

Old Dominion University

## ODU Digital Commons

---

Theses and Dissertations in Urban Services -  
Urban Education

College of Education & Professional Studies  
(Darden)

---

Spring 1993

# An Evaluation Model for Middle School Counseling and Guidance

Ann Salisbury Harrison  
*Old Dominion University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices\\_education\\_etds](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices_education_etds)



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

---

### Recommended Citation

Harrison, Ann S.. "An Evaluation Model for Middle School Counseling and Guidance" (1993). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Dissertation, , Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/whyh-4a61  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices\\_education\\_etds/112](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices_education_etds/112)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Education & Professional Studies (Darden) at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations in Urban Services - Urban Education by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@odu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@odu.edu).

An Evaluation Model For  
Middle School Counseling and Guidance

by

Ann Salisbury Harrison

Ed.B. June 1957, Rhode Island College

M.S. December 1977, Old Dominion University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of  
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Urban Services  
Old Dominion University  
February, 1993

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nina Brown  
(Dissertation Chair),

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Concentration Area Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of Education

### Abstract

The literature on middle school counseling and guidance indicates program evaluation is not being conducted and is resisted by counselors for many reasons. A critical problem is the lack of a widely-accepted evaluation model. This study provides an evaluation model that can be used by middle school counselors to evaluate counseling and guidance. The model furnishes meaningful and useful information to be used in planning a comprehensive and developmentally-appropriate counseling and guidance program for early adolescence. The evaluation model used the framework of Daniel Stufflebeam's CIPP Model. The study provided information on the goals of middle school counseling and guidance and the role and function of the counselor by developing, administering, and analyzing a questionnaire. The information from the questionnaire and that provided by the literature review provided the contents for the evaluation model.

This study found that there were some different perception about the goals of middle school counseling and guidance and the role and function of the counselor among teachers, administrators, counselors, and supervisors/coordinators of guidance. Supervisors/coordinators were in favor of conducting evaluations compared to only 52% of teachers. The supervisors/coordinators indicated that the guidance advisory committee was an important aspect of the program. Only 28% of the administrators thought this committee was important.

## Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to acknowledge those people who have helped to make my years of graduate work enjoyable, exciting, and successful. A very special thanks to Dr. Nina Brown, my committee chairperson, for her incredible patience, for her guidance and encouragement, and for all the time and effort she has so willingly given to my graduate education. My thanks to Dr. Maurice Berube and Dr. Jack Robinson, committee members, for all their support and helpful suggestions.

I can never thank Roger Spuler enough for all the meals he prepared while Frances and I worked every weekend for years and his endless support. Frances Spuler, words cannot express my appreciation for all your help in so many ways.

I am very grateful to my family for their interest and encouragement during the years of my graduate work. Thanks to my son-in-law, Paul Crepeau, for his time and his never ending patience with me and the computer.

## Table of Contents

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Rationale of the Study . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	2
History of School Counseling . . . . .	2
Middle School . . . . .	3
Early Adolescence . . . . .	4
Middle School Counseling . . . . .	5
Program Evaluation . . . . .	6
CIPP Model . . . . .	9
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	12
Objectives of the Study . . . . .	12
Definition of Terms . . . . .	13
Delimitations of the Study . . . . .	16
Overview of the Remaining Chapters . . . . .	16

Chapter	Page
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	17
Overview and Introduction . . . . .	17
Theoretical Development . . . . .	18
Early Adolescence . . . . .	19
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	34
Introduction . . . . .	34
Methodology . . . . .	34
Stakeholders . . . . .	35
Assessment Instrument . . . . .	36
Evaluation Model . . . . .	46
Validation . . . . .	55
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	56
Assessment Instrument . . . . .	56
Demographics . . . . .	56
Statistical Analysis . . . . .	59
Summary of Sections . . . . .	73
Personal Development . . . . .	76
Educational Development . . . . .	77
Career Development . . . . .	78

Chapter	Page
Counseling and Guidance . . . . .	80
Coordinating . . . . .	82
Communicating . . . . .	85
Consulting . . . . .	87
Summary . . . . .	89
Evaluation Model Validation . . . . .	92
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	96
Introduction . . . . .	96
Purpose . . . . .	96
Objectives . . . . .	96
Literature . . . . .	97
Methods . . . . .	98
Results . . . . .	99
Conclusions . . . . .	103
Discussion and Implications . . . . .	104
Problems and Limitations . . . . .	105
Suggestions for Further Research . . . . .	107
REFERENCES . . . . .	108
APPENDIXES . . . . .	117

Chapter	Page
A. Questionnaire and Related Materials . . . . .	117
B. Evaluation Model and Related Materials . . . . .	141
C. Tables Referred to in Chapter IV . . . . .	160



## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Two Uses of the CIPP Model - Formative and Summative . . . .	48
2. Respondents' Demographic Information . . . . .	57
3. Counselors' Background . . . . .	61
4. Program Information . . . . .	62
5. Expected Response and Observed Response . . . . .	63
6. Chi-square and Probability Levels . . . . .	74
7. Summary Ratings for the Personal Development Section . . . . .	79
8. Summary Ratings for the Educational Development Section . . . .	81
9. Summary Ratings for the Career Development Section . . . . .	83
10. Summary Ratings for the Counseling and Guidance Section . . . .	84
11. Summary Ratings for the Coordinating Section . . . . .	86
12. Counselor Ratings for the Communicating Section . . . . .	88
13. Summary Ratings for the Consulting Section . . . . .	90
14. Counselors, Administrators, and Teachers Ratings . . . . .	92
15. Percentage of High, Neutral, Low, and Mean Ratings for all Respondents . . . . .	94

TABLES IN APPENDIX C	Page
C-1. Counselor Ratings for the Personal Section . . . . .	161
C-2. Administrator Ratings for the Personal Section . . . . .	162
C-3. Teacher Ratings for the Personal Section . . . . .	163
C-4. All Respondents Ratings for the Personal Section . . . . .	164
C-5. Counselor Ratings for the Educational Development Section .	165
C-6. Administrator Ratings for the Educational Development Section . . . . .	166
C-7. Teacher Ratings for the Educational Development Section . . .	167
C-8. All Respondents Ratings for the Educational Development Section . . . . .	168
C-9. Counselor Ratings for the Career Development Section . . . .	169
C-10. Administrator Ratings for the Career Development Section . .	170
C-11. Teacher Ratings for the Career Development Section . . . . .	171
C-12. All Respondents Ratings for the Career Development Section .	172
C-13. Counselor Ratings for the Counseling and Guidance Section .	173
C-14. Administrator Ratings for the Counseling and Guidance Section . . . . .	174
C-15. Teacher Ratings for the Counseling and Guidance Section . . .	175

TABLES IN APPENDIX C . . . . .	Page C-
16. All Respondents Ratings for the Counseling and Guidance Section. . . . .	176
C-17. Counselor Ratings for the Coordinating Section . . . . .	177
C-18. Administrator Ratings for the Coordinating Section . . . . .	178
C-19. Teacher Ratings for the Coordinating Section . . . . .	179
C-20. All Respondents Ratings for the Coordinating Section . . . . .	180
C-21. Counselor Ratings for the Communicating Section . . . . .	181
C-22. Administrator Ratings for the Communicating Section . . . . .	182
C-23. Teacher Ratings for the Communicating Section . . . . .	183
C-24. All Respondents Ratings for the Communicating Section . . . . .	184
C-25. Counselor Ratings for the Consulting Section . . . . .	185
C-26. Administrator Ratings for the Consulting Section . . . . .	186
C-27. Teacher Ratings for the Consulting Section . . . . .	187
C-28. All Respondents Ratings for the Consulting Section . . . . .	188

## Chapter I

### Introduction

#### Rationale of the Study

Middle school counseling and guidance evaluation can encourage wise policy making at federal, state, and local levels. A well-conceived, well-designed, and comprehensive model for evaluation can provide useful insights into how the urban, rural, or suburban middle school counseling and guidance program is operating. Evaluation can determine the extent to which the program is serving its intended clients. Evaluation will identify the program's strengths and weaknesses. An evaluation can produce evidence of the counseling program's cost-effectiveness. Counseling program evaluation can provide possible productive directions for the future. Additionally, evaluation can increase public recognition for counselors' accomplishments. A comprehensive evaluation can provide for better working relationships with teachers, administrators, and other support personnel and increase counselors' professional standing. By providing information for decision making, evaluation can help to set counseling program priorities. Program evaluation can help guide the allocation of resources. The modification and refinement of program structures and activities can be facilitated through program evaluation. Further, evaluation can signal the need for redeployment of personnel and resources.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to develop an evaluation model that could be used by urban, rural, or suburban middle school counselors to evaluate their program. In addition, the study will contribute information on the role and function of the middle school counselor and the counseling program's goals. The study provides information on the perceptions that different stakeholders (teachers, administrators, and counselors) have about goals of the middle school counseling program and the role of the counselor.

