected student competencies school counseling programs will address in the academic, career, and personal/social domains (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). The delivery system includes guidance curricula, individual student planning, responsive services (e.g., counseling, referral, and consultation), and systems support (e.g., collaboration, program management, and professional development). The management systems are the systemic monitoring processes that ensure the implementation of the program and include principal-counselor agreements about responsibilities, action plans, calendars, use of data, and advisory councils. The accountability system includes results reports, performance evaluations, and program audits that measure and communicate with stakeholders about program results and related data. In addition to describing the program foundation and systems for delivery, management, and accountability, the ASCA National Model (2003; 2005) integrates the Education Trust's (1997; 2002) transforming school counseling initiative themes of leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change. The ASCA National Model (2003; 2005) encourages school counselors to focus on academic success and to promote equity and access to educational resources for all students. This model also connects school counseling programs to the educational reform initiatives outlined in ESEA and RTTT and emphasizes data-driven decision making and accountability (Carey, Harrity, & Dimmitt, 2005).

History of School Counseling in Tennessee

Tennessee has played an active role in the development of the school counseling profession throughout the history of the profession. Guidance in Tennessee schools had its formal beginning as a professional entity in Knoxville in October 1940 when the National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA) started a state chapter of the organization (Davis, 1985). In 1945, the Tennessee State Testing Program was created at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville with Dr. Joseph Avent as the first director. During his tenure as director, Avent changed the name to the Tennessee State Testing and Guidance Program to reflect the program's interest in the development of guidance programs in Tennessee schools (Davis, 1985). This interest was heightened after another study (Coleman, 1956, as cited in Boser, 1985) revealed only a minority of Tennessee schools had an organized guidance program and less than 40% reported that a teacher-counselor had been designated in their school. Dr. Coleman stated "although the Superintendent's Study Council, Supervisors' Study Groups, and the Principal's Study Council had expressed considerable interest in guidance services, much had yet to be done in Tennessee before all schools would have adequate guidance services" (Boser, 1985, p. 10). Dr. Annie Ward followed Avent as the Director of the Tennessee State Testing and Guidance Program in 1956. Dr. Ward observed that fewer than 20% of Tennessee high schools had an organized guidance program. She asserted the following recommendations:

1. The creation of an area of Guidance under the Division of Instruction at the Tennessee Department of Education, and the securing of a director or supervisor to head this area;

2. Provision for certification of school counselors;
3. Setting up of minimum standards to meet the state's recommendations, "a system of counseling and guidance shall be worked out to assist pupils in making satisfactory adjustments to life situations. Each school shall submit a brief outline of its pupil personnel guidance and counseling programs" (Davis, 1985, p. 11).

In 1956 a master's degree in guidance was approved at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville (Boser, 1985). In addition, the Tennessee State Testing Program office began publishing "Guidance Notes." This newsletter publication served as a statewide means for communicating the development of guidance programs and the increasing employment of school counselors (Boser, 1985). In 1957, Dr. John Lovegrove was named the first Tennessee Department of Education Director of Pupil Guidance and Testing. Under his leadership a statewide guidance study group was formed. It had representation from state colleges and universities as well as select public school personnel. The group outlined formal objectives which were to:

1. give direction to school guidance programs;
2. spell out competencies, job descriptions, and employment standards;
3. assist in the development of guidance programs in Tennessee public schools (Boser, 1985).

As part of the committee work, Dr. Lovegrove's office issued a bulletin, *A First Step in Guidance*, to guide school leaders in the development of a guidance program (Boser, 1985). The major impetus for the development of guidance services in Tennessee came from the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. Within the NDEA was a section devoted to guidance, counseling and testing. The intent of this part of the

NDEA was to (a) establish and maintain a program of testing in all secondary schools and (b) to assist in the development of secondary school guidance and counseling programs to identify outstanding students, to encourage students to complete secondary education, to take the necessary courses for entrance to higher education, and to enter higher education. Title V called on training institutes to improve qualifications of people who were or would be engaged in guidance activities in secondary schools (Jennings, 1995). Each state had the responsibility for developing its own state plan for implementing Title V. In Tennessee, assistance was provided to local schools in the development of guidance services; conferences and workshops were sponsored; schools were provided free achievement and scholastic aptitude tests for all students at one school level in grades 8 to 10. Funds were also provided to local schools for reimbursement of salaries of guidance personnel for necessary travel, clerical assistance, office equipment, materials, supplies, and tests. The qualifications of personnel who would be responsible for the guidance services included a valid teacher's certificate, three years of successful teaching, and at least one course from a menu of course choices in seven specified areas. In order to continue practicing guidance, every school guidance counselor had to demonstrate achievement of an additional area of the seven specified (Boser, 1985). Most counselors at this time had teaching responsibilities, with an hour of daily release time for guidance activities. In 1959, the Tennessee Department of Education's State Testing office released a publication directed at school superintendents and principals called *Guidance, A Must in Education*. This publication assisted the profession in gaining school administration support for guidance services in schools (Boser, 1985). By 1960, Dr. Lovegrove had established a leadership group comprised of counseling

supervisors and counselor educators. This group wrote a job description of the school guidance counselor in *The Job of the School Guidance Counselor in Tennessee Public Schools*, which was published by the Tennessee Department of Education. In addition, the Tennessee Department of Education funded two-week training workshops for school guidance counselors to provide additional training in implementing school guidance programs (Boser, 1985). In December 1961, Dr. Lovegrove formed a committee to develop formal requirements for guidance certification. The new certification still required a valid Tennessee teacher's certificate and three years of successful teaching experience and built on the seven areas already defined. In addition it added the requirements of supervised practice in guidance and counseling and a course on administration and organization of guidance services for a total of 27 quarter hours of study representing each of the nine areas (Boser, 1985). Then, in 1971, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification met to revise the preparatory requirements for school counselors. In 1972, Tennessee adopted these new standards and added a separate certification for elementary counselors (Boser, 1985).

Another major growth force for guidance in Tennessee came about as a result of a House Joint Resolution (1971) which directed the Legislative Council Committee to study vocational education programs in grades seven through twelve. The final report of this committee came in 1973 and served as the basis for House Bill 120 and Senate Bill 1091 which provided for comprehensive vocational education opportunities. Among the provisions for the act were the following statements:

> Appropriate counseling and pre-counseling courses shall be made available by 1975 in grades seven and eight and the training of an adequate number of

> vocational instructors and counselors shall proceed as rapidly as possible. Counseling shall be provided in grades seven through twelve at the ratio of one counselor for two hundred students, with special competence in vocational guidance including some practical experience (Davis, 1985, p. 14).

Because of the wording of the Act, some personnel in Vocational-Technical education were anticipating this unit now had a mandate to train vocational counselors. The Tennessee Pupil Guidance Association (TPGA) strongly objected to the potential duplication of training programs and the likelihood of two types of counselors — vocational and academic. The group argued students needed counselors who could assist with educational, personal, and vocational concerns (Davis, 1985). A subcommittee of the State Advisory Committee on Teacher Certification was subsequently appointed, representing TPGA and Vocational-Technical Education, under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert Saunders, Dean of the College of Education, Memphis State University. In 1973 the group issued recommendations for changes in guidance certification to the Tennessee Department of Education. The committee identified ten competency areas and suggested program approval and implementation procedures. The new certification recommendation removed both teacher certification and teaching experience as requirements for the secondary school guidance position and approximately doubled the length of the training program. The proposal was approved and a new state certificate entitled Guidance Associate was established (Davis, 1985).

As a result of Senate Bill 1914 and House Bill 1965 in 1984 a statewide elementary guidance task force was appointed by Commissioner R. C. McElrath at the request of Governor Lamar Alexander to study the need for elementary school counselors

in Tennessee. As a result of the work of this task force, Senate Bill 133 and House Bill 908 mandated elementary school counselors in grades one and two in each county at a ratio of one counselor to 500 students (Davis, 1985).

In 1999, the Tennessee legislature readdressed Tennessee state laws pertaining to school counselors and passed the following legislation:

School Counselors (49-6-303):

1. Each LEA shall employ or contract with school counselors for grades pre-kindergarten through twelve (pre-K-12).
2. The school counseling program shall be established and operated under guidelines adopted by the State Board of Education.
3. The State Board of Education shall report on the implementation and effectiveness of the program in its annual report to the general assembly.
4. School counselors shall provide preventive and developmental counseling to school students in order to prepare them for their school responsibilities and their social and physical development. In providing these services, school counselors shall: (a) aid children in academic development through the use and interpretation of test scores, improved pupil self-concept, and early identification and attention problems that are deterrents to learning and development; (b) act in a consultative role to teachers relative to the use of test scores and improvement of the learning environment, use of out-of-school resources and agencies and development of a home-school liaison; (c) offer services related to the identification and placement of children with handicapping conditions; (d) serve in a consultative role to parents, in a liaison capacity, as a resource in understanding growth and

development problems, and as an aid in understanding how some nonschool factors affect learning and achievement of children; (e) serve as a resource in decreasing discipline problems through an understanding of peer relations, teacher-pupil relations, social awareness and drug awareness; (f) aid in improving school attendance and retention by implementing an early identification and prevention program for potential attendance and retention problems; (g) serve as a resource in decreasing the incidence of juvenile delinquency by early intervention through guidance and counseling services; (h) act as a resource and consultant to teachers in implementing a career development program which, at the elementary school level, includes self-awareness, job awareness and pre-vocational orientation; (i) provide an available source for youngsters needing someone to "just listen" to their problems or concerns; (j) and serve as a resource and consultant to teachers in implementing an intervention program that utilizes conflict resolution and decision-making strategies aimed at preventing occurrences of disruptive acts by students within the school and on school property. The minimum requirement to be employed as a school counselor shall be an appropriate license granted by the state board of education (TDOE, 2005, pp. 1-5).

School Counseling Career and Guidance Standards

In 2001, the Tennessee State Board of Education adopted formal school counseling career and guidance standards. The adopted standards were developed by a team of thirty-three school counselors, teachers, administrators, parents, community members and state department personnel. These standards are statements of what

students should know and be able to do as a result of participating in a CSCP. The standards were aligned to the Tennessee State Board of Education's *Master Plan for Tennessee Schools* by advocating for school counseling programs that promote school success through a focus on academic achievement, prevention and intervention, and social/emotional and career development. The organizational design of the standards reflected the nine standards in the *National Standards for School Counseling Programs* (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) developed by ASCA. The standards were divided into three sections as outlined by ASCA: academic development, career development, and personal/social development.

The academic development standards were designed to guide the school-counseling program to implement strategies and activities to support and maximize learning. The career development standards served as a guide to provide the foundation for acquiring the attitudes, knowledge and skills that enable students to make a successful transition from school to a post-secondary environment and the personal/social standards provided the foundation for personal and social growth, which contributes to academic and career success. In addition to outlining the standards in the three domains, best practice lesson plans were also provided to aid school counselors in addressing each standard in their day to day lesson plans (TDOE, 2001).

Tennessee Model for Comprehensive School Counseling

Although Tennessee has a rich and dynamic history in school counseling and despite the advancement in legislative mandates, Tennessee school counselors struggled with role ambiguity. Tennessee school counselors expressed similar concerns to those presented at the national level: a need of direction for the development and

implementation of a CSCP to align their work with school improvement and their impact on student achievement and success (TDOE, 2008). In response to this need, the TDOE led a steering committee to develop the TMCSC model. The TMCSC is directly aligned with and has the same components of the ASCA National Model (2003; 2005). The TMCSC, adopted in 2005, represents what a school counseling program should contain and serves as an organizational tool to identify and prioritize the elements necessary for program implementation. Given the research findings which link CSCP's with improved academic achievement, implementation of this model is vital to the school improvement process in Tennessee. The model allows school counselors to work strategically as part of an instructional team to promote student success (TDOE, 2005).

The TDOE developed and adopted the TMCSC for the expressed purpose of focusing and revitalizing school counseling programs in Tennessee schools to be more responsive to the challenges facing schools, teachers, students, families, and communities today and in the future. The continued emphasis is on reaching all students with a school counseling program based on a clearly defined framework emphasizing student standards and connecting activities and processes to student achievement. The model also serves as a guide for administrators on how to evaluate their school counselors and the school counseling program. The TMCSC mirrors the educational reform goals in the state of Tennessee and the nation at large.

The Transformed School Counselor Initiative

The National School Counselor Training Initiative, sponsored by the Education Trust and the DeWitt-Wallace Foundation, has also had significant influence on the school counseling field (Baker, 2001; Hayes & Paisley, 2002; Paisley & Hayes, 2003).

These foundations ignited the Transforming School Counseling Initiative, with the primary goal being to encourage, promote, and advocate for broad changes in the training and professional development of school counselors (Musheno & Talbert, 2002). The impetus of these changes was to help school counselors better address the mandates set forth in NCLB (USDOE, 2001), especially the focus on closing the achievement gap between poor students and students of color and their more advantaged peers (Baker & Gerler, 2004; Paisley & Hayes, 2003; Stone & Dahir, 2006). Subsequently, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) revised standards for pre-service preparation to parallel the language of the Transforming School Counselor Initiative (CACREP, 2009; Paisley & Hayes, 2003). The Education Trust and the DeWitt Wallace Foundation have come to look on school counselors as an integral part of the education team charged with closing the achievement gap. The agencies support the contention that school counselors maintain a school-wide perspective on serving the needs of all students and are in the most advantageous position to see systemic barriers to student success (House & Hayes, 2002). A research study by the Education Trust (2002), funded in part by the DeWitt-Wallace Foundation, found that where students had significant increases in student growth and achievement school counselors were implementing CSCP's and were part of the education team.

Educational Impact of Comprehensive School Counseling Programs

In an effort to validate the impact of CSCP's, two large scale, statewide evaluations have been completed. Both studies produced positive findings related to the implementation of CSCP's (Lapan, Gysbers, & Petroski, 2001; Lapan, Gysbers, & Sun, 1997). The first study (Lapan, Gysbers, & Sun, 1997) collected school data from the

Missouri accreditation program. The data were analyzed to study the relationships between the level of CSCP implementation and a variety of student outcomes. This study indicates that students in schools with more fully implemented CSCP's reported earning higher grades, having better relationships with teachers, and feeling greater satisfaction with school. Students also reported education is relevant to later life, school is safe, and high school students reported that career and college information was accessible (Lapan, Gysbers, & Petroski, 2001). The second study, conducted by Sink and Stroh (2003), was performed to answer the research question, "Do school counseling interventions in elementary schools with CSCP's foster higher academic achievement test scores in students?" (p. 354). Findings from this study (Sink & Stroh, 2003) indicated that early elementary-age students who attend the same school for three or more years do better academically when there is a CSCP in place, even if the CSCP program is not fully implemented. Additionally, students who remained in the same school for multiple years with a well-implemented CSCP obtained higher achievement test scores than students who attend schools without such programs. Another smaller study (Wilson, 1996) focused on counselor interventions with low achieving students and their parents to determine whether school counseling interventions are effective in boosting academic achievement as measured by grade point average (GPA). This review included 19 studies over a 25-year period. Summary information suggested counseling interventions can have positive effects on academic achievement. Similarly, Brigman and Campbell (2003) conducted a study to evaluate the impact of a school-counselor-led intervention on student academic achievement and school success behaviors. The results of this study indicated a significant difference between treatment and comparison groups on reading

and math scores. In addition, Mitcham-Smith (2005) found that school counselors who reported actual activities most closely aligned to the recommended activities of CSCP's had higher levels of self-efficacy and professionalism. The respondents indicated they believed that they were more effective in meeting the needs of students because they were implementing CSCP's. Perhaps in part based upon the findings of these studies, Stone and Dahir (2006) suggested that full implementation of a CSCP supports the goals of educational reform by ensuring equal access to educational opportunities for all students.

Taken collectively, the results of these studies are significant in that they support the premises of ASCA, the DeWitt Wallace Foundation and the Education Trust initiatives. Although the quantity of empirical evidence about current school counseling programs is small, it is nearly uniformly positive in supporting the conclusion that school counseling interventions that focus on the development of cognitive, social, and self-management skills can produce sizable gains in student academic achievement (Lapan, Gysbers, & Petroski, 2001; Lapan, Gyspers, & Kayson, 2007; Whiston & Quinby, 2009).

National Educational Legislation Impacting School Counseling

National acceptance of the ASCA National Model (2003; 2005) and the expeditious rate at which states are creating and adopting models such as the TMCSC have gained interest from a number of education reform stakeholders. In 2001, the NCLB Act signed into law (USDOE, 2001) included the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Program. Four of the five goals of NCLB had a direct impact on school counselors. Goals one and two addressed improved student achievement for learners while goals four and five referenced school climate, affective development, and

the opportunity for all students to graduate from high school (Stone & Dahir, 2004; 2006).

On February 17, 2009, President Obama signed into law the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), historic legislation designed to stimulate the economy, support job creation, and invest in critical sectors, including education (USDOE, 2009). The RTTT executive summary states:

> ARRA lays the foundation for education reform by supporting investments in innovative strategies that are most likely to lead to improved results for students, long-term gains in school and school system capacity, and increased productivity and effectiveness. The ARRA provides $4.35 billion for the Race to the Top Fund, a competitive grant program designed to encourage and reward States that are creating the conditions for education innovation and reform; achieving significant improvement in student outcomes, including making substantial gains in student achievement, closing achievement gaps, improving high school graduation rates, and ensuring student preparation for success in college and careers; and implementing ambitious plans in four core education reform areas:
>
> 1. Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy;
> 2. Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;
> 3. Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and
> 4. Turning around our lowest-achieving schools. (USDOE, 2009)

Tennessee was one of two states to be awarded RTTT funds in round one. Through this grant, Tennessee will receive approximately $500 million dollars over the next four years to implement its comprehensive school reform plans. One of the key components in the Tennessee reform initiative is the commitment to ensure all Tennessee students will graduate from high school ready for college and a career, regardless of their income, race, ethnic or language background, or disability status (TDOE, 2010). This work began two years ago when Tennessee was invited to be a part of the American Diploma Project. As part of this work, high school standards have been aligned with college and workplace expectations, teachers will be required to use a work- and college-based curriculum, and schools will be held accountable with benchmarks that describe specific skills high school graduates must have to succeed in college or the workplace (TDOE, 2010).

Although school counselors may not be directly involved in classroom instruction, they play a crucial role in the academic achievement and success of students (Erford, House, & Martin, 2003). School counselors are trained to have expertise and to be actively involved in all four of the education reform components. Although core academic skills and content knowledge are commonly recognized as college readiness skills, other skills also help shape readiness to be college and work ready. Economists have characterized skills that determine educational achievement but are not measured readily by standardized tests or directly taught in academics as "non-cognitive skills" (Bowles & Gintis, 2002, p. 3). Non-cognitive skills include a range of behaviors that reflect greater student self-awareness, self-monitoring, and self-control. Meeting the developmental demands of college requires behavioral, problem-solving, and coping

skills that allow students to successfully manage new environments and the new academic and social demands of college or the workplace. School counselors have the training to assist students in the development of non-cognitive skills, study skills, work habits, time management, help-seeking behavior, and social problem-solving skills, that will aid in preparing students to be college and work ready (Conley, 2007). However, when school counselor positions are eliminated or when counselors are not permitted to implement CSCP's, the actions hamper their ability to fully contribute to the college and work readiness goals of RTTT.