### History of School Counseling

School counseling has a history of evolution and change. Vocational guidance began in the early 20th century. World War I helped this movement and so did the adoption of many practices developed in psychometrics during and following the war.

Educational guidance, first introduced in the 1920s, had to compete with vocational guidance for acceptance. By the 1940s, many in the guidance profession accepted educational guidance (Strang, 1953; Traxler, 1957). The work of Carl Rogers and his orientation of person-centered therapy (Rogers, 1942) dominated the field of counseling during post-World War II. Counseling, as the key guidance function, replaced testing. There was a rapid growth in school counseling following the launch of Sputnik I on October 4,

1957. This led to the debate about the development of a quality school counseling program. The conflict for counselors in the 1960s and 1970s involved their wish to engage in individual and personal counseling with students. School administration wanted counselors to handle academic and administrative matters.

Counselors today want to emphasize the counseling aspect of their work and are now referring to their department as counseling and guidance. According to Rye and Sparks (1991), this role and function debate has continued until the present, especially at the middle school level. Criticism from stakeholders, according to Rye and Sparks (1991), may be due to a lack of sufficient evidence of effectiveness in the counseling program.

### Middle School

In the 1960s and 1970s, middle schools began to replace junior high schools. The criticism of the junior high school was that it had lost sight of its transitional nature and purpose, and was too subject-matter oriented. The middle school usually enrolls students between the ages of 10 through 14 or 15, early adolescence. The basis for the middle school idea is the belief that today's adolescents reach physical, social, and intellectual maturity at an earlier age than did adolescents in previous generations. Supporters of the

middle school movement believe that students 10 to 14 years old, have unique physical, emotional, social, and mental characteristics.

### Early Adolescence

During early adolescence, students enter a stage of trial and error. Now many have their first experiment with alcohol and drugs and risk addiction. Adolescents may become sexually active, risking diseases or pregnancy. These students live in urban cities where the security of close relationships is rare. Adolescents are finding out what they are good at doing and what they enjoy doing. It is when they are deciding what they believe in. Adolescents are learning how their gender, race, religion, disabilities, and other traits affect how they see themselves. They realize how these personal traits effect how others see them (Scales, 1991). In their future, adolescents will seek jobs in an economy that will need practically all workers to think flexibly and originally. In the past, only a select few workers were needed, and educated, to think in these ways. The employment that will be available will require more skill and knowledge for everyone.

The U. S. Bureau of the Census (1984) estimated that over the decade of the 1990s more than 65 million children will become young adolescents ages 10 to 15. At any given time, roughly 1 in every 12 persons in the United States will be a young adolescent. As the decade progresses, this age group

will enlarge by more than 15%. This will create even greater challenges for the families, middle schools, and communities in which these young adolescents live. The increase in the number of adolescents will have an immense impact on the role of the middle school counselor, especially in urban schools.

### Middle School Counseling

Middle school counselors follow a model similar to one used by high school counseling and guidance. This model is no longer productive, nor should the middle school counselor follow an elementary counselor model. One criticism of counseling and guidance is that the model is neglecting the genuine needs of the populations they serve. The middle school offers the middle school counseling program a chance to provide practical developmental, growth, and preventive activities to early adolescents. The challenge for middle school counselors is to prepare the student for adolescent development in readiness for adult life. To meet the needs of rural, suburban, and urban students in our middle schools today and in the future, counseling and guidance evaluation is a necessity.

Counselors need to develop a middle school role identity. They need to gather support for their endeavors. Counselors need to enlarge the scope of the program. These tasks can be an overwhelming responsibility for any



counselor, according to Miller and Pappas (1978). Miller (1988) explains that counselors need to begin to address their accountability. Counseling programs need to be evaluated. Counselors will need to inform the stakeholders of the exact functions they are providing in their schools. Clarification of their role and function is needed to provide the middle school counselor with credibility.

The literature provides some descriptions of middle school counseling and guidance (Bohlinger, 1976; Cole, 1979; Miller & Pappas, 1978; Stamm & Nissman, 1979). The American School Counselors Association adopted a role statement for middle school counselors in 1978. A clear, widely accepted idea of what constitutes middle level counseling and guidance has not emerged yet. Program evaluation can help provide this information.

### Program Evaluation

According to Madaus, Stufflebeam and Scriven (1983), program evaluation is often mistakenly viewed as a recent event. Program evaluation has an interesting history that predates the era of President Johnson's Great Society. During the 1930s through 1945, Ralph W. Tyler had tremendous influence on education in general and educational evaluation. Tyler's evaluation approach, called a "goal-attainment approach," involves identifying the degree of achievement of formulated educational goals.

Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill, and Krathwohl, (1956) developed techniques to help program staffs identify their goals and objectives and taxonomies of possible educational objectives. New methods of evaluation by Provus (1969, 1971), Eisner (1967), and Metfessel and Michael (1967) introduced changes from the Tyler Model. Scriven (1967), Stufflebeam (1967, and 1971), and Stake (1967) introduced new models of evaluation that were very different from earlier approaches. These models recognized the need to evaluate goals and consider inputs. These models provided the evaluator a way to observe implementation and delivery of services. The new models could measure intended and unintended outcomes of the program. The new evaluation models stress the need to make judgements about the quality of the program evaluated.

Beginning about 1973, the number of individuals performing program evaluations began to expand. Collectively, these evaluators were recognized as specialists that led to the creation of a new profession, different from individuals performing research and testing. This newly-recognized professional field has looked to meta-evaluation (Stufflebeam, 1978) for guaranteeing and examining the quality of evaluations. The (Joint Committee on Educational Evaluation (1981a), issued a comprehensive set of standards for judging evaluations of educational programs and materials. The Committee

has established a mechanism by which to review and revise the standards of evaluation (Joint Committee on Educational Evaluation, 1981b).

The most important standard for judging the adequacy of evaluation, according to the Joint Committee on Educational Evaluation (1981a), would be accuracy, the degree to which an evaluation reflects reality. Another important measure would be credibility. The results of the evaluation must be believable to clients who need it. Another standard is utility and refers to the extent to which the evaluation results are used. Feasibility is another standard and asks if the evaluation is realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal. The last standard, propriety, asks if the evaluation is done legally and ethically, protecting the rights of those involved.

Approaches to program evaluation have been one of three major types. Each type is important and serves a purpose. The first type provides a description of the program which involves information concerning the nature of the program and could include, for example, the percent of time spent counseling with students. The second type is an assessment of attitudes toward the program. This approach to evaluation involves measuring the attitudes of those who receive services through the program or those who provide the services. These people are the stakeholders (pupils, teachers, parents, counselors, and administrators). The third approach is to provide evidence of

student's behavior change. This is the most direct approach to evaluation of program effectiveness. Behavior change may be shown by assessment procedures such as recording the number of disciplinary referrals a student received before and after participation in a specific counseling program.

### CIPP Model

Daniel Stufflebeam developed the CIPP model in the late 1960s. The model was one alternative to the views about evaluations that were most prevalent at the time. The models used were oriented to objectives, testing, and experimental design. Another distinction made at this time about program evaluation was to decide if the goal of the evaluation was to provide evidence of accountability or to evaluate to improve the existing program.

Stufflebeam's CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) approach is based on the view that the most important purpose of evaluation is not to prove but to improve. This model perceives evaluation as an instrument by which to help make programs work better for the people they are intended to serve. This position is consistent with those presented by Patton (1978) and Cronbach (1980). The use of the CIPP Model is intended to encourage growth. In addition it helps the staff systematically obtain and use feedback to meet important needs or meet their needs as best they can with the available resources.

The most familiar model of program evaluation described and suggested in the literature on internal evaluation is the decision-making model (Mathison, 1991). The decision-making model for internal program evaluation is characterized by the work of Stufflebeam (1972, 1983, 1985) in the CIPP Model. It was developed in 1966 as an alternative to the more typical measurement approach to program evaluation. Stufflebeam's view is that evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives. A result of attempts to evaluate projects that had been funded through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) was the development of the CIPP Model by Stufflebeam. The original version of the CIPP Model was developed in the 1960s at the Ohio State University Evaluation Center.

The basic framework of the CIPP model evolved to consist of four sections. The context evaluation section is needed to provide direction for planning decisions. Input evaluation is used to serve structuring decisions. Process evaluation is necessary to guide implementing decisions. Product evaluation verifies the extent the program has met the needs of the students. The first letters of the labels for the four evaluation concepts provided an acronym for the model - CIPP - Content, Input, Process, and Product.

An advantage of the CIPP Model is that it provides for entry either before or during a program, and it allows for the possibility of conducting a single type of evaluation. An evaluator could conduct a Content evaluation alone or a combination of types, such as Context and Product, depending on the needs of the stakeholders.

School districts and state and federal government agencies use the CIPP Model for evaluation. The decision-making approach to evaluation has directed educators through program planning, operation, and review. Program staffs have found this approach a useful guide to program improvement. This method provides a record-keeping framework that assists public review of counseling needs, objectives, plans, activities, and outcomes. School administrators and middle school counselors will find the CIPP approach useful in meeting public demands for information.

The CIPP Model is a useful tool to help the evaluator identify important questions to be addressed in an evaluation. For each type of evaluation, the evaluator can identify several questions about an educational undertaking. The model and the questions it generates also make the evaluation easy to explain to lay audiences. Adapting this model for use in evaluating rural, suburban, or urban middle school counseling and guidance offers counselors a means to identify and meet the unique needs of early adolescents.

### Statement of the Problem

Hoffman (1991) states that if school counseling is to remain an integral part of education in Virginia's middle schools, counselors must convince the Board of Education of the importance of counseling programs to students' success in learning. The middle school counseling program does not provide evidence of its accomplishments or its relevance. No one is conducting middle school counseling and guidance program evaluation. An evaluation could enumerate a program's goals, determine whether goals were achieved, tell whether the program was efficiently run, and determine how economically the department was managed. Program evaluation forms a basis for program improvement.

### Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were:

1. To determine by questionnaire whether evaluations were being performed in counseling and guidance in middle schools;
2. To determine by questionnaire whether a specific model was used for evaluations and, if so, which one;
3. To develop, administer, and analyze results of a questionnaire that provided information on goals of middle school counseling and guidance and the role and function of the middle school counselor; and

4. To use the information yielded from the questionnaire for the contents of an evaluation model and, using the framework of the CIPP Evaluation Model, to provide an evaluation model that meets the needs of urban, rural, or suburban middle school counselors.

#### Definition of Terms

Academic/Educational domain. One of three areas in which a counselor guides a student in dealing with academic and school problems. The counselor helps middle school students to: (a) achieve at a level in keeping with their potential; (b) know and evaluate educational opportunities; and (c) recognize their academic strengths and weaknesses and make well-informed educational decisions.

Career development domain. One of three areas in which the counselor helps middle school students to: (a) discover the meaning of work and its relationship to the individual; (b) develop a positive attitude and a personal identity as a worker who contributes to self and to social needs; and (c) understand their aptitudes and develop their abilities as they pertain to the world of work.

CIPP Model. An evaluation model developed by Daniel Stufflebeam in the 1960s. CIPP stands for content, input, process, and product. These are the four evaluation concepts in the model. The basic framework of the CIPP



Model is context evaluation to inform planning decisions. Input evaluation serves structuring decisions. Process evaluation helps guide implementing decisions. And, product evaluation serves recycling decisions. This model was adapted so it can be used to evaluate the urban, rural, and suburban middle school counseling and guidance program.

Comprehensive program. A counseling and guidance curriculum that includes a range of activities and services provided to middle school students: (a) preventive classroom guidance activities; (b) individual and group counseling; (c) referrals to community agencies; (d) consultation with teachers, administrators, parents, and community representatives; (e) crisis intervention; (f) assessment, placement, and follow-up services; and (g) preparation for transition to a higher educational level.

Goals. Broad, general statements that establish the intent of middle school counseling and guidance. Goals are developed in the areas of personal-social, academic-educational, and career development domains.

Guidance curriculum. A curriculum in which teachers and counselors work with middle school students in large and small groups. The activities could include topics such as study skills, problem solving, conflict resolution, peer pressure, career awareness, and goal setting. Some of these topics may already be included in a subject's curriculum. Structurally-developmental

experiences are presented systematically by counselors and staff through classroom and group activities. The curriculum is organized around three major areas: (a) personal and social development; (b) educational and academic development; and (c) career planning and exploration.

Objectives. A link between a particular goal and the activities that will be used to help students toward the goal.

Personal/Social domain. One of three areas in which a counselor helps students to relate successfully to others as individuals and in groups. Students, given appropriate opportunities, can understand themselves, their effects on others, and of integrating this self-understanding into a realistic and positive self-concept.

Program evaluation. An integral component in determining the effectiveness of middle school counseling and guidance.

Team approach. A method of counseling and guidance that involves teachers, parents, counselors, administrators, psychologists, social workers, and community agencies to promote student achievement.

Scope and sequence. An arrangement of repetitive learning opportunities in a progressive order to help students learn. The age and developmental nature of the individual are important because learning experiences must be within the student's grasp and allow for practice.

### Delimitations of the Study

Limitations of this study are that: (a) the validation of the evaluation model was only done in the state of Virginia; (b) it includes only middle school; (c) it is limited to counseling and guidance; and (d) it is limited to evaluation of counseling and guidance.

### Overview of the Remaining Chapters

A brief history of counseling and guidance, middle schools, adolescents, middle school counseling and guidance, program evaluation, and program evaluation of middle school counseling and guidance has been presented. An evaluation model that can be used to evaluate urban, rural, and suburban middle school counseling and guidance is needed. A review of the literature in this study's areas will be presented in Chapter II. Chapter III presents the methods or procedures of the study. Chapter IV shows the data analysis of the questionnaire used in this study and the validation process used for the evaluation model. Chapter V discusses the implications, the conclusions, and an overview of the study.

## Chapter II

### Review of Literature

#### Overview and Introduction

A review of the literature provides very little concerning middle school counseling and guidance evaluation. Zytowski noted as early as 1975 that few articles report any kind of evaluation of any aspect of counseling and guidance. Many authors have stated that school counselors have resisted efforts to plan systematically, implement, and evaluate their counseling and guidance program. The current literature contains many articles on why counselors resist evaluation of their program. However, the literature provides no evaluations of middle school counseling and guidance that could provide accountability (Aubrey, 1982; Lombana, 1985).

The general theme found in the literature is that counselors do not evaluate the program because they do not know how. Counselors do not understand the importance of evaluation. In addition, the counseling program lacks specific goals and objectives that can be used for evaluation. Counselors also confuse research, supervision, and evaluation. They feel threatened by what they perceive could be the negative results of an evaluation of their program. Finally, middle school counselors have no evaluation model to

follow. Therefore, literature concerning counseling and guidance evaluation is scant.

Counselors may have resisted program planning and evaluation efforts because most of the evaluation models available to them have been inappropriate or confusing for school situations (Lombana, 1985). In a summary statement, Lombana (1985) suggests that present knowledge about evaluation needs to be developed into an inclusive model. This model needs to be adaptable and realistic for use in school counseling and guidance. There is no one accepted model that could be used by counselors to evaluate middle school counseling and guidance.

#### Theoretical Development

Recognition of the importance of education at the middle level is becoming increasingly common. The report, Turning Points, by the Carnegie Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents released in June, 1989 gives insight to the middle school (Alexander & McEwin, 1989).

Turning Points makes strong statements about middle schools:

Middle grade schools have been ignored in discussions of educational reform in the past decade. Yet, they are central not only to channeling every early adolescent into the mainstream of life in American communities, but also to making vast

improvements in academic and personal outcomes for all youth. Middle grade schools are potentially society's most powerful force to recapture millions of youth adrift. Yet all too often, they exacerbate the problems youth face. A volatile mismatch exists between the organization and curriculum of middle grade schools, and the intellectual, emotional, and interpersonal needs of young adolescents. Young adolescents need adult guidance to help them cope with one of life's more confusing periods. Middle school research and literature have increased greatly, giving us more and better information on the best educational practices for early adolescent students. (Alexander & McEwin, 1989, p. 32)

### Early Adolescence

A time of significant growth and change identifies early adolescence. Changes occur in physical, mental, and social characteristics. For most, the period is started by puberty, a stage of physical development more rapid than in any other period of life except infancy. Cognitive growth is just as dramatic for many youth, bringing the new capacity to think in more abstract and complex ways than they could as children. Students at this age can start to make broad and deep generalizations. They can collect more facts and synthesize them into conscious generalizations that lead to abstract thinking.

Socially, the early adolescents go through the most extreme changes of their lives. This social change in adolescents makes both adults and adolescents acutely aware of their relationships to each other. Expanded sense of self and heightened capacity for intimate relationships can surface in early adolescence. These changes illustrate significant potential in our young students and great opportunity for them and our society.

According to Scales (1991), in his book A Portrait of Young Adolescents in the 1990s:

The 10-to-15-year-old population will grow by 15% over the 1990s. They will be increasingly liable to live for at least some time in a single-parent family, and increasingly likely to live in poverty. If current trends continue, young adolescents will have one of the highest age-group probabilities of being victimized by crime outside the home, and abused within it. If current trends continue, greater proportions of these young adolescents will have problems related to early sexual experiences and poor emotional health, and more of them will be without adequate access to physical and mental health services. They will face a future in which their own economic well being will be less and less certain, especially if they fail to graduate from high school with essential

skills and confidence, or fail to go on to postsecondary education.