Challenges to Implementation of Comprehensive School Counseling Programs

The literature suggests a number of factors that may inhibit school counselors from being able to fully implement CSCP's. Some of the more notable barriers include: (a) high counselor-student ratios (Burnett, 1993; Herr, 1999; Johnson & Johnson, 2003; Kuranz, 2003; Mustaine & Pappalardo, 1996; Myrick, 2003; Sparks, 2003; Whitson, 2002); (b) role ambiguity of school counselors (Anderson, 2002; Baker, 2001; Brown, 1989; Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Hart & Prince, 1970; Hogan, 1998; House & Hayes, 2002; Louis, Jones & Barajas, 2001; Mustaine & Pappalardo, 1996; Ribak-Rosenthal, 1994); (c) testing coordinator responsibilities (Brown, Galassi, & Akos, 2004; Green & Keys, 2001; Sears & Granello, 2002); (d) budget constraints (Anderson & Reiter, 1995; Bunce & Willower, 2001; Johnson & Johnson, 2003); and (e) other non-counseling duties (Anderson & Reiter, 1995; Borders & Drury, 1992; Bunce & Willower, 2001; Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Gysbers & Henderson, 2006; Herr, 1999; Louis, Jones, & Barajas, 2001; Myrick, 2003; Napierkowski, & Parsons, 1995; Olson, 1983; Parker, 1977; Partin, 1993; Schmidt, Weaver, & Aldredge, 2001; Sears & Granello, 2002; Whitson, 2002). It

appears from the literature the assignment of non-counseling duties is the greatest barrier to school counselors being able to implement a CSCP. Gysbers (2005) noted this barrier and referred to it as the "implementation gap" (p. 38). An implementation gap occurs in a school district where a CSCP has been written and adopted by the school board but not fully implemented. Gysbers attributed this gap to three main causes: (a) the difficultly for some administrators and school counselors to set aside the old service-oriented model; (b) the fact some administrators and some school counselors are resistant to change; and (c) the burden of non-counseling duties preventing school counselors from fully implementing the CSCP (Gysbers, 2005).

Summary

School counseling has a long and rich history of which contemporary counselors can be proud. However, that history indicates some trends and traditions that are not well suited for contemporary efforts at school reform. Fortunately, the movement for transformation in the field of school counseling is strong, and this is fortunate as the future of the profession lies in the data that school counseling research provides regarding how full implementation of CSCP's contributes to student achievement and success. It is critical that school counselors be seen as "powerful partners and collaborators in school improvement and central to the mission of schools" (Dahir & Stone, 2003, p. 214). As the role and perception of school counselors' changes and more CSCPs are fully implemented, school counselors will begin to be seen as integral in the education reform movement (Erford, House, & Martin, 2003).

ASCA, the TDOE, the Wallace Foundation, and the Education Trust helped to give uniform identity and structure to school counseling programs in Tennessee.

However, a lack of consistency in how school counselors are utilized and viewed across the state and the country continues. This leaves school counselors at a disadvantage for achieving the goals of fully implementing CSCP's and of impacting student achievement and success. Often seen as ancillary personnel and subject to the impulses of their administrators, school counselors are frequently left feeling dissatisfied and unsuccessful, and there may be even greater stakes. Whitson (2002) believed that, during this time of educational reform, school counseling is at a critical crossroad that will determine if the profession flourishes or is disseminated. House and Hayes (2002) and McGannon, Carey, and Dimmitt (2005) cautioned that unless school counselors commit to fully implementing a CSCP, the profession will not be identified as part of the school reform movement and is at risk of extinction. This current study was developed to gather data relative to this issue and to provide information useful for a transformation of school counseling into the mainstream of school reform activities, including the expectations of Tennessee's RTTT goals.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODS

Introduction

This chapter explains the research methods used to carry out the study. This includes the identification of the research design, participants, instrumentation, procedures used, and analysis of data as well as the role of the researcher in limiting bias and ensuring the protection of human subjects. The study utilized a descriptive survey research design. All research activities were approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (Appendix B).

Research Design

The study employed a descriptive survey research design (Creswell, 2009; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003; Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006) to address the following research questions and hypotheses:

1. Based upon grade level served and location of service, to what degree have Tennessee school counselors acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC?

   Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in the degree of acquired attitudes and skills around the implementation of the TMCSC by the following variables: the level work setting of the counselor (elementary, middle, or high school) and location in which service is provided (rural, urban, or suburban).

2. Based upon grade level served and location of service, to what degree were Tennessee school counselors directly collaborating with administrators and teachers to improve student achievement?

Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in the degree to which school counselors are collaborating with administrators and teachers to improve student achievement based on the following variables: level work setting of the counselor (elementary, middle, or high school) and location in which service is provided (rural, urban, or suburban).

3. Based upon grade level served and location of service, what were some of the differences in challenges and obstacles Tennessee school counselors have experienced in implementing the TMCSC?

   Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in the types of challenges or obstacles experienced by school counselors based on the following variables: the level work setting of the counselor (elementary, middle, high school) and location in which service is provided (rural, urban, or suburban).

Survey designs are frequently used in educational research studies (Fink, 2003) to gather specific information from a specific group of people (Windsor, Clark, Boyd, & Goodman, 2004). This descriptive survey research method sought to examine the priorities and practices of school counselors throughout the state of Tennessee in relation to the implementation of the TMCSC.

Population and Sample

All K-12 school counselors who were subscribed to the TDOE's school counselor electronic mailing list and were employed as school counselors in public schools in Tennessee had the opportunity to complete the survey in November, 2010. This constituted a nonrandom or nonprobability convenience sample (Creswell, 2009;

Neuendorf, 2002). The participants responded to the survey anonymously. All participant responses were confidential.

According to Dillman, (1978) one factor that can influence a successful return rate in survey research is the potential respondent's sense of trust in the survey and the overall research. The preservation of anonymity of respondents facilitated building this sense of trust in the survey and the research. Participation was on a voluntary basis, with the goal of the researcher to accumulate responses representative of the school counseling population in Tennessee. Individuals who returned the survey constituted the potential sample for analysis.

Instrumentation

Data were collected from individuals using a questionnaire survey instrument. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2006) argue that survey research is an excellent methodological procedure to gain information about a particular group of people. The selected survey instrument for this study was the *Assessment of School Counselor Needs for Professional Development* questionnaire (ASCNPD) developed by Dahir and Stone in 2003, revised in 2004, and authorized for permission to use in this study in the summer of 2010. The instrument was specifically designed for the purpose of this study and other similar studies. The questions are grouped into the following subscale components:

1. School Counseling Priorities;
2. School Setting Perception;
3. Academic development;
4. Career/Post-secondary development;
5. Personal/Social development;

6. Building and District Expectations (Program Management)

These six subscales are based on the results of the study described below (Burnham, Dahir, Stone, & Hooper, 2009) and are briefly reviewed here. The School Counseling Priorities subscale has 18 items and assesses the degree of relative importance of school counselor priorities. The items are defined as activities and tasks that contribute to the overall well-being and needs of a school, as defined by the ASCA National Model (2003; 2005). Examples include the following: "Improve student access to academic interventions," "Use data to identify specific areas of school improvement," and "Reduce social/institutional barriers that keep students from achieving their potential."

The School Setting Perceptions subscale has 20 items and includes items that assess respondents' beliefs regarding appropriate roles for school counselors as well as items that address collaboration and consultation roles, such as "Counselors are viewed as school leaders," "Teachers and school counselors work together to identify students who are not performing to their best level," and "Administrators work with school counselors to increase student academic performance."

The 18 items that address student development are represented by three subscales: Personal/Social Development, Career and Post-Secondary Development, and Academic Development. The Academic Development (AD) subscale has five items and assesses the priorities school counselors place on program strategies and activities that support and maximize student learning. This section aligned with the academic development domain in the ASCA National Standards included in the National Model (2003; 2005). Example items from this subscale include "Study skills," "Improving grades," and "Test-taking

strategies." The Career and Post-Secondary Development (CPS) subscale has five items and examines the degree to which school counselors are committed to assisting students with career awareness, career exploration, and planning post-high school decisions. The items are aligned with the career development domain in the ASCA National Standards included in the National Model (2003; 2005). Example items from this subscale include "College admissions strategies" and "Developing educational and career plans." The Personal-Social Development (PSD) subscale has eight items and assesses school counselors' practices regarding the importance of strategies and activities that assist students to develop relationships, cope and understand emotional issues, respect self and others, and make positive transitions. Examples include "Managing emotions (stress, anger, coping, etc.), "Strengthening interpersonal communication skills," "personal problems that affect grades," and "Diversity issues." This subscale is aligned to the personal/social domain in the ASCA National Standards included in the National Model (2003; 2005).

The Building and District Expectations/Program Management subscale has 22 items that assess school counselors' involvement in system support activities that provide ongoing support to the school environment and also administrative expectations regarding tasks some of which are considered as non-counseling responsibilities (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Chandler, et al., 2008). Example items from this subscale include "Scheduling courses," "Involvement in coordination of statewide assessments," and "Implementation of four year educational plans."

A recent analysis (Burnham, et al., 2009) of the psychometric properties proved the instrument to be statistically sound, and it has been used extensively to collect data

and establish a baseline level of attitudes, beliefs, priorities, and practices of school counselors. In this study (Burnham, et al., 2009), the component structure of the ASCNPD survey was examined via principal component analysis. A six-component orthogonal solution (varimax) was found to be most interpretable and was retained. The total explained variance for the six-component solution was 53.49%. The six-component subscales were labeled: School Counselor Priorities, School Setting Perceptions, Academic Development, Career and Post-Secondary Development, Personal/Social Development, and Program Management. The internal consistency estimates were examined and an alpha of .94 was obtained for the overall scale. The internal consistency estimates for the subscales were as follows: School Counseling Priorities, [alpha] = .91; School Setting Perceptions, [alpha] = .91; Academic Development, [alpha] = .76; Career and Post-Secondary Development, [alpha] = .81; Personal/Social Development, [alpha] = .86; and Program Management, [alpha] = .69. The researchers confirmed through factor analysis that the items in each section of the survey were consistent and imply the subscale labels represent the scale's content.

The researcher was granted permission to adapt the ASCNPD for use in this study. The ASCNPD (2010) (Appendix C) included sections related to: (a) the school setting in which school counselors work, (b) activities in which school counselors are often engaged, (c) school counselors' perceptions of the importance of those activities, (d) school counselor's work with the students, and (e) the expectations and priorities associated with the school counselor's program. Ms. Mary Simmons and Dr. Kellie Hargis, both previous directors of School Counseling for the State of Tennessee Department of Education, in conjunction with practicing Tennessee school counselors

(Appendix D), reviewed the proposed survey questions based on Dillman's (1978) model and established content validity. Using expert judges to review the domain description and evaluate specific features of the items in relation to this domain, as well as collecting and summarizing their judgments, is known as content validation (Popham, 2008). The questions posed to the committee addressed such issues as uniform understanding of words, vagueness of questions, assumption of knowledge by the researcher, and technical accuracy of the questions. They also reviewed each item and its alignment with the TMCSC. All of these themes were addressed in the survey using five-point Likert scale ratings. According to Fink (2003), the method of requiring participants to use common rating scales allows the responses to be treated as ordinal measures. Thus, the researcher can more effectively analyze the data and draw conclusions.

In addition to the above, the completed survey (Appendix C) also included fifteen items used to gather demographic data related to participant gender, racial/ethnic identity, age, programmatic level, school classification, service on various school and system level committees, work setting, credentials, and activities of school counselors. The information obtained through this survey was anonymous and could not be directly linked to any individual participants a process that ensured the confidentiality of all survey responses.

Data Collection

The survey was administered through the Internet via the well known web-based application *Survey Monkey* (https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/88FQ8TK). According to Fowler (2002), advantages of Internet surveys include the low cost of collecting data and the potentially high speed of returns. Internet surveys have similar advantages to self-

administered surveys in that they generally have high response rates (Fowler, 2002). Additionally, the use of Internet surveys allows participants time to provide thoughtful answers and check records for accuracy (Dillman, 1999). Data collection techniques adhered to Dillman's (1978) Total Design Method (TDM). Dillman explains the goal of this method as follows:

> The appeal of the TDM is based on first convincing people that a problem of importance exists to a group with which they identify, and second, that their help is needed to find a solution. The researcher is portrayed as a reasonable person who, in light of the complexity of the problem, is making a reasonable request for help, and, if forthcoming, such help will contribute to the solution of that problem. The relationship the researcher seeks to establish is broader than that between him or herself and the questionnaire recipient, that is, if you do something for me, I'll do something for you. Rather, the researcher is identified as an intermediary between the person asked to contribute to the solution of an important problem and certain steps that might help solve it. Thus the reward to the respondents derives from the feeling that they have done something important to help solve a problem faced by them, their friends, or members of a group including their community, state, or nation, whose activities are important to them (p. 162-163).

In an effort to impress Tennessee school counselors of the usefulness of the study and the importance of their participation, the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Bruce Opie, provided a letter of support for the study (Appendix E). Another way to accomplish trust and ensure a successful return rate is to link the survey with "a known

organization that has legitimacy" (Dillman, 1999, p. 18). Therefore, the letter of support from the Commissioner of Education was beneficial in legitimatizing the need for this study and in helping ensure a successful return rate. This letter of support was distributed to all Tennessee school counselors through a school counselor electronic mailing list maintained by the Tennessee Department of Education.

Analysis of Data

Survey research uses quantitative methodologies that provide explanations of the phenomenon of interest expressed through numerical data (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006). The data were offloaded from the Internet Survey Monkey website into an Excel file. A rigorous process of cleaning and coding the data took place to prepare the data for formal analyses using Version 15 of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Simple descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, and standard deviations were applied as a first step to organize and sort the data. Means of individual items and subscales were calculated for the total population, across level work setting (elementary, middle, high school) and by location (rural, urban, suburban) to roughly examine differences. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and follow-up univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) and Tukey post-hoc pairwise comparisons were subsequently conducted in this study to examine differences among the six subscales of the survey using level work setting (elementary, middle, high school) and location (rural, urban, suburban) as the categorical, independent variables. An item analysis examining item mean scores was conducted to examine differences for the entire sample and across level work setting and location for item scores for each survey question.

The three research questions proposed by the researcher were aligned to specific questions or groups of questions in the survey. In order for the researcher to fully address Research Question One, responses from survey questions found in the School Counseling Priorities and Student Development subscales were analyzed. In order for the researcher to fully address Research Question Two, responses from survey questions found in the School Setting Perceptions subscale were analyzed. In order for the researcher to fully address Research Question Three, responses from survey questions found in the Building and District Expectations (Program Management) subscale were analyzed. Demographic responses from the survey were analyzed in support of answering all three research questions. SPSS 15 software was the program used to analyze the descriptive data. Table 1 delineates the alignment between the research questions and the survey questions.

Table 1: Survey Components and Research Questions

Section 16: School Counseling Priorities
Research Question One: Based upon grade level served and location of service, to what degree have school counselors acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC?
Section 17: School Counseling Perceptions (a-g, i-k)
Research Question Two: Based upon grade level served and location of service, to what degree Tennessee school counselors directly collaborating and consulting with teachers and administrators to improve student achievement?
Section 18: Student Development
Research Question One: Based upon grade level served and location of service, to what degree have school counselors acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC?

Table 1 (continued)

Section 19: Building and District Level Expectations Research Question Three: Based upon grade level and location of service what were some of the differences in challenges and obstacles school counselors experienced in implementing the TMCSC?

Role of Researcher in Limiting Bias

When conducting a study, the researcher must be aware of the potential for bias to influence the research. Because the researcher was part of the collection, analysis, and interpretation of all data, the potential for bias must be accounted for during the study (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). Creswell (2009) contended that the researcher must clarify the biases that he or she might introduce into the study. Therefore, it is important to understand the researcher's connection to the field.

The researcher currently works for the Tennessee Department of Education as the Director of the Center for School Climate. Previously, the researcher served the Tennessee Department of Education as the Director of School Counseling. In addition, the researcher is an adjunct professor in the College of Human Development and Counseling at Vanderbilt University and Middle Tennessee State University.

Procedures to Protect Human Subjects

All participants in this study were protected (Creswell, 2009) as outlined by the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga's IRB Policy (2010). IRB approval and informed consent were obtained prior to any data collection by the researcher (Appendix B).

CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH RESULTS

Introduction

This study examined the degree to which Tennessee school counselors had acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC, the degree to which they were directly collaborating with administrators and teachers around student achievement, and the differences in challenges and obstacles they faced in implementing the TMCSC.

The following research questions and hypotheses were addressed to determine the importance and frequency of tasks undertaken by Tennessee school counselors:

1. Based upon grade level served and location of service, to what degree have Tennessee school counselors acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC?

   Null Hypothesis: There are no differences in the degree of acquired attitudes and skills around the implementation of the TMCSC by the following variables: the level work setting of the counselor (elementary, middle, or high school) and location in which service is provided (rural, urban, or suburban).

2. Based upon grade level served and location of service, to what degree were Tennessee school counselors directly collaborating with administrators and teachers to improve student achievement?

   Null Hypothesis: There are no differences in the degree to which school counselors are collaborating with administrators and teachers to improve student achievement based on the following variables: level work setting of the counselor

(elementary, middle, or high school) and location in which service is provided (rural, urban, or suburban).

3. Based upon grade level served and location of service, what were some of the differences in challenges and obstacles Tennessee school counselors have experienced in implementing the TMCSC?

   Null Hypothesis: There are no differences in the types of challenges or obstacles experienced by school counselors based on the following variables: the level work setting of the counselor (elementary, middle, high school) and location in which service is provided (rural, urban, or suburban).

Respondent Demographics

Of the 1,200 potential respondents 916 returned the survey for a 76% return rate (89.5 % female and 10.5% were male). The distribution by race/ethnicity was 729 White (80.3%), 171 were African-American (18.9%), and 8 (0.8%) were of other racial/ethnicity groups. Eight respondents skipped this question. There was a wide variety of age ranges, with the majority in the age range 51-60 (29.4%), followed by 31-40 (26.5%). Seven participants skipped this question. The modal local setting was high school (41.9%), followed by elementary school (35.3%), and lastly by middle school (22.8%). Fifty-five respondents skipped this question. Finally, 37.0% of respondents work in a rural setting, 34.3% work in a suburban setting, and 27.9% work in an urban setting. Nine respondents skipped this question.

Table 2 presents the frequency of gender of those participants who completed the survey.

Table 2: Frequency of Gender

Gender	Frequency	%
Male	95	10.4
Female	820	89.5
Missing	1	0.1
Total	916	100.0

Table 3 presents the age ranges of those participants who completed the survey.

Table 3: Frequency of Age Range

Age Range	Frequency	%
22-30	109	11.9
31-40	241	26.3
41-50	187	20.4
51-60	267	29.1
60 +	105	11.5
Missing	7	0.8
Total	916	100.00

Table 4 presents the ethnicities of those participants who completed the survey.