As a group, they experience a disconnection from adult resources that is a particularly critical gap in what they need developmentally. (Scales, 1991, p. 45)

The only way adults and early adolescents can bring about genuine relationships and communication with each other, therefore, is by shared understanding of the impact that the rate of social change has on both the younger and the older generation. These young people are trying to cope with life and all its difficulties in their way. Needed guidance must be provided for them. The middle school counselor and the middle school counseling and guidance program can help early adolescents during this time. The challenge for middle school counselors is to provide a program that prepares the student for adolescent development and for adult life.

The changing nature of the middle level student must be considered in defining the direction of counseling and guidance provided at this level. Evaluation, as a component of counseling and guidance, will aid the decision-making process by determining the effectiveness of programs.

Myrick (1990) states that, during the next decade, counselors will experience more pressure than ever before to be accountable. He agrees with Campbell and Robinson (1990) that part of the resistance has been a



consequence of counselors being ill-prepared in program evaluation methodology. They are unsure of its relationship to their work. Myrick (1990) notes that counselors have mistakenly assumed that accountability studies are aimed at evaluating them as either good or poor counselors. Sophisticated research designs are perceived as too difficult to apply in a work setting as they are time-consuming, and demanding of counselors. Myrick (1990) states that resistance to accountability can be traced to an overemphasis on research designs for collecting data and testing hypotheses.

Another area of confusion for school counselors is supervision versus evaluation. Supervision and evaluation are not synonymous, although they often have been equated in the schools (Aubrey, 1979; Barret & Schmidt, 1986). Supervision refers to ongoing activities to enhance the professional development of counselors (Borders, 1991), a growth process that continues throughout one's professional life span. Supervision is characterized by a cycle of feedback, practice, and additional feedback. Supervision means overseeing the work of others to improve performance and strengthen professional development. In contrast to feedback, evaluation is the determination of worth or value for the purpose of decision making (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1985; Worthen & Sanders, 1973). Evaluators are primarily concerned with whether the counseling program or a counselor is

effective. Supervisors evaluate counselors and offer experiences to improve skills, develop new areas of competence, and refine counseling programs.

Both supervision and evaluation have vital roles in creating effective school counseling programs and in enhancing the professional development of school counselors (Borders, 1991).

Campbell and Robinson (1990) state that school counselors do not initiate research and program evaluation activities. They believe that counselor leaders need to stop criticizing currently practicing counselors and focus on future generations of school counselors. They mention that counselor educators need to teach the importance of program development and evaluation during the training program. Until this is done, many practicing counselors will not perform this important function.

One consistent criticism of counseling and guidance has been the loss of relevance. Counseling programs have been accused of making provisions for needs that no longer exist. The program is ignoring the real needs of the early adolescent students. This demand for accountability has resulted from unmet expectations along with increased costs to the public. Criticism may be due to a lack of sufficient evidence of effectiveness in counseling and guidance.

Miller and Grisdale (1975), after a review of literature, state that there are the many reasons given why counselors do not evaluate their program. A

major reason is that the literature does not offer counselors one commonly accepted evaluation model for them to follow to evaluate their program. An evaluation model for counseling and guidance is needed, according to most authors.

Crabbs (1983) suggests there is no single standard model of accountability accepted within the profession. He further states that implementation of accountability models within school-based counseling and guidance is a recognized goal. He contends that the literature supports that evaluation of the counseling program is necessary.

Miller and Grisdale (1975) support Stufflebeam's CIPP Model because it is a system's approach. They believe there is a considerable need for development in the area of counseling evaluation. They state that there are ideas given about the information that should be contained in an evaluation and materials that could be used, but there are no articles available that describe a middle school program evaluation using a particular model.

Lombana (1985) states that the efforts of individuals concerned with the accountability issue need to be developed into a comprehensive model. An evaluation model needs to be available for use in the school counseling and guidance program. The two different types of counseling and guidance objectives need to be accepted. One type is the school program and the other is the client program. The value of both empirical and perceptual measures in

an evaluation needs to be recognized. This would represent one step in the construction of a model.

Lombana (1985) contends that evaluation models used in business are inappropriate for schools. Accountability models such as Management by Objectives (MBO) and Program Planning and Budgeting Systems (PPBS) are not useful in evaluating a counseling program. Gubser (1974) also takes issue with using behavioral objectives in the area of counseling. He states that behavioral objectives are very limited in measuring long-term goals in counseling. According to Lombana (1985), counselors have almost no control over budgetary matters. Counselors have many responsibilities that cannot be directly traced to student outcomes. Also, the "profit motive" is nonexistent for counselors. As such, certain objectives are not established through student needs assessments, but through job descriptions, district policy statements, or even state and federal regulations. Two equally important types of objectives that dictate the work of the counselor are client objectives and school objectives.

School counselors rarely conduct needs assessments (Carroll, 1985). Many writers identified needs assessment as the first step in establishing clear objectives for which a program will be held accountable (Burck & Peterson, 1975; Carter, 1974; Pulvino & Sanborn, 1972; Weinrach, 1975; Wiggins,

1981, 1985). Terrill (1990) states that every counseling and guidance program should be needs-driven. Conducting a needs-based program will mean that students are not always the counselors' direct clients. Frequently, student needs can be met by working with teachers, administrators, or parents. Many authors argue that a needs assessment comes first, then program development, and, then evaluation. In addition, Gibson, Mitchell, and Higgins (1983) suggest that the program's accomplishments are achieved as efficiently and economically as possible.

Limited possibilities were found in the literature of an evaluation model designed for a counseling program. Krumboltz (1974) and Humes (1972a) propose a total system-analysis approach that relates program costs to the accomplishment of planned goals and activities. The purpose is to help problem solving and decision making with the program. Both the Krumboltz Model and Humes' Planning Program and Budgeting System are quantitative methods that focus not only on client outcomes but also on areas of weakness and suggest alternate program changes based on cost effectiveness.

Krumboltz (1974) identifies seven criteria to be met if an accountability system is to produce the desired results. For example, the accountability system must be constructed to promote professional effectiveness and self-improvement. It is not done to cast blame or punish poor performance. He

also suggests that the activities of the counselor must be stated as costs, not accomplishments. An accountability system does not measure the value of an outcome; it measures only its cost, according to Krumboltz (1974). The cost is calculated by looking at the activity used by the counselor, the hours involved, and a dollar value for the service.

According to Atkinson, Furlong, and Janoff (1979), Krumboltz (1974) has proposed a sophisticated, but administratively uncomplex procedure, that relates counseling outcomes to actual costs. They refer to this method as helpful to counselors caught untrained and unprepared for the demands to justify existence of their counseling and guidance program. This model is a unidimensional method of evaluation intended to collect a specific type of data and not a program-wide accountability process designed to collect a variety of types of data. They state that, in practice, these evaluation procedures have tended to be employed as post hoc, stopgap measures. They are implemented only after administrative threats of reduced support for services that cannot be justified.

Atkinson et al. (1979) propose two types of accountability. The first is transactional accountability. This type centers on what the counselor does or is a measure of the processes or activities involved in a program. The second type is product accountability. This type focuses on the effects of what the

counselor does or measures the end result of how well the program met the stated objectives. In agreement with these authors are Carter (1974), Pulvino and Sanborn (1972), Shami, Hershkowitz, and Shami (1974), and Trembley and Bishop (1974). They maintain that each of these questions can be answered using either qualitative or quantitative data. They suggest that the counselor's services can be defined in terms of the value the services have for someone. An example of transactional--qualitative is a counselor working with children who have poor self-concepts to improve academic achievement. In numerical terms, quantitative-transactional, is the counselor spending 10 hours a week seeing 30 students for individual counseling on self-concept. The effect of what the counselor does (product) also can be defined in terms of the value it has for someone (qualitative or descriptive-product) or numerically (quantitative-transactional).

Atkinson et al. (1979) present four accountability questions and identify corresponding data sets. They offer four steps for implementing a planned approach to accountability; (a) goal identification, (b) stakeholder identification, (c) identify the accountability questions and data categories in which each of the selected constituent groups is most interested, and (d) identify the types of evaluation procedures.

Miller and Grisdale (1975) suggest that we must focus on guidance programs rather than on guidance services. When counseling and guidance is defined as a program, there is an emphasis on program development procedures. These could include a needs assessment, goal setting, selection of diverse strategies, and monitoring of program outcomes. This focus on programs leads to an increase in the use of the systems approach as a model for guidance program development and evaluation. Basic to the systems approach is the continuous use of four types of evaluation described by Stufflebeam (1968) that focuses on context, input, process, and product evaluation (CIPP). According to Miller and Grisdale (1975), context evaluation (planning programs) supports the process of setting goals and objectives for guidance by providing data about the guidance needs of students. Input evaluation (structuring programs) supports the process of program design by providing data about the capacity of the school to support guidance methods and the effectiveness of various methods. Process evaluation (implementing programs) supports program implementation and review by providing data about the efficiency and effectiveness of guidance procedures. Finally, product evaluation (making decisions based on program outcomes) supports program revision by providing information about the effectiveness of



counseling and guidance procedures for facilitating specific guidance outcomes.

Pine (1975) mentions the Discrepancy Model by Provus (1971) as a useful model. He suggests that by using this model counselors can examine what they are doing and how well they are doing it. They also can decide what needs to be corrected in their program. Pine mentions that the Discrepancy Model (Provus, 1971) is among the most useful models that could be used to improve counseling and guidance programs but states that, although this model is probably more efficient than other models, it is complicated. This model is more commonly used by professional evaluators.

In discrepancy evaluation, standards are created and tested against performance in five stages of evaluation. The five stages are design, installation, process, product, and cost. Any difference found between the standard and reality at each stage is termed a discrepancy. At that point, the level of performance or the standard must be changed until a discrepancy is no longer apparent. At each stage, inputs, process, and outputs are determined. The kinds of data generated from using the Discrepancy Evaluation Model are the means by which counselors can rationally analyze what they are doing. In addition they can tell how well they are performing and what needs to be changed in the counseling program.

Daniels, Mines, & Gressard (1981) suggest that because of the emphasis on program evaluation in counseling there has been an increase in the number of evaluation models. They state that, instead of adding clarity and direction to the situation, the new models have complicated the evaluation issue. According to the authors, one advantage of their meta-model framework is that counselors can choose from different models instead of adjusting their needs to fit a single model. As a result of reviewing several different models to select one, counselors would have a better understanding of evaluation models. Selecting an appropriate model also would refine the evaluation process which could lead to the formulation of new methods, procedures, and theories of program evaluation that are superior to existing ones.

Daniels et al. (1981) present a systematic model of program evaluation based on the analysis of existing evaluation models. Their presentation focuses on three issues: the need for a comparative framework, the guidelines for selecting the appropriate evaluation model from available alternatives, and the advantages of the meta-model. They included House's (1978) taxonomy of major evaluation models: (a) systems analysis, (b) behavioral objectives, (c) decision-making, (d) goal free, (e) art criticism, (f) accreditation, (g) adversary, and (h) transaction. Using this taxonomy, they suggest that

counselors determine which evaluation model is the most appropriate for the circumstances.

Daniels et al. (1981) state that little evidence exists to support the belief that counselors are evaluating their program with any single evaluation model, let alone using multiple evaluation methods. A counselor is knowledgeable of more than one evaluation model is the exception rather than the rule. The literature is oriented toward providing articles that promote the beneficial qualities of different evaluation models instead of evaluation reports or evaluations of evaluation methods.

Although counselors are unfamiliar with the different types of evaluation models available, Daniels et al. (1981) continue by presenting a meta-model or framework that addresses the comparative utility of the various models. By answering specific questions, the counselor will determine which model to choose. To complete this task, counselors would then have to educate themselves on the model and then adapt it to a counseling program situation (Daniels et al., 1981).

Most middle school counselors do not evaluate the counseling and guidance program, according to the literature. Counselors resist program planning and evaluation and the literature offers numerous reasons. One major

obstacle to program evaluation is the lack of an evaluation model that can be followed by the urban, rural, and suburban middle school counselor.

## Chapter III

### Methodology

#### Introduction

The purpose of Chapter III is to present the methods and procedures of this study. Information on the goals of middle school guidance and the role and function of the middle school counselor was collected from various sources. A questionnaire (see Appendix A) was developed and sent to respondents representing three stakeholder groups (teachers, administrators, and counselors) in middle schools. Data from the questionnaire were analyzed and the information was used to develop an evaluation model (see Appendix B) that can be used by middle school counselors. The evaluation model was an adaptation of Daniel Stufflebeam's CIPP Model and was validated by specialists in the counseling field.

#### Methodology

The researcher identified the primary goals and objectives of middle school counseling and guidance and the role and function of the middle school counselor. The researcher prepared, piloted, and made changes as necessary to ensure face validity, a questionnaire utilizing the information found in the review of the literature. Three stakeholder groups (counselors, administrators, and core teachers) were asked to respond to the questionnaire. Data were

collected, analyzed, and synthesized from the returned questionnaires. This information was utilized in developing an evaluation model.

The researcher identified an evaluation model and adapted this model for use in evaluating middle school counseling and guidance. The principles for educational evaluation were incorporated into the evaluation model. The evaluation model was sent to specialists in the field for validation.

### Stakeholders

Subjects from each of three stakeholder groups (teachers, counselors, and administrators) were used in the study. All subjects were selected from school systems having middle schools. The stakeholders determined what middle school counseling and guidance program variables were important to them in the areas of (a) the goals of the program, and (b) the counselor's role and function. The stakeholders were asked to consider such concerns as time, money, and resources as they responded to the items. Stakeholders included:

- A. Administrators--all principals and assistant principals in three middle schools in one system; and
- B. Teachers--all middle school teachers that teach the core subjects in three middle schools in one system; and
- C. Counselors--all middle school counselors in the three middle schools in the one system.

Demographic data were collected on the subjects. There were separate demographic questions, one set for counselors and one set for teachers/administrators. Counselors and teachers/administrators were asked their (a) position, (b) gender (c) age (d) educational experience, and (e) level of education. In addition, counselors were asked about (f) the number of counselees and how they were assigned, (g) goals, (h) philosophy, (i) guidance curriculum, (j) involvement with HOMEBase/Advisor/Advisee program, (k) program evaluation, and (l) percentage of time spent in counseling.

#### Assessment Instrument

The questionnaire consisted of six pages: (a) a title page, (b) a demographic page, and (c) four pages containing 49 items about middle school counseling. There were two versions of the questionnaire. One version was for counselors and one was for teachers and administrators. The title page and the demographic page were different, but the items in the questionnaire were the same. The title page contained the researcher's phone number and address if any of the respondents wanted more information. There were seven questions on the demographic page for teachers/administrators. Directions were simple and printed in bold letters at the top of the page. Counselors were asked 16 questions on the demographic page. The additional questions concerned the counselor's role or the program in the middle school.

The counselor's version was printed in green and the teacher/administrator's version was printed in tan. This helped in the distribution of the questionnaire and in the data collection.

A cover letter (see Appendix A) was attached to each questionnaire to provide information to the respondent about the purpose of the questionnaire and the date for returning it to the designated person in the school. The researcher's phone number and address were included in the cover letter. Respondents were encouraged to call if they had any questions or concerns.

There were two major sections on the questionnaire. These were identified by large bold type and they were on separate pages. The first major section included the Goals of the Guidance Program and contained 23 items. This section was subdivided into three sections: (a) Personal Development, which contained eight items; (b) Educational Development, which contained seven items; and (c) Career Development, which contained eight items. The directions to the respondents were simple and located at the top of the page. They were asked to circle one number for each statement which most nearly represented their opinion. The place for them to respond directly followed the statement on the right of the page, as this is an easier format to use in answering.

The second major section was titled Counselor Role and Function and contained 26 items. This section was subdivided into four sections:



(a) Counseling and Guidance, which contained five items; (b) Coordinating, which contained 14 items; (c) Communicating, which contained three items; and (d) Consulting, which contained four items.

The key used with the questionnaire was 5 = Very Important, 4 = Important, 3 = Somewhat Important, 2 = Of Little Importance, 1 = Not Important, and 0 = No Opinion. The key was found on every page of the questionnaire for ease in answering the questionnaire. In the analysis of the questionnaire, a 5 or 4 represented a high response to the item, a 3 represented a neutral response, and a 2 or 1 indicated a low response to the item.

The questionnaire (see Appendix A) used an attitude rating scale which yielded a single score that indicated both the direction and intensity of the respondent's perceptions toward the goals of counseling and guidance and toward the counselor's role and function. It was constructed on a 5-point scale which is a popular multiple-choice format, frequently used in the construction of many types of attitude questionnaires.

A questionnaire format was used because it had certain advantages that make it a popular attitude evaluation tool. It permitted anonymity and, therefore, increased the number of responses returned, and it was more representative of a person's beliefs or feelings. The respondents in this study were not identified except for their membership in a stakeholder's group. The

respondent had more time to think about the response. It was given to many people simultaneously, with each person responding to exactly the same items, which allowed for greater uniformity across the measurement situation. In general, the data the questionnaire provided were more easily analyzed and interpreted as compared to oral responses.

Disadvantages to using a questionnaire were considered: (a) there was no flexibility as in the interview, (b) one cannot gauge how people are interpreting an item, and (c) the researcher had to develop the questionnaire. The respondents were encouraged to call the researcher if they had any questions or comments. People are sometimes better able to express their views orally.