Table 4: Frequency of Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Frequency	%
Caucasian	729	79.6
African American	171	18.7
Hispanic	2	0.2
Native American	3	0.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	0.3

Table 5 (continued)

Ethnicity	Frequency	%
Missing	8	0.9
Total	916	100.0

Table 5 presents level of work settings of those participants who completed the survey.

Table 6: Frequency of Level of Work Setting

Work Setting	Frequency	%
Elementary	304	33.2
Middle	142	15.5
High	361	39.4
Other	56	5.8
Missing	55	6.0
Total	916	100.0

Table 6 presents the location of work settings of those participants who completed the survey.

Table 7: Frequency of Location of Work Setting

Descriptor	Frequency	%
Rural	336	36.7
Urban	253	27.6
Suburban	311	34.0
Missing	9	1.0
Total	916	100.0

Results

Differences in School Level Across the ASCNPD Subscales

Table 7 presents the score ranges, mean scores, and item means by level of work setting for each of the six subscales.

Table 8: Mean Scores and Ranges on ASCNPD for Level of Work Setting

		Work Level Mean Scores and **(Subscale Total Item Means)**			
Subscale	(Score Range)	Elementary	Middle	High	Total
SCP	(18-80)	73.43 **(4.07)**	71.79 **(3.98)**	70.25 **(3.89)**	71.69 **(3.97)**
SSP	(16-80)	60.10 **(3.75)**	57.93 **(3.54)**	55.14 **(3.44)**	57.46 **(3.57)**
PSD	(10-50)	36.94 **(3.69)**	37.29 **(3.67)**	35.26 **(3.50)**	36.24 **(3.60)**
CPS	(5-25)	11.13 **(2.23)**	15.17 **(2.98)**	19.87 **(3.98)**	15.81**(3.14)**
AD	(3-15)	9.75 **(3.24)**	10.13 **(3.32)**	9.88 **(3.30)**	9.87**(3.27)**
PM	(4-20)	13.69 **(4.65)**	12.40 **(4.22)**	10.71 **(3.57)**	12.11 **(4.02)**

Note: "SCP" is School Counseling Priorities, "SSP" is School Setting Perceptions, "PSD" is Personal-Social Development, "CPS" is Career and Post-Secondary Development, "AD" is Academic Development, and "PM" is Program Management. Item means are calculated by taking the grade level subscale means and dividing by the number items per subscale.

With school level as the categorical, independent variable (i.e., elementary, middle, high school), a MANOVA was utilized to examine differences between six subscales (i.e., School Counseling Priorities, School Setting Perceptions, Personal-Social Development, Career and Post-Secondary Development, Academic Development, and Building/District Expectations (Program Management) on the ASCNPD (2010). The corrected significance level was ($\alpha/6 = .0083$). The MANOVA results indicated a significant main effect for school level (*Wilks' Λ* = .367, $F(12, 1496) = 81.00$, $p < .01$, eta squared = .22). For follow-

up tests, univariate ANOVAs and Tukey's post hoc tests were performed. For such tests, the corrected significance level was set at ($\alpha/6 = .0083$).

Univariate ANOVA results indicated significant school level effects for five of the six subscales. The significant effects were: School Counseling Priorities, $F(2, 753) = 7.19$, $p < .01$, eta squared = .02, School Setting Perceptions, $F(2, 753) = 10.07$, $p < .01$, eta squared = .03, Personal-Social Development, $F(2, 753) = 6.91$, $p < .01$, eta squared = .02, Career and Post-Secondary Development, $F(2, 753) = 315.44$, $p < .01$, eta squared = .46, and Program Management, $F(2,753) = 103.33$, $p < .01$, eta squared = .22. Academic Development was not statistically significant.

Tukey HSD post hoc results for the School Counseling Priorities component indicated that the elementary school counselors scored significantly higher than high school counselors on this subscale ($p < .01$). Elementary school counselors had the highest means, followed by middle school counselors, and then the high school counselors. Means for the School Counseling Priorities subscale are found in Table 7.

Tukey HSD post hoc results for School Setting Perceptions component indicated that the elementary school counselors scored significantly higher than the high school counselors on this subscale ($p < .001$). Elementary school counselors had the highest means, followed by middle school counselors, and then the high school counselors.

Tukey HSD post hoc results for Personal-Social Development component indicated that the elementary school counselors scored significantly higher than the high school counselors on the Personal-Social Development subscale ($p = .005$). The middle school counselors also scored significantly higher than the high school counselors ($p =$

.008). Middle school counselors had the highest means, followed by elementary school counselors, and then the high school counselors.

Tukey HSD post hoc results for the Career and Post-Secondary Development component indicated that the high school counselors scored significantly higher than both the elementary school counselors ($p < .001$) and middle school counselors ($p < .001$). Middle school counselors also scored significantly higher than elementary school counselors ($p < .001$). High school counselors had the highest means, followed by middle school counselors, and then the elementary school counselors.

Tukey HSD post hoc results for the Program Management component indicated that the elementary school counselors scored significantly higher than the middle school counselors ($p < .001$) and the high school counselors ($p < .001$). Middle school counselors also scored significantly higher than high school counselors ($p < .001$). Elementary school counselors had the highest means, followed by middle school counselors, and then the high school counselors.

Differences in School Setting Across the ASCNPD Subscales

Table 8 presents score ranges, mean scores and item means by location of work setting for each of the six subscales.

Table 9: Mean Scores and Ranges on ASCNPD

		School Setting Mean Scores and **(Subscale Total Item Means)**			
Subscale	(Score Range)	Rural	Suburban	Urban	Total
SCP	(18-80)	71.23 **(3.96)**	69.99 **(3.89)**	74.94 **(4.16)**	71.81 **(3.99)**
SSP	(16-80)	56.16 **(3.52)**	57.32 **(3.58)**	59.77 **(3.70)**	57.54 **(3.59)**

Table 10 (continued)

Subscale	(Score Range)	School Setting Mean Scores and **(Subscale Total Item Means)** Rural	Suburban	Urban	Total
PSD	(10-50)	36.33 **(3.64)**	36.28 **(3.60)**	36.41 **(3.62)**	36.33 **(3.62)**
CPS	(5-25)	16.57 **(3.30)**	15.45 **(3.09)**	15.59 **(3.08)**	15.92 **(3.16)**
AD	(3-15)	9.59 **(3.20)**	10.07 **(3.34)**	10.09 **(3.33)**	9.90 **(3.28)**
PM	(4-20)	12.06 **(4.03)**	12.15 **(4.00)**	12.29 **(4.08)**	12.15**(4.04)**

Note: "SCP" is School Counseling Priorities, "SSP" is School Setting Perceptions, "PSD" is Personal-Social Development, "CPS" is Career and Post-Secondary Development, "AD" is Academic Development, and "PM" is Program Management. Item means are calculated by taking the grade level subscale means and dividing by the number items per subscale.

With school setting as the categorical, independent variable (i.e., rural, suburban, and urban), a MANOVA was utilized to examine differences between six subscales (i.e., School Counseling Priorities, School Setting Perceptions, Personal-Social Development, Career and Post-Secondary Development, Academic Development, and Program Management) on the ASCNPD (2010). The corrected significance level was ($\alpha/6 = .0083$). The MANOVA results indicated a significant main effect for school setting (*Wilks' Λ* = .93, $F(12, 1676) = 5.58$, $p < .01$, eta squared = .04). For follow-up tests, univariate ANOVAs and Tukey's post hoc tests were performed. For such tests, the corrected significance level was set at ($\alpha/6 = .0083$).

Univariate ANOVA results indicated significant school setting effects for three of the six subscales. The significant effects were: School Counseling Priorities, $F(2, 843) = 16.11$, $p < .01$, eta squared = .04, School Setting Perceptions, $F(2, 843) = 4.61$, $p < .01$,

eta squared = .01, Career and Post-Secondary Development, $F(2, 843) = 3.39$, $p = .03$, eta squared = .01. Personal-Social Development, Academic Development, and Program Management were not statistically significant.

Tukey HSD post hoc results for the School Counseling Priorities component indicated that the school counselors in urban settings scored significantly higher than both school counselors in rural settings ($p < .01$) and suburban settings ($p < .01$) on this subscale. School counselors in urban settings had the highest means, followed school counselors in rural settings, and then the school counselors in suburban settings.

Tukey HSD post hoc results for School Setting Perceptions component indicated that the school counselors in urban school settings scored significantly higher than the school counselors in rural settings on this subscale ($p = .003$). School counselors in urban settings had the highest means, followed by school counselors in suburban settings, and then the school counselors in rural settings.

Tukey HSD post hoc results for the Career and Post-Secondary Development component indicated that the school counselors in rural settings scored significantly higher than the school counselors in suburban settings ($p = .016$). School counselors in rural settings had the highest means, followed by school counselors in urban settings, and then the school counselors in suburban settings.

Item Analysis of Key Responses

Research Question One aimed to determine the degree to which Tennessee school counselors have acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC. The results of this analysis determined that the elementary school counselors scored significantly higher than middle school and high school counselors on five of the six

subscales. An item analysis was conducted to examine responses to items in the School Counseling Priorities and Student Development subscales across the entire sample and within elementary, middle, and high school counselors, and within rural, urban, suburban settings to identify specific issues that were inhibiting implementation of the TMCSC. Means of the individual items were examined overall and across school level and location (scores ranged from 1 to 5 where 1 = "Not at all important"; 2 = "Somewhat important", 3 = "Important"; 4 = "Very important"; 5 = "Extremely important"). To review complete item means and standard deviations for all survey items see Appendices F and G. For purposes of these analyses, the items found in the School Counseling Priorities and Student Development subscales that specifically addressed direct implementation of the TMCSC were examined (Table 9).

School counselors were asked in School Counseling Priorities subscale section to rate the importance of each listed activity or tasks for school counselors. The focus was on participants' perceptions of how important a task or activity was for a school counselor. For example, participants' rated statements such as "improve student access to academic intervention services." An examination of the overall mean scores for the total sample revealed the highest mean (M = 4.59) was for the item "counsel students individually about personal and social issues." The lowest mean (M = 3.10) was for the item "help teachers improve classroom management skills."

In the subscale Student Development, participants were asked to rate the extent to which during this school year they had worked with students on the listed issues. The focus was on the participants' perceptions of the occurrence of an activity. For example, participants rated statements such as "personal problems which affect grades." An

examination of the overall mean scores revealed the highest mean (*M* = 4.29) was for the item "personal/social issues." The lowest overall mean (*M* = 2.76) was for the item "college admissions strategies." When elementary school counselors' responses to Student Development were examined, the highest mean (*M* = 4.45) was for the item "personal/social issues." This item also represented the highest mean (*M* = 4.38) for middle school counselors. The highest mean (*M* = 4.15) for high school counselors was for the item "personal problems that affect grades." The lowest mean (*M* = 3.12) for elementary counselors was for the item "attend academic department or grade-level meetings." The lowest mean (*M* = 2.89) for middle school and high school counselors was for the item "help teachers improve classroom management skills." When doing an analysis based on work location, rural, urban, and suburban school counselors the item "personal/social issues" revealed the highest overall mean (*M* = 4.29). Likewise, the item "college admissions strategies" revealed the lowest overall mean (*M* = 2.76) for rural, urban, and suburban school counselors.

Table 11: Total Population Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Items in the ASCNPD School Counseling Priorities and Student Development Subscales

Item	*M*	*SD*
Counsel students individually about personal/social issues	4.59	0.799
Counsel students who have behavioral problems	4.34	0.920
Refer students to community professional for mental health problems	4.34	0.868
Reduce social/institutional barriers that keep students from achieving their potential	4.33	0.844
Personal/Social issues	4.29	0.901
Improve student access to academic intervention services	4.27	0.845

Table 9 (continued)

Item	*M*	*SD*
Advocate to change policies and practices that can negatively impact student success	4.22	0.818
Work with students in small groups on personal/social issues	4.21	0.989
Work closely with administrators and teachers on school improvement issues	4.19	0.879
Managing emotions (stress, anger, coping)	4.19	0.921
Personal problems that affect grades	4.10	0.906
Evaluate the school counseling program effort to raise academic performance	4.08	0.945
Develop and implement prevention programs	4.01	1.003
Visit classes to help students develop long-term goals	4.00	1.011
Use grades to identify under-performing students	3.99	0.970
Use data to identify specific areas of school improvement	3.99	0.944
Monitor student academic performance	3.97	1.019
Decision-making skills	3.96	1.019
Strengthening interpersonal communication skills	3.86	0.947
Improving grades	3.74	1.151
Help students identify future educational/career options	3.45	1.261
School discipline incidents	3.43	1.198
Serve on school committees	3.42	0.999
Time and task organization	3.32	1.066
Developing educational/career plans	3.31	1.364
Provide professional development activities to teachers	3.31	1.077
Attend academic department or grade level meetings	3.22	1.103
Educational program planning	3.19	1.364
Work with students individually or in groups on career planning services	3.11	1.273

Table 9 (continued)

Item	*M*	*SD*
Help teachers improve classroom management skills	3.10	1.192
Serious mental health problems	3.06	1.112
Study skills	3.05	1.123
Test-taking strategies	3.04	1.132
Preventing problems	2.97	1.145
Diversity issues	2.95	1.018
College admissions strategies	2.76	1.637

The conclusions drawn from the results of these analyses lead to the rejection of the first null hypothesis there is, in fact, a difference in degree of acquired attitudes and skills around the implementation of the TMCSC by the following variables: the level work setting of the counselor (elementary, middle, or high school) and the location in which service is provided (rural, urban, or suburban). The following patterns emerged from the analysis of work setting and location.

1. Elementary school counselors had higher score means on rated items found in the School Counseling Priorities subscale on the ASCNPD which are more closely aligned to the TMCSC compared to high school or middle school counselors.
2. Urban school counselors had higher score means on items found in the School Counseling Priorities subscale on the ASCNPD which are more closely aligned to the TMCSC compared to rural or suburban school counselors.
3. Elementary school counselors had higher score means on items found in the ASCNPD Personal/Social Development subscale which are more closely aligned to the TMCSC compared to high school or middle school counselors.

4. High school counselors had higher score means on items found in the ASCNPD Career and Post-Secondary subscale which are more closely aligned to the TMCSC compared to elementary or middle school counselors.
5. There were no significant differences found between elementary, middle, or high school counselors in how they rated items in the ASCNPD Academic Development subscale.

Research Question Two aimed to determine to what degree Tennessee school counselors directly collaborated with administrators and teachers to improve student achievement. The analysis focused on the School Setting Perception subscale, items a-g and i-k. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which the listed statements were accurate, based on their perceptions of the occurrence of an activity. For example, participants rated statements such as "school counselors work with faculty and administration to improve school climate." The results of these analyses determined that the elementary school counselors scored significantly higher than middle school and high school counselors on this subscale. An item analysis was conducted to examine responses to the identified items in the School Setting Perceptions subscale across the total sample and among elementary, middle, and high school counselors, and across rural, urban, and suburban locations to identify if school counselors were directly collaborating with administrators and teachers to improve student achievement. Means of the individual items were examined overall and across school level and location. To review complete item means and standard deviations see Appendices F and G. For purposes of these analyses, the items found in the School Setting Perceptions subscale that specifically addressed collaborating were examined (Table 10).

An examination of the total population item mean data related specifically to collaborating in the School Setting Perceptions subscale revealed the highest mean (*M* = 4.42) was for the item "school counselors regularly consult with parents, teachers, and school administrators." The lowest mean (*M* = 2.57) was for the item "teachers ask school counselors to consult with them on improving classroom management techniques." When elementary school counselors' responses to collaborating in the School Setting Perceptions were examined, the highest mean (*M* = 4.55) was for the item "school counselors regularly consult with parents, teachers, and school administrators". This item also produced the highest mean (*M* = 4.29) for middle school counselors and high school counselors (*M* = 4.37). When doing an analysis based on work location, the item "school counselors regularly consult with parents, teachers, and school administrators" had the highest mean across all work locations. Likewise, the item "teachers ask school counselors to consult with them on improving classroom management techniques" revealed the lowest mean for rural, urban, and suburban school counselors.

Table 12: Total Population Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Selected Items in the ASCNPD School Setting Perception

Item	*M*	*SD*
School counselors regularly consult with parents, teachers, and school administrators	4.42	1.005
Teachers and counselors work together to identify students who are not performing to their best level	3.99	1.146
School counselors work with faculty and administration to improve the school climate	3.95	1.201

Table 13: Total Population Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Selected Items in the ASCNPD School Setting Perception

Item	*M*	*SD*
School counselors provide leadership to promote every student's right to a quality education	3.69	1.222
Teachers work with school counselors to improve student achievement	3.64	1.217
Teachers ask school counselors to consult with them on improving classroom management techniques	2.57	1.375
Administrators work with school counselors to increase student achievement	3.54	1.348
Counselors are viewed as school leaders	3.45	1.404
School counselors develop strategies to change systems and practices that are impeding student success	3.37	1.313
School counselors monitor and evaluate the impact of the school counseling program on student achievement and success	3.36	1.271
School counselors are key in decision making teams	3.35	1.434

The conclusions drawn from the results of these analyses lead to the rejection of the second null hypothesis: There is no difference in the degree to which school counselors were collaborating with administrators and teachers to improve student achievement based on the following variables: level work setting of the counselor (elementary, middle, or high school) and location in which service is provided (rural, urban, or suburban). The following patterns emerged from the analysis of work setting and location.

1. Elementary school counselors rated items found in the School Setting Perceptions subscale on the ASCNPD which are aligned to consulting and collaborating higher than high school or middle school counselors.
2. Urban school counselors rate items found in the School Setting Perceptions subscale on the ASCNPD which are more closely aligned to collaborating more highly than rural or suburban school counselors.

Research Question Three aimed to identify some of the challenges and obstacles Tennessee school counselors have experienced in implementing the TMCSC. School counselors were asked in the Building and District Expectations/Program Management subscale to rate the extent to which these statements of expectations and tasks accurately reflect their programs. The focus was on the participants' perceptions of the occurrence of an activity. For example, participants rated statements such as "I am involved in the clerical aspects of record keeping (transferring records, posting grades, managing transcripts, etc.)." The results of these analyses determined that the elementary school counselors scored significantly higher than high school counselors and middle school counselors scored higher than high school counselors. An item analysis was conducted to examine responses to items in the Building and District Expectations/Program Management subscale across the entire sample, and within elementary, middle, and high school counselors, and within rural, urban, suburban locations, to identify specific challenges school counselors experienced in implementing the TMCSC. Means of the individual items were examined overall and across school level and across location (scores ranged from 1 to 5). To review complete item means and standard deviations see Appendices F and G. Eight items in the Building and District Expectations subscale

are considered to be non-counseling duties and were examined for purposes of these analyses (Table 11). An examination of the total population item means data related specifically to Building and District Expectations/Program Management subscale revealed the item "involved in the coordination of statewide assessments" to have the highest mean (M = 3.54). When elementary school counselors' responses to Building and District Expectations/Program Management were examined, the highest mean (M = 4.21) was for the item "responsible for the implementation of my school's character education program." The lowest mean (M = 1.04) was for the item "require my students to maintain an educational/career portfolio." When middle school counselors' responses to Building and District Expectations/Program Management were examined, the item, "involved in the coordination of statewide assessments" revealed the highest mean (M = 4.01). The lowest mean for middle school counselors was the item, "require my students to maintain an educational/career portfolio" (M = 1.44). When high school counselors' responses to Building and District Expectations/Program Management were examined the item, "involved in the scheduling of student courses" revealed the highest mean (M = 4.50). The lowest mean score item for high school counselors was "spend 75% of my time delivering classroom guidance lessons (M = 1.21). When doing an analysis based on work location, the highest mean for rural and suburban counselors was the item "involved in the coordination of statewide assessments." Likewise, the item "spend 75% of my time delivering classroom guidance lessons" revealed the lowest mean for rural, urban, and suburban school counselors.