The questionnaire was constructed by (a) identifying the program objectives for which the questionnaire was being prepared and determining what specific information the researcher hoped to obtain from the questionnaire, (b) choosing a response format, (c) identifying the frame of reference of the respondents, (d) writing the items, (e) piloting the items, (f) assembling and piloting the questionnaire, and (g) administering the questionnaire. (Henerson, Morris, & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987)

The first step in the process of developing a questionnaire that could be used to develop the evaluation model was to collect and identify possible goals

for middle school counseling and guidance, identify the role and function of the middle school counselor, and determine what specific information the researcher hoped to obtain from the questionnaire. The following areas were used to locate information on the goals of middle school guidance and the role and function of the middle school counselor: (a) PSYCHLIT and Education Resources Information Center database searches, (b) journal articles, books, and their references, (c) the state of Virginia's counseling and guidance standards of learning objectives, (d) The American School Counselor Association's Position Statements, (e) The American Association for Counseling and Development, (f) The Virginia Counselors Association, (g) information requested and received from other states, and (h) other questionnaires. All the information from the various sources was analyzed and the possible middle school goals and counselor's role and function were identified.

The second task in developing a questionnaire was to choose a response format. There were more than 30 respondents, so a closed-response format was used. No open-ended items were contained in the questionnaire. A no opinion option was included to avoid blank responses. A Likert-type scale response format was used to assess the relative importance of program goals and counselor role and function, as perceived by three stakeholder groups.

The key used in the questionnaire was: 5 = Very Important; 4 = Important; 3 = Somewhat Important; 2 = Of Little Importance; 1 = Not Important; 0 = No Opinion. In analyzing the data, a 5 or 4 response was be considered important or high; a 3 response was considered neutral or somewhat important; and a 1 or 2 response was considered low or not important to the respondent.

Third, the frame of reference of the respondent was a consideration when constructing the questionnaire. The following questions were asked of each item in the questionnaire as it was being constructed, keeping in mind that the respondents would be middle school counselors, teachers, and administrators: (a) Is the vocabulary appropriate for the respondents; (b) How well informed are the respondents likely to be; and (c) Does the group have a particular perspective that must be taken into account?

Fourth, the items for the questionnaire were written with the following information in mind. The item should be so constructed as to evoke a credible, useful response. Since a good attitude measure focuses upon a few basic attitude objectives, three major sections of attitude objectives about the goals of the guidance program were used in this questionnaire: (a) personal development, (b) educational development, and (c) career development. Four major sections of attitude objectives about the counselor's role and function

were used: (a) counseling and guidance, (b) coordinating, (c) communicating, and (d) consulting. A reliable attitude instrument can support a strong case for validity and, therefore credibility. Validity will be important if a decision will be based on the questionnaire's results. Items were included only if they ensured validity and enhanced reliability for the questionnaire. A calculation and comparison of attitude indices for each of the seven sections was performed.

A first draft, using the information gathered in the first three steps, was written and given to seven colleagues (counselors and teachers). More items than necessary were included in the first draft of the questionnaire and the seven counselors and teachers were asked to identify the most important items and the least important items.

Fifth, another important area in the development of a questionnaire was to critique the items. For each item written, the researcher asked: (a) Does the item relate to one idea? (b) Is there a simpler or more direct way to word the item? An effort was made to keep the items under 20 words to limit the number of complex concepts in any one item and to try to use words of fewer than three syllables.

In developing the questionnaire, attention was given to the use of confusing or inappropriate words in the items. For example: (a) Is there

more than one meaning for a word? and (b) Are there words unfamiliar to respondents? Items were checked by counselors and teachers for words or phrases that were likely to influence a person's responses for reasons not germane to the issue. For example, some words make people nervous, like forbid.

Questions asked about each item in the questionnaire were: (a) Is the item worded negatively, (b) Does the item encourage one answer or discourage another, and (c) Does the item permit a response that indicates a lack of knowledge or lack of opinion without demeaning the respondent?

The next step was to develop a questionnaire using the items that were identified in previous steps. Five school counselors and two teachers were asked to comment and offer suggestions on the first draft of the questionnaire. Changes suggested in the first draft were incorporated into the second draft. Six colleagues were asked to review the second draft of the questionnaire. Four drafts of the questionnaire were completed and evaluated by colleagues. Changes suggested were incorporated into the questionnaire that was then piloted.

Sixth, when assembling the questionnaire, decisions were made to improve the response rate: (a) professional printing improved the appearance of the questionnaire, (b) the questionnaire looked easy to complete, (c) there

were as few items as possible, (d) lines or skipped spaces were used as demarcation between blocks of items, and (e) the key was printed on every page.

There were two sections on the questionnaire; one section was for the goals of the guidance program and the other section was for the role and function of the counselor. The layout of the questionnaire made divisions between sections clear. An introductory comment was placed before each section. The instructions for the questionnaire were specific and unambiguous and aimed for as simple a format as possible. The response possibilities were self-explanatory since many people do not read instructions.

Another important step in developing a questionnaire was in piloting it. Seventeen counselors and teachers were asked to critically review the questionnaire and offer suggestions. The pilot group consisted of 17 educators: (a) one supervisor of guidance, (b) four upper elementary counselors, (c) three sixth grade teachers, (d) seven counselors of seventh and eighth grade students, (e) two seventh grade teachers, and (f) one eighth grade teacher. A cover letter was attached to each questionnaire for piloting which included suggestions for reading the items in the questionnaire. Fifteen questionnaires were returned. The questionnaire was revised using suggestions from the pilot group.

The last step was administering the questionnaire. Permission to send the questionnaire to teachers, administrators, and counselors in the school system was granted by the school system's central administration. Introductory comments to the principals of middle schools receiving the questionnaires were included in a cover letter (see Appendix A) along with a copy of the permission letter from central administration.

A cover letter (see Appendix A) introducing the questionnaire was attached for each respondent. It explained the purpose of the questionnaire and provided guidelines for answering the items. A deadline for returning the questionnaire was included in the cover letter.

The questionnaires were delivered to the principals of the three middle schools, two urban, and one suburban in a large southeastern school district. After one and one-half weeks, the researcher called each school to inquire if there were any questions and offered to help in any way that could possibly increase the number of questionnaires returned.

The respondents had three weeks to complete the questionnaire and return it to the designated person in each school. The researcher picked up the questionnaires from the middle schools after the allotted time had elapsed as this may have improved the rate of return. Each respondent's answers were entered into a computer program for analysis so the information obtained from



the questionnaires could be used in developing an evaluation model for middle school counselors.

### Evaluation Model

After considerable review of the literature concerning evaluation models, the researcher selected the CIPP Model to adapt for use in evaluating counseling and guidance programs because (a) it is a decision-making model, (b) it provides evidence of accountability, (c) the framework provided by this model could be adapted to counseling, and (d) the results will be usable for planning, improvement, further development, and ongoing evaluation of the program.

Using the CIPP Model as a framework, the information gathered from the questionnaire, as well as other sources, were utilized in developing the evaluation model. The adapted model was validated by twenty supervisors/coordinators of guidance in Virginia.

The evaluation satisfied the four main principles published by The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981). The first principle is utility, to ensure that the evaluation is informative, timely, and influential. The second principle is feasibility; this assures that the study operates in the actual field setting and uses practical procedures. Third, propriety requires that the study protects the rights of the individual. Fourth is accuracy that guarantees that the information obtained from the study is sound and verifiable.

In this study, Stufflebeam's CIPP Model was adapted because it is a systems-analysis, decision-making model which provides useful information for judging decision alternatives and determining whether needs have been met. The CIPP Model can serve needs for summative evaluation (supply information for accountability), as well as, formative evaluation (decision making). In addition, it is a model that can be understood by counselors. It is one of the best known of the decision-facilitation evaluation schemes (Popham, 1988).

Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1985) described these two uses (formative and summative) of the CIPP model as shown in Table 1.

The evaluation model in this study was geared more to a system view of counseling. This model concentrated not so much on guiding the conduct of an individual study but on providing ongoing evaluation services to the decision makers in a middle school counseling and guidance department. This person could be the guidance supervisor at the administrative level, the building principal, or the guidance director and the counselors of the school. The evaluation is better if it is a collaborative effort of all those involved in the decision making for middle school guidance.

The main features of the four types of evaluation in this model were adapted from those proposed by Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1985). The

Table 1

Two Uses of the CIPP Model - Formative and Summative

	Decision Making	Accountability
	Formative	Summative
Context	Guidance for choice of objectives and assignment of priorities	Record of objectives and bases for their choices, along with a record of needs, opportunities, and problems
Input	Guidance for choice of program strategy and input for specification of procedural design	Record of chosen strategy and design and reasons for their choice over other alternatives
Process	Guidance for implementation	Record of the actual process
Product	Guidance for termination, continuation, modification, or installation	Record of attainments and decisions

Note. From Systematic Evaluation: A Self-Instructional Guide to Theory and Practice (p. 164) by D. L. Stufflebeam and A. J. Shinkfield, 1985, Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

model developed in this study contains an introduction and a description of the four kinds of evaluation that can be used by the counselor. Each type of evaluation is on a separate page because one of the values of this model is that one does not have to do all four kinds of evaluation at the same time. The evaluator can choose one, two, or all four sections, depending on the need of the guidance department. Each section contains 15 statements which were a result of the literature search and the information yielded by the questionnaire. Additional statements can be added by a school or school system to meet their particular needs.

Context evaluation is, according to Stufflebeam (1971), the most basic kind of evaluation. The primary orientation is to identify the strengths and weaknesses of middle school counseling and guidance and to provide direction for improvement. The main objectives of this type of study are to assess the guidance program's overall status, to identify its deficiencies, to inventory the strengths at hand that could be used to remedy the deficiencies, and to diagnose problems whose solution would improve the guidance program's well-being.

This study's model provides the objective for each of the four types of evaluation and gives 15 items for each type of evaluation. The possible answers are: "yes," "no," or "uncertain." A sample is given on how to

provide documentation for a “yes” answer in the model. For example, in the context evaluation section, the first statement is, “A guidance advisory committee has been formed and meets regularly.” According to the literature this, is an important area in providing for a fully functioning program and communicating with the different stakeholder groups. The documentation could include the names of those serving on the committee, evidence of scheduled meetings, and a list of their goals. This documentation in turn provides accountability for interested or questioning stakeholders. A “no” answer could indicate that this is a weakness of the program and steps need to be taken to form such a committee.

A context evaluation also is aimed at examining whether existing goals and priorities are attuned to the needs of the middle school student. A common starting point is to administer a needs assessment instrument to the clients of the program (students, teachers, parents, and administrators) to obtain their perceptions of strengths, weaknesses, and problems.

Another statement in the model is, “The results of the needs assessment are used in planning programs and activities.” A “no” answer would indicate to the evaluator that this is a necessary step in providing a sound program and would identify a weakness that needs to be corrected. The results of a context evaluation should provide a sound basis for adjusting its existing goals and priorities and targeting needed changes.

Context evaluation by assessing the needs of the target population would encourage: (a) identifying opportunities for addressing the needs, (b) diagnosing problems underlying the needs, and (c) judging the strength of program goals and priorities. Such a context evaluation might be motivated from inside the school as a regular assessment or as a response to indications from some stakeholders of dissatisfaction about the program's performance. In general, such evaluative studies aid the counseling and guidance department by: (a) renewal and promotion of better and more efficient service to students, (b) diagnosis of particular problems and targeting of improvement efforts, and (c) communication about the program's strengths and weaknesses with its stakeholders.

The results of the context evaluation would lead to a decision about whether to introduce some kind of change in the program. If a decision to change the program in some way was made, then the counselors would clarify the problems to be solved and formulate their objectives. Next, they would consider whether some appropriate solution strategy is apparent and readily adaptable to their situation. If so, they would install it and redirect their attentions to using it and evaluating it as a part of the program.

If no satisfactory solution was apparent, then the counselors would conduct an input evaluation. Input evaluation is intended to provide

information regarding how to employ counseling resources to achieve program objectives. Such an evaluation would search the literature, ask personnel in other institutions that have dealt successfully with a similar problem, draw on the ingenuity and creativity of the school's staff and stakeholder groups, and, possibly, involve outside experts. The first statement in the model is, "New ideas for activities to meet goals are requested, investigated and incorporated into program planning." Subsequently, one or more persons would be assigned to write one or more proposed solution strategies. The resulting proposal(s) would then be assessed against such criteria as responsiveness to the defined needs, problems, and objectives; theoretical soundness; and feasibility.

The results of the input evaluation would be used to decide whether alternative program strategies had been found to warrant going ahead with its further development. If not, the staff would reconsider whether the desired change is sufficiently important to warrant further search, and, if so, would recycle through the search for a solution strategy. If a promising strategy had been found, then the staff would decide whether or not the strategy could justifiably be installed without further testing. If much were known about the strategy and there was little concern about being able to install it, the staff would be likely to turn their attention directly to incorporating the change into their regular ongoing counseling and guidance activities.

However, if they decided to test it further, they would direct their attention to a field test of the strategy, and the counselor would subject it to process and product evaluation over whatever time period would be required to evaluate the procedure and reach the desired level of performance and readiness for installation. The purpose of process evaluation is to identify any defects in the procedural design, particularly in the sense that planned elements of the counseling and guidance program are not being implemented as they were originally conceived. The first statement in the model developed for this study under process evaluation is, "Program activities are monitored in terms of process as they are being delivered, looking for unanticipated results." The documentation for this activity could include the name of the particular activity, how it was monitored, and the final evaluation of the activity by the counselor, students, or other clients.

Product evaluation attempts to measure and interpret the attainments yielded by a counseling/guidance activity, not only at its conclusion but, as often as necessary, during the activity itself. The emphasis in product evaluation is clearly on the outcomes produced by the program. The first statement in the model is, "The guidance program provides for small group counseling sessions." According to the literature and the questionnaire, this is an important function of the counselor. This outcome information is related to



the objectives of the program or activity, then comparisons are made between expectations and actual results. The product evaluation helps decide whether to continue, terminate, modify, or refocus a guidance activity. If the project/activity has not performed satisfactorily or is viewed as too costly, the leadership of the institution or the counselors might conclude that no further effort is warranted and, in accordance with this conclusion, decide to abort the effort. Under the assumption that the project was a success and the solution it afforded was still needed and wanted, the guidance department would install the proven project and include regularized evaluation of the ongoing program.

The approach suggested by Stufflebeam and used in this model is cyclical in that feedback is continuously being provided to the counselor or decision maker, and new information may lead to reexamination of earlier decisions. Thus, it is possible, for example, that information provided during process evaluation may lead the counselor or decision maker to reconsider a structuring decision which was made earlier and, thus, initiate a new input evaluation or revise the previous one. Such practical considerations are among the major contributions derived from this approach to evaluation. It is essential that the evaluator or counselor be fully aware of these factors when evaluating middle school counseling and guidance.

Deciding precisely what information to collect is essential. Focusing on informational needs and pending decisions of counselors limits the range of

relevant data and brings the evaluation into sharp focus. It stresses the importance of the utility of information. Connecting evaluation to decision making underlines the purpose of evaluation.

#### Validation

A panel of experts was identified and asked to validate the model. This panel consisted of the guidance supervisors/coordinators from the 25 school systems in Virginia that had at least three middle schools. The model (see Appendix B), a cover letter (see Appendix B), and a return self-addressed envelope was sent to each specialist. The model was professionally printed as one method of insuring a good return. The cover letter provided suggestions for reading the model. The specialists were encouraged to call the researcher collect if there were any questions or comments. Anonymity was assured, but the specialists had the option to include their names and addresses on the returned model if they wanted a final analysis of the model. Twenty specialists, 80%, validated the evaluation model. The comments and suggestions on the returned models were analyzed and revisions in the evaluation model (see Appendix B) were completed.

## Chapter IV

### Results

#### Assessment Instrument

A questionnaire (see Appendix A) was constructed and administered to members of three stakeholder groups--teachers, administrators, and counselors. The questionnaire had two major areas: (a) Goals of a Middle School Counseling and Guidance Program, and (b) Counselor Role and Function. There were 3 sections in the Goals Area: (a) Personal Development, (b) Educational Development, and (c) Career Development. There were four sections in the Role and Function Area: (a) Counseling and Guidance, (b) Coordinating, (c) Communication, and (d) Consulting.

#### Demographics

Three stakeholder groups from three middle schools in Virginia were surveyed--teachers, administrators, and counselors. Administrators returned 77.7% of the questionnaires that were distributed to them. Core teachers returned 78.6% of the questionnaires that were distributed to them and counselors returned 88.8% of the questionnaires that were distributed to them. This represented an average of 81.7% of the questionnaires returned.

Table 2 presents demographic information for all the respondents to the questionnaire of which, 76% were middle school core teachers. Nineteen

Table 2

Respondents' Demographic Information

Category	Counselor		Teacher		Administ.		All	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Administ.					7	11		
Teacher			48	76				
Counselor	8	12						
<hr/>								
Category								
<hr/>								
Gender								
Male	2	25	10	21	3	43	15	24
Female	6	75	38	79	4	57	48	76
<hr/>								
Age								
Under 30	0	0	9	19	0	0	9	14
31 - 40	3	38	12	25	2	29	17	27
41 - 50	3	38	21	44	5	71	29	46
Over 50	2	25	6	13	0	0	8	13
<hr/>								
Education								
Bachelors	0	0	22	46	0	0	22	35
Masters	8	100	24	50	7	100	39	62
Ed.S./CAS	0	0	2	3	0	0	2	3

percent of the teachers were less than 30 years old. Eleven percent of the sample were principals or assistant principals, and all were over 30 years.

Twelve percent of all the respondents were counselors with 4% being directors of guidance. Seventy-five percent of the counselor respondents were female and 25% were male. The majority, 75% were between the ages of 31 and 50 and all had masters degrees. Overall the sample tended to be female (76%), ages 41 and over (69%), and have advanced degrees.