Table 14: Total Population Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Selected Items in the ASCNPD Building/District Expectations (Program Management)

Item	*M*	*SD*
I am involved in the coordination of statewide assessments	3.54	1.750
I perform fair share duties above and beyond what is expected of other certified staff at my school	3.25	1.642
I am involved in the clerical aspects of record keeping	3.16	1.811
I am involved in the scheduling of student courses	3.05	1.897
I am involved in the development of the master schedule	2.54	1.722
I am scheduled in classrooms by my principal for classroom guidance lessons	2.33	1.719
I serve as the building registrar for new entrants and transferred and withdrawn students	2.27	1.667
I spend more that 75% of my time delivering classroom guidance lessons	1.75	1.304

The conclusions drawn from the results of these analyses lead to the rejection of the third null hypothesis: There is no difference in the types of challenges or obstacles experienced by school counselors based on the following variables: the level work setting of the counselor (elementary, middle, high school) and location in which service is provided (rural, urban, or suburban). The following patterns emerged from the analysis of work setting and location.

1. Elementary school counselors rated items found in the Building and District Expectations/Program Management subscale on the ASCNPD more highly than high school or middle school counselors.

2. There were no significant differences found among urban, rural, and suburban school counselors on the Building and District Expectations/Program Management subscale.
3. The analysis revealed assignment of non-counseling duties is a common challenge experienced by all school counselors in trying to successfully implement the TMCSC.

Summary of Results

This chapter presented findings and statistical analyses of data garnered from Tennessee school counselors in response to the ASCNPD survey (2010). The survey, adapted from other statewide studies of school counseling practices, consisted of six subscales: School Counseling Priorities, School Setting Perceptions, Student Development (Personal/Social, Career, Academic) and Building/District Expectations (Program Management). The three research questions were directly aligned to appropriate questions or groups of questions in the survey. With the exception of the demographic sections, the 78 survey items were organized around the themes found in the ASCA National Model, TMCSC, and supported in the literature devoted to school counseling and CSCP's. Simple descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, and standard deviations were applied as a first step to organize and sort the data. Means of individual items across level work setting (elementary, middle, high school) and by location (rural, urban, suburban) were examined as well as for the total sample. The researcher also used mean scores for all school counselors to see if there were differences across the six subscales of the survey. Multivariate inferential statistical procedures including multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and follow-up univariate

analyses of variance (ANOVAs) and Tukey post-hoc pairwise comparisons were subsequently conducted in this study to examine differences among the six subscales of the survey. Level work setting (elementary, middle, high school) and location (rural, urban, suburban) were the categorical, independent variables. An item analysis was conducted to examine differences for the entire sample across level work setting and location for item scores for each survey question. In conclusion, these results allow for the rejection of all three of the null hypotheses.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 5 summarizes the four previous chapters including an overview of the study, a review of the methodology, discussion of findings, implications for practice and future research.

Overview of the Study

NCLB's (USDOE, 2001) and RTTT (USDOE, 2009) goals to close the achievement gap is contingent on accountability for outcomes, which is measured by student test results (Dahir & Stone, 2009). Although being urged by these education reform initiatives to step up to leadership roles, advocate for themselves, and show accountability for their work, many school counselors feel unprepared to enter these new territories (Rayle & Adams, 2008). This accountability movement provides school counselors a vehicle to direct and demonstrate how their efforts and skills are positively impacting the academic achievement of all students (Dahir & Stone, 2009; Isaacs, 2003). The accountability quadrant in the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2003; 2005) and the TMCSC (TDOE, 2005) provides opportunities for school counselors to connect CSCP's and student academic achievement (Brigman & Campbell, 2007; Whiston, Tai, Rahardja, & Eder, 2011). Gysbers (2001) studied CSCP's implemented in Missouri and Utah and found:

> When certified professional school counselors have the time, the resources, and the structure of a CSCP in which to work, they contribute to positive student academic and career development as well as the development of positive and safe learning climates in schools (p. 103).

With Tennessee's recent receipt of RTTT, school counselors also will soon be evaluated and held accountable for contributing to improved student achievement. Therefore, school counselors must be committed to the implementation of the TMCSC and also need the support of school administration and collaboration with the faculty to fully and successfully implement.

The essential problem that led to the development of this dissertation study was that Tennessee school counselors are still struggling to define their roles and demonstrate how their programs contribute to student achievement and growth. According to Walsh, Barrett, and DePaul (2007), full implementation of a CSCP allows school counselors to better identify the needs of students, align the school counseling program with the mission of the school, evaluate the program's success, and reflect and revise the program for future implementation.

This dissertation study examined: (a) the degree to which Tennessee school counselors have acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC, (b) the degree to which Tennessee school counselors were directly collaborating with administrators and teachers around improving student achievement, and (c) the differences in challenges and obstacles school counselors experienced in implementing the TMCSC.

This research study presents a snapshot of the current priorities and practices of Tennessee school counselors. The results acquired from this study can provide important insight to the TDOE administration who seeks to continue to provide meaningful and relevant professional development and support to school counselors. By using the implementation of the TMCSC as the foundation for the study, this study revealed a

deeper understanding of the factors which influence the degree to which the TMCSC is utilized in local districts and schools. The results of this study have established a baseline which reveals which areas of the TMCSC are embraced by the counseling profession and which areas need support and assistance to ultimately determine in the future the contribution of the TMCSC to student achievement and student success in school growth.

Review of Research Methods

This study employed a descriptive survey research design (Creswell, 2009; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003; Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006) to address the following research questions:

1. Based upon grade level served and location of service, to what degree have Tennessee school counselors acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC?
2. Based upon grade level served and location of service, to what degree were Tennessee school counselors directly collaborating with administrators and teachers to improve student achievement?
3. Based upon grade level served and location of service, what were some of the differences in challenges and obstacles Tennessee school counselors have experienced in implementing the TMCSC?

The three research questions were aligned to specific questions or groups of questions in the survey.

The survey instrument employed for this study was the *Assessment of School Counselor Needs for Professional Development* questionnaire (ASCNPD) developed by Dahir and Stone in 2003, revised in 2004, and authorized for permission to use in this

study in the summer of 2010. The instrument was specifically designed for the purpose of this study and other similar studies. The questions are grouped into the following subscale components:

1. School Counseling Priorities
2. School Setting Perception;
3. Academic development;
4. Career/Post-secondary development;
5. Personal/Social development;
6. Building and District Expectations (Program Management)

All K-12 school counselors who were subscribed to the TDOE's school counselor electronic mailing list and were employed as school counselors in public schools in Tennessee had the opportunity to complete the survey. The survey was administered through the Internet via a web-based application called Survey Monkey (https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/88FQ8TK).

Simple descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, and standard deviations were applied as a first step to organize and sort the data. Means of individual items and subscales were calculated for the total population, across level work setting (elementary, middle, high school) and by location (rural, urban, suburban) to roughly examine differences. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and follow-up univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) and Tukey post-hoc pairwise comparisons were subsequently conducted in this study to examine differences among the six subscales of the survey using level work setting (elementary, middle, high school) and location (rural, urban, suburban) as the categorical, independent variables. An item

analysis examining item mean scores was conducted to examine differences for the entire sample and across level work setting and location for item scores for each survey question.

Summary of the Results

Differences in School Level Across the ASCNPD Subscales

The means for five of the six subscales on the ASCNPD revealed significant differences among elementary, middle, and high school counselors in the overall subscales for School Counseling Priorities (SCP), School Setting Perceptions (SSP), Career and Post-Secondary (CPS), and Personal-Social Development (PSD), and Building and District Expectations/Program Management (PM), which are essential components of a CSCP.

The total subscale mean score for SCP was M = 71.69, SD = 10.46. The ASCNPD subscale score range for this component was 18-80. For all participants, the total item mean for SCP was 3.97. The total subscale mean score for SSP was M = 57.46, SD = 13.92, with a subscale range of 16-80. For all participants, the total item mean for SSP was 3.57. The total subscale mean score for PSD was M = 36.24, SD = 6.72, with a subscale range of 10-50. For all participants, the total item mean for PSD was 3.60. The total subscale mean score for CPS was M = 15.81, SD = 5.84, with a subscale range of 5-25. For all participants, the total item mean for CPS was 3.14. The total subscale mean score for AD was M = 9.87, SD = 2.83, with a subscale range of 3-15. For all participants, the total item mean for AD was M = 3.27. The total subscale mean score for PM was M = 12.11, SD = 2.90, with a subscale range of 4-20. For all participants, the total item mean for PM was M = 4.02.

Differences in School Setting Across the ASCNPD Subscales

The means for two of the six subscales on the ASCNPD revealed significant differences among rural, urban, and suburban school counselors in the overall subscales for School Counseling Priorities (SCP) and School Setting Perceptions (SSP) which are essential components of a CSCP. Each ASCNPD subscale provides insight around potential professional development needs. Examining the item means for each subscale on the ASCNPD helps to further explore where potential needs exist. Overall, when there are low item scores on the ASCNPD, there is an increased need for professional development. Total item mean scores for each subscale disaggregated by school setting (i.e., rural, suburban and urban) are found in Table 8. The total subscale mean score for SCP was $M = 71.81$, $SD = 10.37$. The ASCNPD subscale score range for this component was 18-80. For all participants, the total item mean for SCP was 3.99. The total subscale mean score for SSP was $M = 57.54$, $SD = 13.94$, with a subscale range of 16-80. For all participants, the total item mean for SSP was $M = 3.59$. The total subscale mean score for PSD was $M = 36.34$, $SD = 6.61$, with a subscale range of 10-50. For all participants, the total item mean for PSD was $M = 3.62$. The total subscale mean score for CPS was $M = 15.92$, $SD = 5.77$, with a subscale range of 5-25. For all participants, the total item mean for CPS was $M = 3.16$. The total subscale mean score for AD was $M = 9.89$, $SD = 2.81$, with a subscale range of 3-15. For all participants, the total item mean for AD was $M = 3.28$. The total subscale mean score for PM was $M = 12.15$, $SD = 2.89$, with a subscale range of 4-20. For all participants, the total item mean for PM was $M = 4.04$.

Reflecting on Research Question One, based on grade level served and location of work setting to what degree have Tennessee school counselors acquired the attitudes and

skills to successfully implement the TMCSC? The results of these analyses found elementary school counselors had higher mean scores on the subscales School Counseling Priorities and Personal/Social Development. High school counselors had higher scores means on the Career and Post-Secondary subscale. No significant differences were found between elementary, middle or high school counselors in how they rated items on the Academic Development subscale. The results of reviewing specific item means revealed elementary school counselors emphasize strong personal-social development for students and a strong prominence of classroom guidance curriculum. Additional distinctive conclusions for elementary school counselors also revealed a strong commitment to program management, less emphasis on academic development priorities, and little or no involvement in career and post-secondary development. These results indicate elementary school counselors appear to need additional training and support in aligning their work to assist students' academic development, career and post-secondary development, and initiating a mindset of college and career readiness in the elementary grades.

The results of these analyses also revealed that high school counselors have the lowest means for all scales, with the exception of CPS. High school counselors placed significantly higher priority on academic development and career and post-secondary development. This was not surprising given similar findings in the existing literature (Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Coil & Freeman, 1997; Dahir, 2004; Scarborough, 2005; Schmidt, 1995, 2000; Tennyson et al., 1989). Nonetheless, responses of high school counselors in this study reaffirmed their traditional practice of placing highest priority to individual counseling, educational and career planning, and preparing for post-secondary

opportunities. Not surprisingly, CPS related items for high school counselors resulted in the highest means. Although high school counselors are more closely aligning their work with the goals set forth in RTTT around student achievement, they do not appear to be fully implementing the TMCSC. This can be interpreted as high school counselors being the group which most likely need the most training and support on how to fully implement the TMCSC. For example, only 20% of high school counselors indicated it was "very accurate" that they are viewed as school leaders. Only 20% indicated it was "very accurate" that they developed strategies to change systems and practices that are impeding the success of their program. In addition, only 22% of school counselors indicated it was "very accurate" that they were part of key decision-making teams. These findings strongly indicate high school counselors may need additional professional development around how to incorporate the themes of TMCSC (i.e. advocacy, leadership, collaboration, and systemic change) into their daily practice.

An intriguing finding from these analyses was related to middle school counselors, who have not garnered as much attention in school counseling literature as their counterparts. In this study, middle school counselors seemed to be prioritizing and engaging in activities most strongly aligned to the TMCSC. The middle school counselors never received the lowest ratings on any subscales, when compared across all school levels. These middle school counselors identified priorities and activities which bring balance to academic, career, and personal-social development as well as adhere to the belief that CSCP's are an integral component to every student's success. These results seem to contradict past research that has shown elementary school counselors (Dahir, 2004; Hardesty & Dillard, 1994; Johnson, 2000; Scarborough, 2005) as most

closely aligned in priorities and practices to the ASCA National Model. This finding may indicate middle school counselors may be able to provide important information to help their elementary and high school counterparts move forward with TMCSC implementation.

Results from these analyses found that school counselors in urban settings were prioritizing and practicing activities most closely aligned to the TMCSC. For example, 71% of the urban school counselors responded it was "extremely important" to serve on school committees. Sixty-eight percent of urban respondents indicated it was "extremely important" to attend academic department or grade level meetings. Eighty-two percent of urban respondents indicated it was "extremely important" to monitor student academic performance. These analyses suggest urban school counselors are prioritizing their activities around the goals of the TMCSC. However when CPS development subscale means were examined, rural school counselors had the highest means. For instance, 69% of rural respondents reported they work on developing educational and career plans "frequently" or "almost daily" with their students. Rural school counselors could benefit from professional development related to expanding their work from the career and post-secondary domain to the academic and personal/social domains as well. These analyses revealed suburban school counselors had the lowest mean scores for SCP, PSD, and CPS subscales. This can be interpreted as indicating that suburban counselors are in most need of targeted professional development activities around implementation of TMCSC. Suburban and rural school counselors could likely benefit from having the opportunity to engage in conversations and targeted professional development activities with their urban counterparts regarding techniques for being able to successfully implement the TMCSC.

According to the ASCA National Model (2003; 2005) engagement in activities related to the foundation, management, delivery, and accountability are at the core of establishing and implementing a CSCP. This study reaffirms research conducted for more than 20 years (Dahir, 2004; Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009; Foster, Young, & Hermann, 2005; Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan, & Jones, 2004; Scarbourough, 2005), that has reported variations in program priorities and practice for school counselors at each school level (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school). Although there has been a concerted effort from ASCA and the TDOE to train and motivate school counselors to universally embrace CSCP's across all grade levels, only 49% of Tennessee school counselors rated "somewhat accurate" or "very accurate" the statement, "I have implemented a school counseling program that is aligned with the TMCSC and/or the ASCA National Model."

Reflecting on Research Question Two, based on grade level served and location of work setting to what degree were Tennessee school counselors directly collaborating with administrators and teachers to improve student achievement? The results of the analyses found elementary school counselors rated items found in the School Setting Perceptions subscale, which are aligned to collaborating around student achievement, higher than high school or middle school counselors. For example, 52% indicated it was "somewhat accurate" or "very accurate" that they worked with administrators to increase student academic performance. In addition, 75% indicated it was "somewhat accurate" or "very accurate" that they worked with teachers to identify students who were not performing to their best level. These analyses suggest middle and high school counselors need additional professional development in how to collaborate with administrators and

teachers around student achievement. Middle and high school counselors could benefit from the best practices exhibited by elementary school counselors around collaboration. In addition, urban school counselors rated items found in the School Setting Perceptions subscale which are aligned to collaborating around student achievement, higher than rural or suburban school counselors. Eighty percent of urban school counselors indicated it was "somewhat accurate" or "very accurate" that they worked with administrators to increase student academic performance. Seventy-five percent responded it was "somewhat accurate" or "very accurate" that they worked with teachers to identify students who were not performing to their best level. Still, it does appear all categories of Tennessee school counselors could benefit from working to build stronger relationships with building administrators and teachers to discuss and establish program priorities and activities around gaps in full implementation of the TMCSC. The TDOE could help facilitate this kind of relationship building by providing training opportunities for teams of administrators, counselors, and teachers rather than providing professional development to these groups individually.

Reflecting on Research Question Three, based on grade level served and location of work setting to what degree were differences in the types of challenges and obstacles experienced in implementing the TMCSC? The results of these analyses revealed elementary school counselors rated items found in the Building and District Expectations/Program Management subscale more highly than high school or middle school counselors. This indicates elementary school counselors are more supported than middle or high school counselors in the implementation of the TMCSC. However, these analyses indicate approximately half of Tennessee's school counselor population are not

supported in fully implementing the TMCSC. Overall, these analyses suggest that the assignment of non-counseling duties is the most common challenge and obstacle to counselors having the ability to fully implement the TMCSC. For example, 54% of the total population of school counselors responded it was "very accurate" they were involved in the coordination of statewide assessments. Forty-four percent of the total population of school counselors responded it was "very accurate" they were involved in the clerical aspects of record keeping. Forty-six percent of the total population of school counselors responded it was "very accurate" they were involved in the scheduling of student courses. No significant differences were found between urban, rural, and suburban school counselors.

Implications

Just as the TDOE provides ongoing professional development for classroom teachers around their academic standards, school counselors would also benefit from continued, ongoing professional development around implementation of the TMCSC. Through targeted professional development and state level support, school counselors will gain the knowledge to readdress their daily priorities, and transform their actual practices which would then increase their capacity to fully implement the TMCSC. Awareness and understanding is power and motivates school counselors' desire to align priorities and practices for the benefit of improving student achievement and overall school success (Stone & Dahir, 2006). Tennessee school counselors should become more cognizant of where they are in the implementation process, and identify and reflect on the skills and knowledge essential to move the profession forward.

If the ASCA National Model and the TMCSC are to impact and change school counseling practice, administrators and policymakers must pay close attention to the opinions and perceptions of professional school counselors; those who are closest to the sources of their building and student needs. Tools such as the ASCNPD survey offer state departments of education, school counseling supervisors, counselor educators, policy makers, school counselor association leaders, principals and teachers a baseline from which to better understand the attitudes, beliefs, priorities, and practices of school counselors. The authors of the ASCA National Model and the TMCSC believe school counselors can be agents of change when allowed to fully implement a CSCP. However, if change is to occur, it is critical the issues revealed in this study be addressed. Leaders must take note and address the areas revealed in this study that indicate gaps in full implementation of the TMCSC, gaps in collaboration efforts, and those challenges or obstacles which prohibit TMCSC implementation. This study provides valuable information for the TDOE to construct a solid baseline and guide decision making to help move the entire statewide school counseling population closer to delivering a 21st century CSCP which will help the state meet its RTTT goals for all students in Tennessee.

It may be noted the TDOE could focus on the development of professional development modules around topics school counselors, administrators, and teachers have in common. Due to the fact that school counselors, administrators, and teachers are trained separately and have few opportunities to learn about the different roles, responsibilities, and perspectives of their counterparts, it is important for these diverse groups to engage in collaborative work that addresses students' academic and affective development and needs (Shoffner & Williamson, 2000). Once student

needs are identified, school counselors can work with the broader range of stakeholders to plan and provide appropriate interventions (Griffin & Steen, 2010; Grothaus & Cole, 2010). For example, if taken into account that only 14% of school counselors thought it extremely important to help teachers improve classroom management and that only 14% felt it extremely important to provide professional development activities to teachers, then it becomes clear why only 12% report that they are being consulted on issues relating to improving classroom management. School counselors have the knowledge and skills to assist in this area, but if they do not view this as an important activity, then it will not happen. One way the TDOE could assist school counselors in becoming more engaged in collaboration with administrators and teachers around student achievement would be to offer professional development to administrators, teachers, and school counselors on how counselors can use their training, knowledge, and skills to assist in this critical area.

With the increased focus on academic achievement, it seems it would be important for school counselors to place high priority on activities which would help students improve their academic achievement. However, when asked about their collaboration with teachers to improve student achievement only 30% indicated it was "very accurate" they were engaging in this activity. When asked if they monitor and evaluate the impact of their school counseling program on student achievement and success only 24% indicated it was "very accurate" they were engaging in this activity. When participants were asked to rate the frequency of working with students on issues related to study skills, only 36% of Tennessee school counselors reported that they engaged in this activity either frequently or

daily. Only 34% reported working the same amount of time on test-taking strategies. Helping students advance by mastering study skills and test taking strategies are critical competencies for helping students improve grades and test scores as dictated in RTTT. If school counselors want to better address their relevance within the educational landscape, one way to accomplish this is to assist in these essential areas of student need. School counselor assistance in improving study skills and test taking strategies of students will lead to solid assessment data that shows how school counselors can make a difference in improving student achievement and growth. If school counselors are not working with students in these vital areas, it may be due to a lack of understanding on the part of teachers and principals that school counselors have the knowledge to assist with these important academic development skills. If practicing school counselors lack the expertise to assist students in these areas, then professional development from the TDOE is recommended. If teachers are reluctant to use the school counselor in this area or if teachers are unaware that the school counselor is a resource for academic skill support and affective development, then professional development for teachers on how to collaborate and consult with school counselors is warranted. If administrators lack an understanding that they can and should expect the school counselor to assist in the area of student academic development, professional development for school leaders is also warranted. Finally, institutions of higher education need to reexamine school counselor preparation programs to ensure that pre-service school counselors receive sufficient training

in assisting in the academic development domain and in administrator, teacher, and school counselor collaboration skills.

Involvement in non-counseling duties has long been a common challenge and obstacle for the school counselor, not only in Tennessee, but across the nation (Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Coll & Freeman, 1997; Lieberman, 2004). Results of this study were not surprising in this regard and only stand to confirm that school counselors in Tennessee continue to battle the assignment of non-counseling duties. If counselors are to be a central force in directly impacting student achievement, then administrators must be encouraged to rethink assigning of such tasks as test coordination to the school counselor (60% reported high levels of involvement); delegating record keeping tasks to the counselor (51% reported high levels of involvement); and data entry of scheduling student courses (50% reported high levels of involvement). Principals play important roles in deciding what tasks and duties are assigned to the school counselor. According to Ponec and Brock (as cited in Lieberman, 2004), "The principal determines the role and function of the counselor within the school and often must be educated to that role" (p. 555). Therefore, professional development for administrators in the area of how to properly implement the TMCSC and appropriate expectations for school counselors is warranted. Additionally, Tennessee school counselors require further training from the TDOE on appropriate counseling and non-counseling duties for the position based on the disparities demonstrated in their responses to several aspects of the research in this study.

Future Research

School counselors can and should be viewed as educational leaders, collaborators, and student advocates critical to moving a school forward in meeting their academic targets (ASCA, 2003; House & Hayes, 2002). School counselors possess the training, knowledge, and skills to assist in improving the academic achievement and success of all students. However, if school counselors do not prioritize the appropriate use of their time and activities in a way that closely aligns to the ASCA National Model and the TMCSC, then the full benefits of a CSCP cannot be obtained. This study of school counselors and school counseling in Tennessee provided some insight into school counseling in the state. However, there remain critical questions, largely outside the scope of this study, that should be addressed in order to advocate for school counseling in Tennessee and across the nation. Recommendations for further research include:

1. Given the current focus of RTTT, future research could examine the correlation between implementation of the TMCSC and student achievement.
2. This quantitative study did not provide Tennessee school counselors with the opportunity to discuss their thoughts and concerns with regard to implementation of the TMCSC. A qualitative study that consisted of focus groups or interviews could provide an even greater understanding of the roles that school counselors play within their schools, the collaborative relationships they have with administrators and teachers, and further understanding about the challenges and obstacles they face when trying to implement a CSCP.

3. While this study did have as one of its goals to identify priorities and practices of school counselors related to the foundation, management, delivery, and accountability, as well as their perception of importance of the themes of leadership, advocacy, use of data, and systemic change, it did not explore the depth to which school counselors embraced these approaches. Further study could analyze the degree to which school counselors use these process skills in how they approach their work on a daily basis.
4. Almost half of Tennessee school counselors agreed that they are engaged in counseling duties as defined by TMCSC and the ASCA National Model. What is not clear from this study, however, is the degree to which non-counseling duties in which counselors also reported being involved interfere with full implementation of a CSCP. Examining how school counselor and principal relationships impact the school counselors' ability to fully implement a CSCP would be informative to the field and would provide insight into the impact of assigned non-counseling on the TMCSC. Closer examination of this question could produce helpful discourse for the profession in the state and across the nation.
5. While this study provides a glimpse of school counseling in Tennessee, it is not necessarily generalizable when examining the condition of the profession in other states. A call to action for every state department of education to analyze the degree of implementation of their CSCP is warranted. It would then be beneficial to conduct a national analysis of the results of this study to similar studies nationwide in order to provide a broader picture of ASCA's National Model and

CSCP implementation. This would also provide a broader perspective of the relationship of CSCP to student achievement and the goals of RTTT.

6. Given the need to further clarify appropriate roles of school counselors, and given the role that administrators play in determining those roles, a study of principals regarding their perceptions of school counselor priorities and practices could provide beneficial information.

Conclusion

The field of school counseling has yet to see the full scope of what is possible if all state departments of education devoted the time and support to help their school counselors fully implement CSCP's, develop school counselors' skills in collaborating with administrators and teachers, and target resolving the challenges and obstacles identified by school counselors as prohibiting them from doing their best work. This study expresses the importance of making CSCP implementation a priority in reaching the accountability goals mandated in RTTT. Regardless of the context, full implementation of CSCP's has the power to advance school counseling programs to the forefront of education reform initiatives.

It is critical that Tennessee, as well as other states, invest in building infrastructures that can support quality and sustained implementation practices as is accomplished with other education professionals including teachers and administrators. All school counselors could benefit from being part of a statewide program that works to increase their effectiveness and contributions within their respective contexts.

So what was learned from analyzing the priorities and practices of Tennessee school counselors? Initial work conducted by the TDOE to train and support school

counselors in the implementation of the TMCSC has taken a foothold. This study presents a great opportunity to begin a conversation with the newly elected Tennessee Governor and leadership team about what future TDOE school counseling services might look like and involve. The first critical issue being the imperative need to budget to once again fund a state level director of school counseling position and to provide the needed resources to educate and support school counselors, administrators, and teachers in understanding the importance and impact of a CSCP.

This study broadens the perspective of how school counselors fit into the overall education reform initiatives of our nation and individual states. Outcomes reveal what is possible when state departments of education, not just individual school counselors, engage in propelling the field into the 21st century. Moreover, this study stressed the importance of context (work level setting and work location setting) in understanding how CSCPs are implemented and how school counselors fit into the larger school and educational reform picture. If school counselors, principals, and teachers view each other as partners and collaborate to seek solutions around what students need to success as well as communicate about what support mechanisms must be put in place to ensure every student graduates high school college and career ready (ASCA, 2005) the school improvement process will move forward in a coherent and positive way. In addition, principals, teachers, and school counselors need to develop a common language, identify an understanding of appropriate school counselor roles and responsibilities, and have ongoing conversations focused on how together they can partner to improve student achievement and success (Janson & Mititello, 2009). The forgings of these kinds of

strong relationships will result in improved communication, mutual respect, and a shared vision for school improvement (NOSCA, ASCA, & NASSP, 2009).

The overall findings of these analyses suggest that CSCP implementation efforts at the state level warrant more attention and present opportunities to solve problems which have historically plagued the field and to move school counseling into new uncharted territories. In an effort to meet Tennessee's RTTT goals, it will be important to adequately address the multilayered challenges students contend with that impact the schooling process (Teale & Scott, 2010). A vast body of evidence shows that student achievement is affected by a variety of social, psychological, and environmental factors (Coleman et al., 1966; Adelman & Taylor, 2002; Rothstein, 2004). There is also evidence that merely responding to student needs by focusing on school improvement alone will not guarantee improved learning outcomes (Noguera, 2008). The persistence of the achievement gap suggests that a new approach is needed if greater progress is to be realized (Payne, 2008). School counselors' training in education and counseling for a developmental and systemic framework positions them to play a major role in helping schools meet the increased expectations set forth in RTTT (Barna & Brott, 2011). Couple this training with ongoing professional development and support from the TDOE and school counselors will continue to align their priorities and practices around the TMCSC.

REFERENCES

Adelman, H., & Taylor, L. (2002). School counselors and school reform: New directions. *Professional School Counseling, 5,* 235-248.

Akos, P., & Galassi, J. P. (2008). Strength-based school counseling: Introduction to the special issue. *Professional School Counseling*, *12*, 66-67.

American School Counselor Association. (2003; 2005). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: Author

Anderson, K. (2002). A response to common themes in school counseling. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(5), 315-322.

Anderson, R.S., & Reiter, D. (1995). The indispensable counselor. *School Counselor, 42*(4), 268-297.

Aubrey, R.F. (1991). A house divided: Guidance and counseling in the 20th century America. In D. R. Coy, C. G. Cole, W. C. Huey, & S. J. Sears (Eds.), *Toward the transformation of secondary school counseling* (p. 4-46). Ann Arbor, MI: ERIC Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse.

Baggerly, J., & Osborn, D. (2006). School counselors' career satisfaction and commitment: Correlates and predictors. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(3), 197-205.

Baker, S. (2001, December). Reflections on forty years in the school counseling profession: Is the glass half full or half empty? *Professional School Counseling, 5*(2), 75. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier.

Baker, S. B., & Gerler, E. R., Jr. (2004). *School counseling for the twenty-first century*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Barna, J., & Brott, P. (2011). How important is personal/social development to academic achievement? The elementary counselor's perspective. *Professional School Counseling, 14*, 242-249.

Beale, A. V. (2004, November, December). Questioning whether you have a contemporary school counseling program. *The Clearing House, 78*(2), 73-76. doi: 10.3200/TCHS.78.2.73-77

Bemak, F. (2000). Transforming the role of the counselor to provide leadership in educational reform through collaboration. *Professional School Counseling, 3*(5), 323-331.

Bodenhorn, N. (2001). Development of the school counselor self-efficacy scale. *Dissertation Abstract, 03,* 922. (UMI No. 3009069).

Borders, L. D. (2002). School counseling in the 21st century: Personal and professional reflections. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(3), 180-185.

Borders, L. D., & Drury, S. M. (1992). Comprehensive school counseling programs: A review for policymakers and practitioners. *Journal of Counseling & Development,* 70, 487-498.

Boser, J. (1985). *A study of elementary guidance counseling*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Bowers, J., Hatch, T., & Schwallie-Giddis, P. (2001, September-October). The brain storm. *ASCA School Counselor,* 17-18.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (2002). The inheritance of inequality. *Journal of Economic Perspectives 16*, 3-30. doi: 10.1257/089533002760278686

Burnett, P. C. (1993). Self-concept or self-esteem. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counseling, 3,* 1-8.

Burnham, J., & Jackson, C. (2000). School counselor roles: Discrepancies between actual practice and existing models. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(1), 41-50.

Bunce, C. A., & Willower, D. J. (2001). Counselor subculture in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 39*(5), 472-488.

Brigman, G., & Campbell, C. (2003). Helping students improve academic achievement and school success behavior. *Professional School Counseling, 7,* 91-99.

Brigman, G., Campbell, C., & Webb, L. (2004). *Student Success Skills: Helping students develop the academic, social and self-management skills they need to succeed. Group counseling manual.* Boca Raton, FL: Atlantic Education Consultants.

Brigman, G., Webb, L., & Campbell, C. (2007). Building skills for school success: Improving the academic and social competence of students. *Professional School Counseling, 10,* 279-288.

Brown, D. (1989). The perils, pitfalls, and promises of school counseling reform. *The School Counselor, 37,* 47-53.

Brown, D., Galassi, J. P., & Akos, P. (2004). School counselors' perceptions of the impact of high-stakes testing. *Professional School Counseling, 8,* 31-39.

Brown, D., & Trusty, J. (2005). *Designing and leading comprehensive school counseling programs.* Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Thompson.

Brown, D., & Trusty, J. (2005). School counselors, comprehensive school counseling programs, and academic achievement: Are school counselors promising more than they can deliver? *Professional School Counseling, 9,* 1-8.

Burnham, J. J., & Jackson, C. M. (2000). School counselor roles: Discrepancies between actual practice and existing models. *Professional School Counseling, 9,* 1-8.

Burnham, J. J., Dahir, C. A., Stone, C. B., & Hooper, L. M. (2008). An examination of the psychometric properties of the assessment of school counselor needs for professional development survey. *Research in the Schools, 15,* 51-63.

Campbell, C. A., & Dahir, C. A. (1997). *Sharing the vision: The ASCA national standards for school counseling programs.* Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.

Carey, J., Harrity, J., & Dimmitt, C. (2005).The development of a self-assessment instrument to measure a school district's readiness to implement the ASCA National Model. *Professional School Counseling, 8,* 305–312.

Carey, J. C., Dimmitt, C., Hatch, T. A., Lapan, R. T., & Whiston, S. C. (2008). Report of the National Panel for Evidence-Based School Counseling: Outcome Research Coding Protocol and evaluation of Student Success Skills and Second Step. *Professional School Counseling, 11,* 197-206. doi: 10.5330/PSC.n.2010-11.197

Chandler, J.W. (2006). *School counseling in Alabama: Comparisons of counseling and non-counseling duties.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

Chandler, J., Burnham, J., & Dahir, C. (2008). Counseling versus non-counseling duties: Examining the past and present in school counseling. *Alabama Counseling Association Journal, 34,* 44-59.

Chief State School Officers. (2006). ESEA reauthorization policy statement. Retrieved from http://www.publiceducation.org/nclb_main/Reauth_Positions_Org_Arch.asp.

Clark, M. A., & Amatea, E. (2004). Teacher perceptions and expectations of school counselor contributions: Implications for program planning and training. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(2), 132.

Coll, K. M., & Freeman, B. (1997). Role conflict among elementary school counselors: A national comparison with middle and secondary school counselors. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 31*(4), 251-261.

College Board. (2009). A closer look at the school counselor-principal relationship: A survey of principals and counselors. Retrieved from http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/CloserLook.pdf.

College Board's National Office for Student Advocacy, American School Counselor Association, & National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2009). *Finding a way: Practical examples of how an effective principal-counselor relationship can lead to success for all students.* Washington, DC: Author.

Commission on No Child Left Behind. (2007). *Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the Promise to Our Nation's Children,* Washington: Aspen Institute, p. 22.

Conley, D. (2007). Redefining college readiness. Epic Policy Improvement Center Report. Retrieved from http://www.aypf.org/documents/RedefiningCollegeReadiness.pdf

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs. (2001). *The 2001 CACREP Standards.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2006). ESEA Reauthorization Policy Statement, p. 4, Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/ESEA_Policy_Stmnt.pdf

Culbreth, J. R., Scarborough, J. L., Banks-Johnson, A., & Solomon, S. (2005). Role stress among practicing school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*(1), 58-72.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (3rd ed).* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dahir, C. A., Sheldon, C. B., & Valiga, M. J. (1998). *Vision into action: Implementing the National Standards for School Counseling Programs.* Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.

Dahir, C. A. (2001). The national standards for school counseling programs: Development and implementation. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(5), 320.

Dahir, C. A. (2004). Supporting a nation of learners: The role of school counseling in educational reform. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82,* 344-353.

Dahir, C. A., & Stone, C. B. (2003). Accountability: A M.E.A.S.U.R.E. of the impact school counselors have on student achievement. *Professional School Counseling, 6*(3), 214-220.

Dahir, C. A., & Stone, C. B. (2009). School counselor accountability: The path to social justice and systemic change. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 87,* 12-20.

Dahir, C. A., Burnham, J. J., & Stone, C. B. (2009). Assessing readiness to implement a comprehensive school counseling program. *Professional School Counseling, 12,* 182-192.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future. New York: Teachers College Press.

Davis, R. E. (1985). A perspective: School counseling in Tennessee. *Tennessee Teacher, 52*(5), 14.

Davis, T. (2005). *Exploring school counseling: Professional practices and perspectives*. Boston: Lahaska Press.

DeVoss, J. A., & Andrews, M. F. (2006). School counselors as educational leaders. Boston: Lahaska Press.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Dillman, D. A. (1999). *Mail and Internet Surveys: The tailored design method. (2nd ed.),* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Dimmitt, C., Carey, J., & Hatch, T. (2007). *Evidence-based school counseling: Making a difference with data-driven practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Dinkmeyer, D. C., & Caldwell, E. (1970). Developmental counseling and guidance: A comprehensive school approach. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Education Trust (2002). *Transforming school counseling imitative. DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Grant*. Washington, DC: Author.

Education Trust. (2007). *National center for transforming school counseling at the education trust*. Retrieved from http://www2.edtrust.org/EdTrust/Transforming+School+Counseling/main

Erford, B. T., House, R., & Martin, P. (2003). Transforming the school counseling profession. In B. T. Erford (Ed.) *Transforming the School Counseling Profession*. Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Fink, A. (2003). *How to sample in surveys* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fitch, T. J., & Marshall, J. L. (2004). What counselors do in high- achieving schools: A study on the role of the school counselor. *Professional School Counseling*, 7(3), 172-178.

Foster, L. H., Watson, T. S., Meeks, C., & Young, T. S. (2002). Single subject research design for school counselors: Becoming an applied researcher. *Professional School Counseling, 6,* 146–154.

Foster, L.H., Young, J.S., & Hermann, M. (2005). The work activities of professional school counselors: Are the national standards being addressed? *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 313-321.

Fowler, F. J. (2002). *Survey research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education (5th ed.).* New York, NY: Mc Graw Hill.

Galassi, J.P., & Akos, P. (2004). Developmental advocacy: Twenty-first century school counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *82*(2).

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Gladding, S. T. (2009). *Counseling: A comprehensive profession* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Green, A., & Keys, S. (2001). Expanding the developmental school counseling paradigm: Meeting the needs of the 21st century student. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(2), 84-96.

Griffin, D., & Steen, S. (2010). School-family-community partnerships: Applying Epstein's theory of the six types of involvement to school counselor practice. *Professional School Counseling, 13*, 218-226.

Grothaus, T., & Cole, R. (2010). Meeting the challenges together: School counselors collaborating with students and families with low income. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*, 27-32.

Gysbers, N. C. (2001). School guidance and counseling in the 21st century: Remember the past into the future. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(2), 96.

Gysbers, N. C. (2004). Comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: The evolution of accountability. *Professional School Counseling, 8,* 1-14.

Gysbers, N.C. (2005). *Closing the implementation gap*. Retrieved from http://www.schoolcounselor.org/printarticle.asp?article=794

Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (1997). *Comprehensive guidance programs that work part II*. Greensboro, NC: ERIC/CASS.

Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2000). *Developing and managing your school guidance program (3rd ed.).* Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2006). *Developing and managing your school guidance and counseling program (4th ed.).* Alexandra, VA: American Counseling Association.

Gysbers, N. C., & Moore, E. J. (1974). *Career guidance, counseling, and placement: Elements of an illustrative program guide (A life career development perspective).* Columbia MO: University of Missouri, Columbia.

Hardesty, P., & Dillard, J. (1994). The role of elementary school counselors compared with their middle and high school counterparts. *The School Counselor, 29*, 83-90.

Hart, P., & Jacobi, M. (1992). Gatekeeper to advocate. New York: College Board Press.

Hart, D. H., & Prince, D. J. (1970). Role conflict for school counselors: training versus job demands. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 48*(5), 374-380.

Hayes, R., & Paisley, P. (2002). Transforming school counseling preparation programs. *Theory into Practice, 41*(3), 169-176. Doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4103_2

Herr, E. L. (1999). *Counseling in a dynamic society: Contexts and practices for the 21st century* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Herr, E. L. (2001). The impact of national policies, economics, and school reform on comprehensive guidance programs. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(4), 236-245.

Herr, E. L. (2002). School reform and perspectives on the role of school counselors: A century of proposals for change. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 220-234.

Hines, P.L., & Fields, T.H. (2004). School counseling and academic achievement. In R. Perusse & G.E.

Goodnought (Eds.), Leadership, advocacy, and direct service strategies for professional school counselors (pp. 3-24). Belmont, CA: Thomsong-Brooks/Cole.

Hogan, C. C. (1998). Integrating school counselors into the learning process. *High School Magazine, 5,* 18-21.

House, R. M., & Hayes, R. L. (2002). School counselors: Becoming key players in school reform. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 249.

Howard, S. (1989). Examining functions within school counselor roles. *Texas Association of Counseling and Development Journal, 17*, 115-120.

Hughes, D. K., & James, S. H. (2001).Using accountability data to protect a school counseling program: One counselor's experience. *Professional School Counseling, 4,* 306–309.

Janson, C., & Militello, M. (2009). Where do we go from here? Eight elements of effective school principal-counselor relationships. In F. Connolly & N. Protheroe (Eds.), *Principals and counselors partnering for student success* (pp. 159-164). Washington, DC: Educational Research Service/Naviance.

Jennings, S. (1995). Dramatherapy for survival: Some thoughts on transitions and choices for children and adolescents. In S. Jennings (Ed), *Dramatherapy with children and adolescents* (pp. 90-106). New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, L. (2000). Promoting professional identity in an era of educational reform. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 31-40.

Johnson, S., & Johnson, C. (2003). Results based guidance: A systems approach to student support programs. *Professional School Counseling, 6*(3), 180-185.

Johnson, S., Johnson, C., & Downs, L. (2006). *Building a results-based student support program.* Boston: Lahaska/ Houghton Mifflin.

King, M. A. (2003). *Comprehensive school counseling program: Counselor and principal agreement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, Starkville.

Kirchner, G. L., & Setchfield, M. S. (2005). School counselors' and school principals' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Education, 126*(1), 10-17.

Kuranz, M. (2003). Cultivating student potential. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(3), 172-180.

Lambie, G. W., & Williamson, L. L. (2004). The challenge to change from guidance counseling to professional school counseling: A historical proposition. *Professional School Counseling*, *8*(2), 124-132.

Lapan, R. T., Gysbers, N. C., & Kayson, M. A. (2007). Missouri school counselors benefit all students. Jefferson City, MO: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Lapan, R. T. (2001). Results-based comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: A framework for planning and evaluation. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 289-299.

Lapan, R. T., Gysbers, N. C., & Petroski, G. (2001). Helping 7th graders be safe and academically successful: A statewide study of the impact of comprehensive guidance programs. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79*, 320-330.

Lapan, R. T., Gysbers, N. C., & Sun, Y. (1997). The impact of more fully implemented guidance programs on the school experiences of high school students: A statewide evaluation study. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 75,* 292-302.

Legum, H. L., & Hoare, C. H. (2004). Impact of a career intervention on at-risk middle school students' career maturity levels, academic achievement, and self-esteem. *Professional School Counseling, 8(2), 148 – 155.*

Lehr, R**.,** & Sumarah, J. (2002). Exploring the vision: What contributes to the successful implementation of a Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling Program? *The Professional Counselor, 5*(4), 292-29.

Lieberman, A. (2004). Confusion regarding school counselor functions: School leadership impacts role clarity. *Education, 124*(3), 552-559.

Louis, K. S., Jones, L. M., & Barajas, H. (2001). Districts and schools as a context for transformed counseling roles. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 85*(625), 62-73. doi: 10.1177/019263650108562507

Martin, P .J. (2002). Transforming school counseling: A national perspective. *Theory Into Practice, 41*, 148-153. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4103_2

McGannon, W., Carey, J., & Dimmitt, C. (2005). *The current status of school counseling outcome research* (Research Monograph No. 2). Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Center for School Counseling Outcome Research.

Mitcham-Smith, M. A. (2005). *Relationships among school counselor self-efficacy, perceived school counselor role, and actual practice.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, Orlando. (UMI No. 3178955)

Musheno, S., & Talbert, M. (2002). The transformed school counselor in action. *Theory into Practice, 41*(3), 186-191. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4103_7

Mustaine, B.L., & Pappalardo, S. (1996). The discrepancy between actual and preferred time on task for Ontario school counselors. *Guidance and Counseling, 11*(2), 32-36.

Myrick, R. D. (1997). Developmental guidance and counseling: A practical approach (3rd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media Corporation.

Myrick, R.D. (2003). Accountability: Counselors count. *Professional School Counseling*, *6*(3), 174-179.

Napierkowski, C. M., & Parsons, R. D. (1995). Diffusion of innovation: Implementing changes in school counselor roles and functions. *The School Counselor, 42*, 364-369.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. London: Sage publications.

Noguera, P. A. (2008). The trouble with black boys and other reflections on race, equity, and the future of public education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Olson, B. L. (1983). The counselor's role: Actual and ideal time spent on guidance functions. *Guidance Clinic, 16*(3), 11-16.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2005). On becoming a pragmatic researcher: Importance of combining quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 8*(5): 375-387.

Paisley, P., & Hayes, R., (2003). School counseling in the academic domain: Transformations in preparation and practice. *Professional School Counseling, 6*(3), 198-204.

Paisley, P. O., & McMahon, G. H.(2001). School counseling in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(2), 106-116.

Parker, B. J. (1977). *A study of the perceived elementary school counseling role of Alabama elementary school counselors.* Unpublished education specialist thesis, Troy State University, Montgomery, Alabama.

Partin, R. L. (1993). School counselors' time: Where does it go? *School Counselor, 40*(4), 274-282.

Perusse, R., Goodnough, G. E., Donegan, J., & Jones, C. (2004). Perceptions of school counselors and school principals about the National Standards for School Counseling Programs and the Transforming School Counseling initiative. *Professional School Counseling, 7*, 152-161.

Ponec, D. L., & Brock, B. L. (2000). Relationships among elementary school counselors and principals: A unique bond. *Professional School Counseling, 3*(3), 208-217.

Popham, W. (2008). Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know. New York: Pearson.

Poynton, T. A., & Carey, J. C. (2006). An integrative model of data-based decision making for school counseling. *Professional School Counseling, 10*(2), 121-130.

Rayle, A.D., & Adams, J.R. (2008). *An exploration of 21st century school counselors' daily work activities.* Retrieved from http://www.jsc.montana.edu/articles/v5n8.pdf

Ribak-Rosenthal, N. (1994). Reasons individuals become school administrators, school counselors and teachers. *School Counselor, 42*(3), 158-165.

Rowell, L. L. (2006). Action research and school counseling: Closing the gap between research and practice. *Professional School Counseling, 9*, 376-384.

Scarborough, J. L. (2005). The school counselor activity rating scale: An instrument for gathering process data. *Professional School Counseling, 41*(3), 158-165.

Schmidt, J. J. (1995). Assessing school counseling programs through external reviews. *School Counselor, 43*, 114-123.

Schmidt, J. J. (2000). Counselor accountability: Justifying your time and measuring your worth. In J. Wittmer (Ed.), *Managing your school counseling programs: K-12 developmental strategies* (2nd ed., pp. 273-291). Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media.

Schmidt, J. J., Weaver, F. S., & Aldredge, A. L. (2001). *Perceptions of school counselor's role and satisfaction by newly hired counselors and principals in eastern North Carolina.* Greenville, NC: East Carolina University, School of Education.

Sears, S. J., & Coy, D. R. (1991). *The scope of practice of the secondary school counselor.* Ann Arbor, MI: ERIC Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse.

Sears, S., & Granello, D. (2002). School counseling now and in the future: A reaction. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(3), 164-172.

Sink, C. A., & MacDonald, G. (1998). The status of comprehensive guidance and counseling in the United States. *Professional School Counseling, 2*, 88-94.

Sink, C. A., & Stroh, H. R. (2003). Raising achievement test scores of early elementary school students through comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling, 6*, 352-364.

Sink, C. A., Akos, P., Turnbull, R. J., & Mvududu, N. (2008). An investigation of comprehensive school counseling programs and academic achievement in Washington state middle schools. *Professional School Counseling, 12*, 43-53.

Sparks, E. (2003). Defining school counselor. *School Counselor, 40*(3), 14-17.

Stone, C. B., & Dahir, C. A. (2004). *School counselor accountability: A MEASURE of student success*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Stone, C. B., & Dahir, C. A. (2006). *The transformed school counselor*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Stone, C. B., & Dahir, C. A. (2007). School counselor accountability: A MEASURE of student success (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, N J: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Sutton, J. M., & Fall, M. (1995). The relationship of school climate factors to counselor self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73*(3), 331-336.

Sweeney, T. J. (1995). Accreditation credentialing, professionalization: The role of specialties. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74*(2), 117-126.

Teale, W. H., & Scott, J. L. (2010). Making urban schools better places for students, teachers, and families: An interview with Charles Payne. *The Reading Teacher, 63*, 701-704.

Tennessee Department of Education. (2005). Tennessee model for comprehensive school counseling. Nashville, TN: Author.

Tennessee Department of Education. (2008). Unpublished manuscript. Nashville, TN: Author.

Tennessee Department of Education. (2010). *Tennessee evaluation advisory council meeting notes.* Retrieved from http://www.tn.gov/education/TEAC.shtml)

Tennyson, W., Miller, D., Skovolt, T., & Williams, C. (1989). How they view their role: A survey of school counselors in different secondary schools. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 67*, 399-403.

Thornburg, H. D. (1986). The counselor's impact on middle grades students. *School Counselor, 33*, 170-177.

U.S. Department of Education. (1983, April). *A nation at risk*. Retrieved from, http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk.html

U.S. Department of Education. (1990, 2000). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*: Public Law 103-227.

U.S. Department of Education. (1996a, September). Background and brief history of the ESEA. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA/Guidance/pt1.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Pub. L. No. 107-110.

U.S. Department of Education (2009). Race to the Top. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html

U.S. Department of Education (2009). Race to the top executive summary. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf

Walsh, M. E., Barrett, J. G., & DePaul, J. (2007). Day-to-day activities of school counselors: Alignment with new directions in the field and the ASCA national model. *Professional School Counseling*, 10, 370-378.

Webb, L., Brigman, G., & Campbell, C. (2005). Linking school counselors and student success: A replication of the Student Success Skills approach targeting the academic and social competence of students. *Professional School Counseling*, 8, 407–413.

Whiston, S. C., & Quinby, R. F. (2009), Review of school counseling outcome research. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46: 267–272. doi: 10.1002/pits.20372

Whiston, S. C. (2002). Response to the past, present, and future of school counseling: Raising some issues. *Professional School Counselor, 5*(3), 148-155.

Whiston, S. C., & Sexton, T. L. (1998). A review of school counseling outcome research: Implications for practice. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 76*(4), 412-426.

Whiston, S., Tai, W. ,Rahardja, D., & Eder, K. (2011). School counseling outcome: A Meta-analytic examination of interventions. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 89, 37-55.

Wilson, W. J. (1996). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York: Knopf.

Windsor, R., Clark, N., Boyd, N. R., & Goodman, R. M. (2004). *Evaluation of Health Promotion, Health Education, and Disease Prevention Programs* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wittmer, J. (2000). *Managing your school counseling program: K-12 developmental strategies* (2nd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media Corporation.

Appendix A—Research Questions Outline

General Research Questions	Aligns to survey components
1. To what degree have Tennessee school counselors acquired the attitudes and skills to successfully implement the TMCSC?	Section 16: School Counseling Priorities Section 18: Student Development (Academic, Personal/Social, Career and Post-Secondary)
2. To what degree were Tennessee school counselors directly collborating with administrators and teachers to improve student achievement?	Section 17: School Setting Perception (a-g; i-k)
3. What were some of the challenges and obstacles Tennessee school counselors have experienced in implementing the TMCSC?	Section 19: Building and District Expectations/Program Management

Appendix B--- IRB Approval Memorandum

MEMORANDUM

TO:	Nicole Cobb	IRB # 10 –144
	Dr. Valerie Rutledge	
FROM:	Lindsay Pardue, Director of Research Integrity	
	Dr. Bart Weathington, IRB Committee Chair	
DATE:	November 1, 2010	
SUBJECT:	IRB # 10- 144: An Examination of the Priorities and Practices of Tennessee School Counselors in the Implementation of the Tennessee Model for Comprehensive School Counseling Programs	

The Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved your application and assigned you the IRB number listed above. You must include the following approval statement on research materials seen by participants and used in research reports:

The Institutional Review Board of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (FWA00004149) has approved this research project # 10 - 144.

Please remember that you must complete a Certification for Changes, Annual Review, or Project Termination/Completion Form when the project is completed or provide an annual report if the project takes over one year to complete. The IRB Committee will make every effort to remind you prior to your anniversary date; however, it is your responsibility to ensure that this additional step is satisfied.

Please remember to contact the IRB Committee immediately and submit a new project proposal for review if significant changes occur in your research design or in any instruments used in conducting the study. You should also contact the IRB Committee immediately if you encounter any adverse effects during your project that pose a risk to your subjects.

For any additional information, please consult our web page http://www.utc.edu/irb or email instrb@utc.edu

Best wishes for a successful research project.

Appendix C---Dissertation Survey

Tennessee Assessment of School Counselor Needs for Professional Development (ASCNPD)

Demographic Information

Gender

- ❑ Male
- ❑ Female

Racial Identity

- ❑ Caucasian/Non-Hispanic
- ❑ Hispanic
- ❑ African American
- ❑ Asian/Pacific Islander
- ❑ Native American

Age Range

- ❑ 22-30
- ❑ 31-40
- ❑ 41-50
- ❑ 51-60
- ❑ 60+

4. In what school level(s) are you currently employed? (Check all that apply)

- ❑ Elementary School
- ❑ Middle School/Junior High
- ❑ High School
- ❑ K-12
- ❑ Other (Specify)

_____

5. Is your school classified as:

❑ Rural

❑ Suburban

❑ Urban

6. What is your current job title:

_____

7. How long have you held this position?

_____

8. How many students do you serve? _____caseload

9. How many students are enrolled in your school?

under 500 ____ 501-1000____ over 1000_____

10. How many school counselors are at your school? _____

11. Is your counselor supervisor/coordinator a licensed school counselor? ____yes ____no

12. Have you ever been a K-12 teacher? ❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ If Yes, for how long?

13. What type of certification/licensure/credential(s) do you hold? (Check all that apply)

_____ Tennessee School Counselor Certification

_____ LPC _____NCC

_____ NCSC _____ NBPTS _____ Other (Identify)

14. Do you have a Master's Degree in School Counseling? _____

School Counselor Activities

What roles do you regularly play within your school? (Check all that apply)

❑ I serve on one or more school committees.

(specify name of the committee(s)_____

❑ I serve on one or more system-level committees.

(specify name of the committee(s)_____

❑ I participate in fair-share duties such as hall monitoring, bus duty, and/or lunchroom duty.

❑ I work with teachers to help specific students improve their grades.

- ❑ I work with parents to help specific students improve their grades.
- ❑ I have a role in the development of my school improvement plan.

School Counseling Priorities (SCP)

16. How important are the following activities or tasks for school counselors?

	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Extremely important
a. Improve student access to academic intervention services.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
b. Evaluate the school counseling program effort to raise academic performance.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
c. Advocate to change policies and practices that can negatively impact student success.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
d. Use data to identify specific areas of school improvement.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
e. Work closely with administrators and teachers on school improvement issues.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
f. Reduce social/institutional barriers that keep students from achieving their potential.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
g. Provide professional development activities to teachers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
h. Develop and implement prevention programs.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
. Serve on school committees.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
j. Attend academic department or grade-level meetings.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
k. Monitor student academic performance.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

l. Work with students in small groups on personal/social issues.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
m. Visit classes to help students develop long-term goals.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
n. Use grades to identify under-performing students.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
o. Counsel students who have behavioral problems in classes.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
p. Help teachers improve classroom management skills.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
q. Counsel students individually about personal and social issues.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
r. Refer students to community professionals for mental health problems.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

School Setting Perception (SSP)

17. Please indicate the extent to which, in your experience in your school, the following statements are accurate.

1 2 3 4 5

	Not at all accurate	A little accurate	Accurate	Somewhat accurate	Very accurate
a. School counselors work with faculty and administration to improve the school climate.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
b. Counselors are viewed as school leaders.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
c. School counselors are part of key decision-making teams.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
d. Administrators work with school counselors to increase student academic	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

performance.					
e. School counselors develop strategies to change systems and practices that are impeding student success.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
f. School counselors provide leadership to promote every student's right to a quality education.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
g. Teachers and counselors work together to identify students who are not performing to their best level.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
h. School counselors use school data to assess student performance and develop necessary services.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
i. Teachers work with school counselors to improve student achievement.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
j. Teachers ask school counselors to consult with them on improving classroom management techniques.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
k. School counselors monitor and evaluate the impact of the school counseling program on student achievement and success.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
l. My school has established strong collaborative relationships with local community organizations and agencies.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
m. School counselors reduce social/institutional barriers that keep students from achieving success.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
n. School counselors regularly consult with parents, teachers, and school administrators.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
o. School counselors are increasing the participation of under-represented students in higher-level academics such as honors, IB, AP classes.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

p. Teachers regularly send students to the school counselor to deal with personal problems.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
q. School counselors counsel students individually about personal/social issues.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
r. School counselors use the Tennessee standards for school counseling programs to deliver specific student competencies in academic, career, and personal-social development.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
s. School counselors deliver guidance programs in classes.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
t. School counselors provide group counseling based on identified student needs.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Student Development: Academic - Career- Personal/Social

Since school started this year, how often have you worked with students on:

	1	2	3	4	5
	Never	Rarely	Some-times	Frequently	Almost daily
a. Managing emotions (stress, anger, coping, etc.).	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
b. Strengthening interpersonal communication skills.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
c. Personal problems that affect grades.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
d. Personal/social issues.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
e. Decision-making skills.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
f. Diversity issues.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
g. Serious mental health problems (depression, addiction, etc.).	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
h. School discipline incidents.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
i. Preventing problems (alcohol, teen pregnancy, truancy, dropout, etc.).	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
j. Time and task organizational skills.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
k. College admissions strategies.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
l. Developing educational and career plans.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
m. Educational program planning.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
n. Study skills (note taking, outlining, reading, etc).	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
o. Test-taking strategies.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
p. Improving grades.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
q. Help students identify their future educational	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

and career options.					
r. Work with students individually or in groups on career planning activities.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Building and District Expectations/Program Management (PM)

Please indicate the extent to which these statements of expectations and tasks accurately reflect your program.

1 2 3 4 5

	Not at all accurate	A little accurate	Accurate	Somewhat accurate	Very accurate
a. I am involved in the coordination of statewide assessments (TCAP, Gateways, etc).	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
b. I am involved in the clerical aspects of record keeping (transferring records, posting grades, managing transcripts, etc.)	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
c. I am involved in the development of the master schedule.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
d. I am involved in the scheduling of student courses.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
e. I serve as the building registrar for new entrants and transferred and withdrawn students.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
f. I adhere to the Tennessee Code (49-5-302) for the Role of the School Counselor.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
g. I implement a four-year educational plan, beginning in the eighth grade, that is revised annually and that requires approval in writing by the parent.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
h. I require my students to maintain an educational/	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

career-planning portfolio in Grades 9 – 12.					
i. I have established a School Counseling/ Guidance Advisory Committee.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
j. I / we have implemented a school counseling program that is aligned with the Tennessee Model for Comprehensive School Counseling and/or the ASCA National Model.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
k. I am encouraged to attend school counseling conferences and/or workshops during this school year by my principal/supervisor.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
l. I/we meet regularly with our system-level counselor coordinator.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
m. I keep records that document time spent or activities performed, which would enable me to determine the percentage of time spent providing direct services to students.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
n. I perform fair-share duties above and beyond what is expected of other certified staff at my school.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
o. I am responsible for the implementation of my school's character education program.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
p. I interpret test data for students, parents, and teachers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
q. I am scheduled in classrooms by my principal for classroom guidance lessons.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
r. I am financially supported (partial or full) to attend professional development.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
s. I collaborate with my administrator/supervisor to establish goals for the school counseling program.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
t. I spend more than 75% of my time delivering classroom guidance lessons.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

u. I conduct more than 3 different group counseling experiences for my students each year.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
v. I have a scope and sequence for my classroom guidance lessons.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions.

APPENDIX D—Survey Review Committee

Assessment of School Counselor Needs for Professional Development (ASCNPD)

Review Committee

Name	Organization
Mary Simmons	Currey-Ingram Elementary School, School Counselor
Kellie Hargis	Hume Fogg, Assistant Principal
Maggie Nichols	Dupont Middle School, School Counselor
Andrea Morrison	Eakin Elementary, School Counselor
Kate Donnelly	Williamson County Schools, Director of School Counseling
Leigh Bagwell	Rutherford County Schools, Director of School Counseling
Sonja Sanes	Memphis City Schools, Director of School Counseling
Dee Dee Lunsford	Shelby County Schools, Director of School Counseling
Steven Lay	LaVergne High School, School Counselor
Emily Jenkins	Westmoreland Elementary School, School Counselor

Andy Finch	Vanderbilt University, Counselor Educator
Robin Lee	Middle Tennessee State University, Counselor Educator

Appendix E---Commissioner Support Letter

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
6th FLOOR, ANDREW JOHNSON TOWER
710 JAMES ROBERTSON PARKWAY
NASHVILLE, TN 37243-0375

PHIL BREDESEN
GOVERNOR

BRUCE OPIE
COMMISSIONER

To: School Counselors

From: Bruce Opie, Commissioner of Education

Re: School Counselor Survey

Date: November 5, 2010

The Tennessee Department of Education in partnership with Nicole Cobb, doctoral student at the University of Tennessee-Chattanooga, is conducting a research study that involves all school counselors in Tennessee. We consider this study to be of great importance because it examines the implementation of the *Tennessee Model for Comprehensive School Counseling,* as well as the actual tasks you are being asked to perform in your current position.

In an effort to better serve you through professional development workshops, statewide meetings, as well as guide future policy setting with the State Board of Education, your help is needed. It would be greatly appreciated if you partake in the study by taking the online survey. Your identity will remain anonymous so please answer each question as accurately as possible. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please complete the survey no later than January 7, 2011.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact Nicole Cobb at nicoleacobb@gmail.com.

I appreciate your help with this request and all the work you do for all of Tennessee's students.

BO/nc

Appendix F: Means and Standard Deviations; Elementary, Middle, High School

(all participants)

School Counseling Priorities (SCP)

16. How important are the following activities or tasks for school counselors?

	Elementary	Middle	High School	Total Population
a. Improve student access to academic intervention services.	M= 4.18 SD= .892	M= 4.29 SD= .920	M= 4.34 SD= .784	M= 4.27 SD= .845
b. Evaluate the school counseling program effort to raise academic performance.	M= 4.12 SD= .908	M= 4.03 SD= 1.090	M= 4.08 SD= .909	M= 4.08 SD= .945
c. Advocate to change policies and practices that can negatively impact student success.	M= 4.21 SD= .829	M= 4.23 SD= .865	M= 4.22 SD= .796	M= 4.22 SD= .818
d. Use data to identify specific areas of school improvement.	M= 3.99 SD= .942	M= 4.06 SD= .976	M= 3.97 SD= .923	M= 3.99 SD= .944
e. Work closely with administrators and teachers on school improvement issues.	M= 4.20 SD= .904	M= 4.09 SD= .962	M= 4.20 SD= .825	M= 4.19 SD= .879
f. Reduce social/institutional barriers that keep students from achieving their potential.	M= 4.47 SD= .758	M= 4.27 SD= .883	M= 4.22 SD= .859	M= 4.33 SD= .844
g. Provide professional development activities	M= 3.53 SD=	M= 3.37 SD=	M= 3.08	M= 3.31 SD=

to teachers.	.945	1.150	SD= 1.099	1.077
h. Develop and implement prevention programs.	M= 4.26 SD= .939	M= 4.04 SD= .915	M= 3.73 SD= 1.034	M= 4.01 SD= 1.003
i. Serve on school committees.	M= 3.56 SD= .978	M= 3.51 SD= .998	M= 3.28 SD= 1.009	M= 3.42 SD= .999
j. Attend academic department or grade-level meetings.	M= 3.12 SD= 1.059	M= 3.39 SD= 1.077	M= 3.26 SD= 1.144	M= 3.22 SD= 1.103
k. Monitor student academic performance.	M= 3.64 SD= 1.094	M= 3.96 SD= .995	M-= 4.31 SD= .838	M= 3.97 SD= 1.019
l. Work with students in small groups on personal/social issues.	M= 4.57 SD= .696	M= 4.23 SD= .946	M= 3.86 SD= 1.104	M= 4.21 SD= .989
m. Visit classes to help students develop long-term goals.	M= 4.15 SD= .989	M= 3.93 SD= 1.012	M= 3.88 SD= 1.028	M= 4.00 SD= 1.011
n. Use grades to identify under-performing students.	M= 3.70 SD= 1.047	M= 3.99 SD= .904	M= 4.24 SD= .863	M= 3.99 SD= .970
o. Counsel students who have behavioral problems in classes.	M= 4.64 SD= .639	M= 4.43 SD= .724	M= 4.02 SD= 1.078	M= 4.34 SD= .920
p. Help teachers improve classroom management skills.	M= 3.62 SD= 1.049	M= 2.89 SD= 1.176	M= 2.74 SD= 1.168	M= 3.10 SD= 1.192
q. Counsel students individually about personal and social issues.	M= 4.77 SD= .590	M= 4.61 SD= .710	M= 4.39 SD= .956	M= 4.59 SD= .799
r. Refer students to community professionals	M= 4.49 SD=	M= 4.32 SD= .871	M= 4.22 SD= .908	M= 4.34 SD= .868

for mental health problems.	.806			

School Setting Perception (SS)

17. Please indicate the extent to which, in your experience in your school, the following statements are accurate.

	Elementary	Middle	High School	Total
a. School counselors work with faculty and administration to improve the school climate.	M= 4.20 SD= 1.147	M= 3.93 SD= 1.221	M= 3.68 SD= 1.213	M= 3.95 SD= 1.201
b. Counselors are viewed as school leaders.	M= 3.72 SD= 1.368	M= 3.56 SD= 1.359	M= 3.15 SD= 1.360	M= 3.45 SD= 1.404
c. School counselors are part of key decision-making teams.	M= 3.62 SD= 1.402	M= 3.32 SD= 1.392	M= 3.14 SD= 1.412	M= 3.35 SD= 1.434
d. Administrators work with school counselors to increase student academic performance.	M= 3.40 SD= 1.418	M= 3.61 SD= 1.331	M= 3.61 SD= 1.283	M= 3.54 SD= 1.348
e. School counselors develop strategies to change systems and practices that are impeding student success.	M= 3.58 SD= 1.330	M= 3.34 SD= 1.336	M= 3.18 SD= 1.263	M= 3.37 SD= 1.313
f. School counselors provide leadership to promote every student's right to a quality education.	M= 3.90 SD= 1.158	M= 3.59 SD= 1.239	M= 3.54 SD= 1.231	M= 3.69 SD= 1.222
g. Teachers and counselors work together to identify students who are not performing to their best level.	M= 4.14 SD= 1.056	M= 3.87 SD= 1.162	M= 3.96 SD= 1.184	M= 3.99 SD= 1.146
h. School counselors use school data to assess student performance and develop necessary services.	M= 3.62 SD= 1.299	M= 3.60 SD= 1.278	M= 3.65 SD= 1.174	M= 3.62 SD= 1.248

i. Teachers work with school counselors to improve student achievement.	M= 3.70 SD= 1.234	M= 3.65 SD= 1.283	M= 3.57 SD= 1.174	M= 3.64 SD= 1.217
j. Teachers ask school counselors to consult with them on improving classroom management techniques.	M= 3.14 SD= 1.361	M= 2.40 SD= 1.321	M= 2.12 SD= 1.226	M= 2.57 SD= 1.375
k. School counselors monitor and evaluate the impact of the school counseling program on student achievement and success.	M= 3.68 SD= 1.221	M= 3.34 SD= 1.282	M= 3.12 SD= 1.258	M= 3.36 SD= 1.271
l. My school has established strong collaborative relationships with local community organizations and agencies.	M= 3.72 SD= 1.203	M= 3.21 SD= 1.293	M= 3.15 SD= 1.184	M= 3.38 SD= 1.234
m. School counselors reduce social/institutional barriers that keep students from achieving success.	M= 3.88 SD= 1.162	M= 3.38 SD= 1.253	M= 3.39 SD= 1.087	M= 3.59 SD= 1.172
n. School counselors regularly consult with parents, teachers, and school administrators.	M= 4.55 SD= .928	M= 4.29 SD= 1.082	M= 4.37 SD= 1.025	M= 4.42 SD= 1.005
o. School counselors are increasing the participation of under-represented students in higher-level academics such as honors, IB, AP classes.	M= 2.77 SD= 1.564	M= 3.08 SD= 1.381	M= 3.48 SD= 1.241	M= 3.15 SD= 1.416
p. Teachers regularly send students to the school counselor to deal with personal problems.	M= 4.42 SD= 1.050	M= 4.49 SD= 1.103	M= 3.99 SD= 1.147	M= 4.24 SD= 1.130
q. School counselors counsel students individually about personal/social issues.	M= 4.68 SD= .793	M= 4.56 SD= .949	M= 4.22 SD= 1.146	M= 4.45 SD= 1.022
r. School counselors use the Tennessee standards for school counseling programs to deliver specific student competencies in academic, career, and personal-social development.	M= 4.41 SD= 1.046	M= 3.83 SD= 1.347	M= 3.44 SD= 1.292	M= 3.90 SD= 1.277

s. School counselors deliver guidance programs in classes.	M= 4.55 SD= .939	M= 3.70 SD= 1.463	M= 3.04 SD= 1.317	M= 3.76 SD= 1.411
t. School counselors provide group counseling based on identified student needs.	M= 4.21 SD= 1.170	M= 3.51 SD= 1.491	M= 2.67 SD= 1.414	M= 3.41 SD= 1.518

Student Development: Academic - Career- Personal/Social

18. Since school started this year, how often have you worked with students on:

	Elementary	Middle	High School	Total
a. Managing emotions (stress, anger, coping, etc.).	M= 4.37 SD= .874	M= 4.27 SD= 1.010	M= 3.98 SD= .916	M= 4.19 SD= .921
b. Strengthening interpersonal communication skills.	M= 4.11 SD= .861	M= 4.00 SD= 1.045	M= 3.54 SD= .897	M= 3.86 SD= .947
c. Personal problems that affect grades.	M= 4.04 SD= .906	M= 4.11 SD= 1.032	M= 4.15 SD= .837	M= 4.10 SD= .906
d. Personal/social issues.	M= 4.45 SD= .807	M= 4.38 SD= 1.028	M= 4.10 SD= .876	M= 4.29 SD= .901
e. Decision-making skills.	M= 4.16 SD=	M= 4.01 SD=	M= 3.76 SD= 1.065	M= 3.96 SD=

	.965	1.028		1.019
f. Diversity issues.	M= 3.08 SD= 1.029	M= 2.99 SD= 1.035	M= 2.80 SD= .976	M= 2.95 SD= 1.018
g. Serious mental health problems (depression, addiction, etc.).	M=2.89 SD= 1.169	M= 2.96 SD= .992	M= 3.18 SD= 1.055	M= 3.06 SD= 1.112
h. School discipline incidents.	M= 3.85 SD= 1.160	M= 3.55 SD= 1.174	M= 3.08 SD= 1.104	M= 3.43 SD= 1.198
i. Preventing problems (alcohol, teen pregnancy, truancy, dropout, etc.).	M= 2.58 SD=1.203	M= 2.98 SD= .996	M= 3.20 SD= 1.069	M= 2.97 SD= 1.145
j. Time and task organizational skills.	M= 3.34 SD= 1.100	M= 3.46 SD= 1.086	M= 3.25 SD= 1.051	M= 3.32 SD= 1.066
k. College admissions strategies.	M= 1.32 SD= .840	M= 2.23 SD= 1.175	M= 4.17 SD= 1.049	M= 2.76 SD= 1.637
l. Developing educational and career plans.	M= 2.32 SD= 1.243	M= 3.11 SD= 1.190	M= 4.17 SD= .943	M= 3.31 SD= 1.364
m. Educational program planning.	M= 2.28 SD= 1.329	M= 3.21 SD= 1.107	M= 3.94 SD= 1.074	M= 3.19 SD= 1.381
n. Study skills (note taking, outlining,	M=	M= 3.19	M= 2.91	M= 3.05

reading, etc).	3.12 SD= 1.207	SD= 1.062	SD= 1.074	SD= 1.123
o. Test-taking strategies.	M= 3.10 SD= 1.254	M= 3.06 SD= 1.057	M= 2.97 SD= 1.081	M= 3.04 SD= 1.132
p. Improving grades.	M= 3.49 SD= 1.140	M= 3.70 SD= 1.219	M= 4.01 SD= 1.078	M= 3.74 SD= 1.151
q. Help students identify their future educational and career options.	M= 2.71 1.236	M= 3.28 SD= 1.109	M= 4.08 SD= 1.030	M= 3.45 SD= 1.261
r. Work with students individually or in groups on career planning activities.	M= 2.51 SD= 1.229	M= 3.07 SD= 1.138	M= 3.53 SD= 1.174	M= 3.11 SD= 1.273

Building and District Expectations

19. Please indicate the extent to which these statements of expectations and tasks accurately reflect your program.

	Elementary	Middle	High School	Total
a. I am involved in the coordination of statewide assessments (TCAP, Gateways, etc).	M= 2.80 SD= 1.799	M= 4.01 SD= 1.509	M= 3.95 SD= 1.586	M= 3.54 SD= 1.750
b. I am involved in the clerical aspects of record keeping (transferring records, posting grades, managing transcripts, etc.)	M= 1.82 SD= 1.410	M= 3.33 SD= 1.725	M= 4.13 SD= 1.412	M= 3.16 SD= 1.811
c. I am involved in the development of the master	M= 1.43	M= 2.77	M= 3.35	M= 2.54

schedule.	SD= 1.003	SD= 1.703	SD= 1.687	SD= 1.722
d. I am involved in the scheduling of student courses.	M= 1.30 SD= .957	M= 3.22 SD= 1.726	M= 4.50 SD= 1.191	M= 3.05 SD= 1.897
e. I serve as the building registrar for new entrants and transferred and withdrawn students.	M= 1.36 SD= 1.009	M= 2.89 SD= 1.741	M= 2.70 SD= 1.722	M= 2.27 SD= 1.667
f. I adhere to the Tennessee Code (49-5-302) for the Role of the School Counselor.	M= 3.85 SD= 1.473	M= 3.90 SD= 1.354	M= 3.59 SD= 1.510	M= 3.75 SD= 1.493
g. I implement a four-year educational plan, beginning in the eighth grade, that is revised annually and that requires approval in writing by the parent.	M= 1.07 SD= .718	M= 3.76 SD= 1.667	M= 3.66 SD= 1.594	M= 2.77 SD= 1.861
h. I require my students to maintain an educational/career-planning portfolio in Grades 9 – 12.	M= 1.04 SD= .599	M= 1.44 SD= 1.285	M= 2.30 SD= 1.498	M= 1.70 SD= 1.353
i. I have established a School Counseling/ Guidance Advisory Committee.	M= 2.12 SD= 1.608	M= 2.05 SD= 1.550	M= 1.82 SD= 1.299	M= 1.94 SD= 1.455
j. I / we have implemented a school counseling program that is aligned with the Tennessee Model for Comprehensive School Counseling and/or the ASCA National Model.	M= 3.82 SD= 1.303	M= 3.47 SD= 1.403	M= 2.98 SD= 1.456	M= 3.37 SD= 1.452
k. I am encouraged to attend school counseling conferences and/or workshops during this school year by my principal/supervisor.	M= 3.44 SD= 1.457	M= 3.48 SD= 1.438	M= 3.32 SD= 1.527	M= 3.41 SD= 1.487
l. I/we meet regularly with our system-level counselor coordinator.	M= 3.51 SD= 1.494	M= 3.17 SD= 1.454	M= 2.90 SD= 1.519	M= 3.14 SD= 1.545
m. I keep records that document time spent or	M= 3.66 SD=	M= 3.05 SD=	M= 2.55 SD= 1.357	M= 3.06 SD=1.44

activities performed, which would enable me to determine the percentage of time spent providing direct services to students.	1.315	1.480		9
n. I perform fair-share duties above and beyond what is expected of other certified staff at my school.	M= 3.44 SD= 1.616	M= 3.13 SD= 1.685	M= 3.17 SD= 1.593	M= 3.25 SD= 1.642
o. I am responsible for the implementation of my school's character education program.	M= 4.21 SD= 1.208	M= 2.99 SD= 1.607	M= 1.83 SD= 1.341	M= 3.00 SD= 1.730
p. I interpret test data for students, parents, and teachers.	M= 2.73 SD= 1.432	M= 3.67 SD= 1.330	M= 3.91 SD= 1.232	M= 3.44 SD= 1.435
q. I am scheduled in classrooms by my principal for classroom guidance lessons.	M= 3.20 SD= 1.805	M= 2.12 SD= 1.644	M= 1.52 SD= 1.118	M= 2.33 SD= 1.719
r. I am financially supported (partial or full) to attend professional development.	M= 2.77 SD= 1.492	M= 2.68 SD= 1.532	M= 2.89 SD= 1.517	M= 2.88 SD= 1.534
s. I collaborate with my administrator/supervisor to establish goals for the school counseling program.	M= 3.42 SD= 1.433	M= 3.26 SD= 1.423	M= 2.91 SD= 1.471	M= 3.14 SD= 1.481
t. I spend more than 75% of my time delivering classroom guidance lessons.	M= 2.35 SD= 1.536	M= 1.45 SD= .979	M= 1.21 SD= .672	M= 1.75 SD= 1.304
u. I conduct more than 3 different group counseling experiences for my students each year.	M= 3.64 SD= 1.505	M= 2.99 SD= 1.650	M= 2.30 SD= 1.565	M= 2.92 SD= 1.670
v. I have a scope and sequence for my classroom guidance lessons.	M= 3.75 SD= 1.358	M= 3.01 SD= 1.611	M= 2.18 SD= 1.422	M= 2.96 SD= 1.602

Appendix G: Means and Standard Deviations; Rural, Urban, Suburban

School Counseling Priorities (YP)

16. How important are the following activities or tasks for school counselors?

	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Total Population
a. Improve student access to academic intervention services.	M= 4.22 SD= .795	M= 4.41 SD= .833	M= 4.22 SD= .901	M= 4.27 SD= .845
b. Evaluate the school counseling program effort to raise academic performance.	M= 4.04 SD= .919	M= 4.23 SD= .934	M= 3.99 SD= .972	M= 4.08 SD= .945
c. Advocate to change policies and practices that can negatively impact student success.	M= 4.20 SD= .852	M= 4.31 SD= .839	M= 4.19 SD= .764	M= 4.22 SD= .818
d. Use data to identify specific areas of school improvement.	M= 3.95 SD= .916	M= 4.15 SD= .947	M= 3.90 SD= .966	M= 3.99 SD= .944
e. Work closely with administrators and teachers on school improvement issues.	M= 4.17 SD= .892	M= 4.33 SD= .855	M= 4.09 SD= .877	M= 4.19 SD= .879
f. Reduce social/institutional barriers that keep students from achieving their potential.	M= 4.30 SD= .821	M= 4.39 SD= .941	M= 4.31 SD= .789	M= 4.33 SD= .844
g. Provide professional development activities to teachers.	M= 3.28 SD= 1.058	M= 3.57 SD= 1.054	M= 3.15 SD= 1.090	M= 3.31 SD= 1.077
h. Develop and implement prevention programs.	M= 3.98 SD= .977	M= 4.15 SD= 1.003	M= 3.91 SD= 1.015	M= 4.01 SD= 1.003
i. Serve on school committees.	M= 3.37 SD= .982	M= 3.56 SD=	M= 3.35 SD= .973	M= 3.42 SD= .999

		1.048		
j. Attend academic department or grade-level meetings.	M= 3.19 SD= 1.050	M= 3.40 SD= 1.139	M= 3.12 SD= 1.121	M= 3.22 SD= 1.103
k. Monitor student academic performance.	M= 3.94 SD= 1.052	M= 4.10 SD= 1.011	M= 3.92 SD= .987	M= 3.97 SD= 1.019
l. Work with students in small groups on personal/social issues.	M= 4.14 SD= 1.006	M= 4.34 SD= .877	M= 4.18 SD= 1.035	M= 4.21 SD= .989
m. Visit classes to help students develop long-term goals.	M= 3.94 SD= 1.010	M= 4.20 SD= .912	M= 3.91 SD= 1.069	M= 4.00 SD= 1.011
n. Use grades to identify under-performing students.	M= 3.93 SD= .966	M= 4.18 SD= .905	M= 3.91 SD= .981	M= 3.99 SD= .970
o. Counsel students who have behavioral problems in classes.	M= 4.34 SD= .934	M= 4.47 SD= .863	M= 4.24 SD= .932	M= 4.34 SD= .920
p. Help teachers improve classroom management skills.	M= 3.09 SD= 1.168	M= 3.44 SD= 1.168	M= 2.86 SD= 1.176	M= 3.10 SD= 1.192
q. Counsel students individually about personal and social issues.	M= 4.62 SD= .776	M= 4.59 SD= .824	M= 4.56 SD= .792	M= 4.59 SD= .799
r. Refer students to community professionals for mental health problems.	M= 4.41 SD= .829	M= 4.36 SD= .903	M= 4.26 SD= .859	M= 4.34 SD= .868

School Setting Perception (SS)

17. Please indicate the extent to which, in your experience in your school, the following statements are accurate.

	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Total

a. School counselors work with faculty and administration to improve the school climate.	M= 3.93 SD= 1.160	M= 4.00 SD= 1.263	M= 3.92 SD= 1.205	M= 3.95 SD= 1.201
b. Counselors are viewed as school leaders.	M= 3.39 SD= 1.371	M= 3.64 SD= 1.486	M= 3.36 SD= 1.356	M= 3.45 SD= 1.404
c. School counselors are part of key decision-making teams.	M= 3.32 SD= 1.422	M= 3.51 SD= 1.500	M= 3.28 SD= 1.368	M= 3.35 SD= 1.434
d. Administrators work with school counselors to increase student academic performance.	M= 3.55 SD= 1.328	M= 3.59 SD= 1.391	M= 3.49 SD= 1.307	M= 3.54 SD= 1.348
e. School counselors develop strategies to change systems and practices that are impeding student success.	M= 3.25 SD= 1.249	M= 3.62 SD= 1.391	M= 3.31 SD= 1.278	M= 3.37 SD= 1.313
f. School counselors provide leadership to promote every student's right to a quality education.	M= 3.59 SD= 1.160	M= 3.90 SD= 1.274	M= 3.63 SD= 1.200	M= 3.69 SD= 1.222
g. Teachers and counselors work together to identify students who are not performing to their best level.	M= 3.88 SD= 1.139	M= 4.00 SD= 1.212	M= 4.08 SD= 1.056	M= 3.99 SD= 1.146
h. School counselors use school data to assess student performance and develop necessary services.	M= 3.52 SD= 1.226	M= 3.85 SD= 1.275	M= 3.55 SD= 1.190	M= 3.62 SD= 1.248
i. Teachers work with school counselors to improve student achievement.	M= 3.54 SD= 1.130	M= 3.66 SD= 1.293	M= 3.74 SD= 1.221	M= 3.64 SD= 1.217
j. Teachers ask school counselors to consult with them on improving classroom management techniques.	M= 2.47 SD= 1.260	M= 2.85 SD= 1.544	M= 2.47 SD= 1.314	M= 2.57 SD= 1.375
k. School counselors monitor and evaluate the impact of the school counseling program on student achievement and	M= 3.23 SD= 1.224	M= 3.53 SD= 1.344	M= 3.39 SD= 1.229	M= 3.36 SD= 1.271

success.				
l. My school has established strong collaborative relationships with local community organizations and agencies.	M= 3.38 SD= 1.137	M= 3.50 SD= 1.314	M= 3.32 SD= 1.246	M= 3.38 SD= 1.234
m. School counselors reduce social/institutional barriers that keep students from achieving success.	M= 3.57 SD= 1.110	M= 3.68 SD= 1.249	M= 3.55 SD= 1.137	M= 3.59 SD=11.172
n. School counselors regularly consult with parents, teachers, and school administrators.	M= 4.33 SD= .956	M= 4.42 SD= 1.054	M= 4.52 SD= .960	M= 4.42 SD=1.005
o. School counselors are increasing the participation of under-represented students in higher-level academics such as honors, IB, AP classes.	M= 3.14 SD= 1.285	M= 3.25 SD= 1.482	M= 3.10 SD= 1.482	M= 3.15 SD= 1.416
p. Teachers regularly send students to the school counselor to deal with personal problems.	M= 4.26 SD= 1.096	M= 4.20 SD= 1.192	M= 4.26 SD= 1.083	M= 4.24 SD= 1.130
q. School counselors counsel students individually about personal/social issues.	M= 4.48 SD= .927	M= 4.42 SD= 1.076	M= 4.45 SD= 1.033	M= 4.45 SD= 1.022
r. School counselors use the Tennessee standards for school counseling programs to deliver specific student competencies in academic, career, and personal-social development.	M= 3.90 SD= 1.186	M= 3.99 SD= 1.311	M= 3.83 SD= 1.312	M= 3.90 SD= 1.277
s. School counselors deliver guidance programs in classes.	M= 3.72 SD= 1.426	M= 3.84 SD= 1.333	M= 3.73 SD= 1.434	M= 3.76 SD= 1.411
t. School counselors provide group counseling based on identified student needs.	M=3.25 SD= 1.427	M=3.68 SD= 1.468	M= 3.40 SD= 1.570	M= 3.41 SD=1.518

Student Development: Academic - Career- Personal/Social

18. Since school started this year, how often have you worked with students on:

	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Total
a. Managing emotions (stress, anger, coping, etc.).	M= 4.24 SD= .762	M= 4.15 SD= 1.045	M= 4.18 SD= .915	M= 4.19 SD= .921
b. Strengthening interpersonal communication skills.	M= 3.87 SD= .813	M= 3.85 SD= 1.014	M= 3.87 SD= .982	M= 3.86 SD= .947
c. Personal problems that affect grades.	M= 4.10 SD= .791	M= 4.06 SD= 1.014	M= 4.16 SD= .871	M= 4.10 SD= .906
d. Personal/social issues.	M= 4.35 SD= .750	M= 4.27 SD= .979	M= 4.27 SD= .912	M= 4.29 SD= .901
e. Decision-making skills.	M= 3.93 SD= .834	M= 4.00 SD= 1.140	M= 3.97 SD= 1.055	M= 3.96 SD= 1.019
f. Diversity issues.	M= 2.93 SD= .885	M= 3.00 SD= 1.129	M= 2.95 SD= 1.038	M= 2.95 SD= 1.018
g. Serious mental health problems (depression, addiction, etc.).	M= 3.12 SD= 1.006	M= 2.94 SD= 1.213	M= 3.10 SD= 1.123	M= 3.06 SD= 1.112
h. School discipline incidents.	M=	M= 3.68	M= 3.27	M= 3.43

	3.39 SD= 1.090	SD= 1.278	SD= 1.198	SD= 1.198
i. Preventing problems (alcohol, teen pregnancy, truancy, dropout, etc.).	M= 3.19 SD= 1.042	M= 2.92 SD= 1.261	M= 2.78 SD= 1.111	M= 2.97 SD= 1.145
j. Time and task organizational skills.	M= 3.23 SD= .983	M= 3.33 SD= 1.161	M= 3.42 SD= 1.053	M= 3.32 SD= 1.066
k. College admissions strategies.	M= 2.88 SD= 1.618	M= 2.59 SD= 1.615	M= 2.77 SD= 1.662	M= 2.76 SD= 1.637
l. Developing educational and career plans.	M= 3.45 1.257	M= 3.19 SD= 1.396	M= 3.27 SD= 1.432	M= 3.31 SD= 1.364
m. Educational program planning.	M= 3.28 SD= 1.250	M= 3.11 SD= 1.491	M= 3.17 SD= 1.413	M= 3.19 SD= 1.381
n. Study skills (note taking, outlining, reading, etc).	M= 2.97 SD= 1.002	M= 3.12 SD= 1.251	M= 3.11 SD= 1.125	M= 3.05 SD= 1.123
o. Test-taking strategies.	M= 2.94 SD= .991	M= 3.19 SD= 1.244	M= 3.05 SD= 1.156	M= 3.04 SD= 1.132
p. Improving grades.	M= 3.69	M= 3.70 SD=	M= 3.85 SD= 1.143	M= 3.74 SD=

	SD= 1.017	1.280		1.151
q. Help students identify their future educational and career options.	M= 3.58 SD= 1.164	M= 3.40 SD= 1.344	M= 3.36 SD= 1.278	M= 3.45 SD= 1.261
r. Work with students individually or in groups on career planning activities.	M= 3.32 SD= 1.187	M= 3.09 SD= 1.354	M= 2.89 SD= 1.259	M= 3.11 SD= 1.273

Building and District Expectations

19. Please indicate the extent to which these statements of expectations and tasks accurately reflect your program.

	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Total
a. I am involved in the coordination of statewide assessments (TCAP, Gateways, etc).	M= 3.79 SD= 1.656	M= 3.34 SD= 1.755	M= 3.50 SD= 1.799	M= 3.54 SD= 1.750
b. I am involved in the clerical aspects of record keeping (transferring records, posting grades, managing transcripts, etc.)	M= 3.55 SD= 1.765	M= 2.88 SD= 1.796	M= 2.96 SD= 1.791	M= 3.16 SD= 1.811
c. I am involved in the development of the master schedule.	M= 2.83 SD= 1.764	M= 2.46 SD= 1.726	M= 2.31 SD= 1.632	M= 2.54 SD= 1.722
d. I am involved in the scheduling of student courses.	M= 3.20 SD= 1.885	M= 2.94 SD= 1.898	M= 3.01 SD= 1.898	M= 3.05 SD= 1.897
e. I serve as the building registrar for new entrants and transferred and withdrawn students.	M= 2.73 SD=	M= 2.13 SD=	M= 1.89 SD= 1.496	M= 2.27 SD=

	1.770	1.578		1.667
f. I adhere to the Tennessee Code (49-5-302) for the Role of the School Counselor.	M= 3.78 SD= 1.468	M= 3.77 SD= 1.487	M= 3.69 SD= 1.528	M= 3.75 SD=1.493
g. I implement a four-year educational plan, beginning in the eighth grade, that is revised annually and that requires approval in writing by the parent.	M= 3.13 SD= 1.856	M= 2.40 SD= 1.760	M= 2.69 SD= 1.872	M= 2.77 SD= 1.861
h. I require my students to maintain an educational/career-planning portfolio in Grades 9 – 12.	M= 1.79 SD= 1.397	M= 1.81 SD= 1.415	M= 1.55 SD= 1.243	M= 1.70 SD 1.353
i. I have established a School Counseling/ Guidance Advisory Committee.	M= 1.74 SD= 1.310	M= 2.19 SD= 1.523	M= 1.99 SD= 1.537	M= 1.94 SD= 1.455
j. I / we have implemented a school counseling program that is aligned with the Tennessee Model for Comprehensive School Counseling and/or the ASCA National Model.	M= 3.21 SD= 1.456	M= 3.51 SD= 1.433	M= 3.40 SD= 1.453	M= 3.37 SD= 1.452
k. I am encouraged to attend school counseling conferences and/or workshops during this school year by my principal/supervisor.	M= 3.45 SD= 1.422	M= 3.40 SD= 1.531	M= 3.38 SD= 1.512	M= 3.41 SD= 1.487
l. I/we meet regularly with our system-level counselor coordinator.	M= 2.65 SD= 1.565	M= 3.73 SD= 1.357	M= 3.14 SD= 1.485	M= 3.14 SD= 1.545
m. I keep records that document time spent or activities performed, which would enable me to determine the percentage of time spent providing direct services to students.	M= 3.02 SD= 1.393	M= 3.29 SD= 1.420	M= 2.93 SD= 1.496	M= 3.06 SD= 1.449

n. I perform fair-share duties above and beyond what is expected of other certified staff at my school.	M= 3.18 SD= 1.650	M= 3.57 SD=1.576	M= 3.09 SD= 1.639	M= 3.25 SD= 1.642
o. I am responsible for the implementation of my school's character education program.	M= 3.15 SD= 1.707	M= 3.21 SD= 1.656	M= 2.67 SD= 1.759	M= 3.00 SD= 1.730
p. I interpret test data for students, parents, and teachers.	M= 3.53 SD= 1.382	M= 3.50 SD= 1.413	M= 3.31 SD= 1.497	M= 3.44 SD= 1.435
q. I am scheduled in classrooms by my principal for classroom guidance lessons.	M= 2.47 SD= 1.757	M= 2.31 SD= 1.665	M= 2.24 SD= 1.729	M= 2.33 SD= 1.719
r. I am financially supported (partial or full) to attend professional development.	M= 3.24 SD= 1.510	M= 2.61 SD= 1.512	M= 2.68 SD= 1.504	M= 2.88 SD= 1.534
s. I collaborate with my administrator/supervisor to establish goals for the school counseling program.	M= 2.94 SD= 1.496	M= 3.40 SD= 1.499	M= 3.14 SD= 1.426	M= 3.14 SD= 1.481
t. I spend more than 75% of my time delivering classroom guidance lessons.	M= 1.89 SD= 1.418	M= 1.89 SD= 1.338	M= 1.52 SD= 1.127	M= 1.75 SD= 1.304
u. I conduct more than 3 different group counseling experiences for my students each year.	M= 2.71 SD= 1.592	M= 3.19 SD= 1.678	M= 2.88 SD= 1.708	M= 2.92 SD= 1.670
v. I have a scope and sequence for my classroom guidance lessons.	M= 2.88 SD= 1.600	M= 3.20 SD= 1.551	M= 2.85 SD= 1.626	M= 2.96 SD= 1.602