Table 3 presents counselor background information and Table 4 presents counseling and guidance program information. One hundred percent of the counselors stated there are goals and a philosophy for the counseling department and a job description for counselors. Sixty-three percent said there is not a guidance curricula and 63% state a formal evaluation is not done. One hundred percent said there is no evaluation model that is followed to evaluate middle school counseling and guidance. There was a 100% negative response to the statement, "Homebase or advisor/advisee programs are not coordinated by the counselors."

The state of Virginia requires middle school counselors to spend at least 60% of their day engaged in individual or group counseling. Forty percent of the day is for guidance, paper work, and other activities. Thirty-seven and one half percent of the counselors responded that between 50% and 60% of

their day was spent counseling and 62.5% were in the 40% to 50% daily average range.

### Statistical Analysis

Closed-response data were used and a people-item data roster was constructed to record the responses to the questionnaire. Each returned questionnaire was given a number for purposes of entry into the computer program and the respondents' stakeholder group was identified. Descriptive statistics and percentages were calculated from this roster. Percentages were reported for each group of respondents (counselors, administrators, and teachers) and for the total group in the following way: (a) the percentage of persons who gave a 5 or a 4 rating to the item, (b) the percentage of respondents who gave a rating of 3 to the item, (c) the percentage of respondents who gave a rating of 2 or a 1 to the item, (d) the percent of respondents who gave a "no opinion" rating, that is, giving a 0 to the item, and (e) the mean rating for each item.

A nonparametric test, chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ), was used for statistical analysis to determine if there were significant differences in ratings from the three stakeholder groups for sections on the questionnaire. The information gained from this analysis was used to formulate the statements found in the evaluation model. Essentially, this procedure involves a "test of independence" wherein

the sample frequencies actually falling within certain categories ( $f_o$ ) are contrasted with those which might be expected ( $f_e$ ) on the basis of the hypothetical distribution or by chance. These will be the perceptions of the three stakeholder groups regarding the role and function of the counselor and the goals of counseling and guidance. If a marked difference exists between the observed or actual frequencies falling in each category and the frequencies expected to fall in each category on the basis of chance or a previously established distribution, then the  $\chi^2$  test will yield a numerical value large enough to be interpreted as statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected.

Twenty-one contingency tables were computed representing the seven major sections of the questionnaire: goals of counseling (a) personal development, (b) educational development, (c) career development and role and function of the counselor, (d) counseling and guidance, (e) coordinating, (f) communicating, and (g) consulting. The observed frequency, the expected frequency, and the value of  $\chi^2$  was found for each of the three stakeholder groups and for three ratings--high, neutral, and low. Observed frequencies ( $f_o$ ) for each cell of the contingencies tables were obtained from the questionnaire's data.

Table 3

Counselors' Backgrounds

Category	Number	Percent
Counseling Experience		
Less than five years	1	12.5
Between 5 - 15	5	62.5
Between 16 - 25	2	25.0
Over 25	0	0.0
Middle school counseling experience		
Less than five years	7	87.5
Between 5 - 15	0	0.0
Between 16 - 25	1	12.5
Over 25	0	0.0



Table 4

Program Information

Category	Number	Percent
Students assigned by:		
Grade Level	8	100
Alphabet	0	0
Core Groups	0	0
Other	0	0
Number of counselees per counselor		
Under 200	0	0.0
200 - 300	3	37.5
300 - 350	1	12.5
Over 350	4	50.0
Percent of time counseling per day		
30% - 40%	0	0.0
40% - 50%	5	62.5
50% - 60%	3	37.5
60% - 70%	0	0.0

Expected frequencies ( $f_e$ ) for each cell of the contingencies tables were calculated in the following manner:

$$f_e = \frac{\text{row marginal} \times \text{column marginal}}{N}$$

The following table (Table 5) will indicate the E = expected response and the O = observed response for the three groups in the three categories for the seven sections of the questionnaire. The table will also show the observed response minus the expected response. Next, it will show this number squared. The last column will show the results of this number divided by the expected frequency which is the value of chi-square.

The formula for chi-square is:

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e} \text{ for all the cells.}$$

Table 5

Expected Response and Observed Response

---

Column 1 = O = Observed Frequency

Column 2 = E = Expected Frequency

Column 3 = (O-E) = (Observed Frequency - Expected Frequency)

Column 4 = (O-E)<sup>2</sup> = Column 3's Results Squared

Column 5 = (O-E)<sup>2</sup>

E = Column 4's Results Divided by the Expected Frequency

---

(table continues)

## I. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

Teachers					
$\chi^2 =$	O	E	O-E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
Positive	350	357	-7	49	0.137
Neutral	30	23	7	49	2.13
Negative	4	3	1	1	0.333
Overall	384	383	1	1	2.61

Administrators					
Positive	55	52	3	9	0.173
Neutral	1	3	-2	4	1.33
Negative	0	0.45	-0.45	0.2	0.45
Overall					1.95

Counselors					
Positive	64	60	4	16	0.27
Neutral	0	4	-4	16	4.00
Negative	0	0.51	-0.51	0.26	0.51
Overall					4.78

Value of  $\chi^2$ :

Total for positive:  $.137 + .173 + .27 = .58$

Total for neutral:  $2.13 + 1.33 + 4. = 7.46$

Total for negative:  $.333 + .45 + .51 = 1.29$

Total for overall Personal:  $2.61 + 1.95 + 4.78 = 9.34$

Not statistically significant at the .05 level

## II. EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

### Teachers

$\chi^2 =$	O	E	O-E	(O-E) <sup>2</sup>	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
Positive	266	282	-16	256	0.91
Neutral	69	56	13	169	3.02
Negative	16	12	4	16	1.33
Overall					5.26

### Administrators

Positive	45	39	6	36	0.92
Neutral	4	8	-4	16	2.00
Negative	0	2	-2	4	2.00
Overall					4.92

### Counselors

Positive	56	60	-4	16	0.27
Neutral	0	9	-9	81	9.00

Negative	0	2	-2	4	2.00
Overall					11.27

Value of  $\chi^2$

Total for positive:  $0.91 + 0.92 + 0.27 = 2.10$

Total for neutral:  $3.02 + 2.00 + 9.00 = 14.02$

Total for negative:  $1.33 + 2.00 + 2.00 = 5.33$

Total for overall Educational:  $5.26 + 4.92 + 11.27 = 21.45$

Statistically significant at the .05 level

### III. CAREER DEVELOPMENT

#### Teachers

$\chi^2 =$	O	E	O-E	(O-E) <sup>2</sup>	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
Positive	260	272	-12	144	.53
Neutral	92	88	4	16	.18
Negative	32	24	8	64	2.67
Overall					3.38

#### Administrators

Positive	35	40	-5	25	0.63
Neutral	21	13	8	64	4.92

Negative	0	3.5	-3.5	12.25	3.5
Overall					9.02

---

Counselors					
Positive	62	45	17	289	6.42
Neutral	2	15	-13	169	11.27
Negative	0	4	-4	16	4.00
Overall					21.69

---

Value of  $\chi^2$

Total for positive:  $.53 + .63 + 6.42 = 7.58$

Total for neutral:  $.18 + 4.92 + 11.27 = 16.37$

Total for negative:  $2.67 + 3.5 + 4.00 = 10.17$

Total for overall Career:  $7.58 + 16.37 + 10.17 = 34.12$

Statistically significant at the .05 level

---

#### IV. COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

Teachers					
$\chi^2 =$	O	E	O-E	(O-E) <sup>2</sup>	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
Positive	211	217	-6	36	.17
Neutral	21	17	4	16	.94

Negative	8	6	2	4	.24
OVERALL					1.35

---

## Administrators

Positive	34	32	2	4	.13
Neutral	1	2	-1	1	.5
Negative	0	1	-1	1	100
Overall					1.63

---

## Counselors

Positive	40	36	4	16	0.11
Neutral	0	3	-3	9	3.00
Negative	0	1	-1	1	.00
Overall					4.11

---

Value of  $\chi^2$

Total for positive:  $.17 + .13 + .11 = .41$

Total for neutral:  $0.94 + 0.5 + 3.00 = 4.44$

Total for negative:  $.333 + .45 + .51 = 1.29$

Total for overall Personal:  $2.61 + 1.95 + 4.78 = 9.34$

Not statistically significant at the .05 level

---

## V. COORDINATING

Teachers					
$\chi^2 =$	O	E	O-E	(O-E) <sup>2</sup>	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
Positive	490	491	-1	1	0.002
Neutral	115	125	-10	100	0.8
Negative	63	52	11	121	2.33
Overall					3.132
Administrators					
Positive	61	72	-11	121	1.68
Neutral	34	18	16	256	14.22
Negative	3	8	-5	25	3.13
Overall					19.03
Counselors					
Positive	95	82	13	169	2.06
Neutral	15	21	-6	36	1.71
Negative	2	9	-7	49	5.44
Overall					9.21

Value of  $\chi^2$



Total for positive:  $.002 + 1.68 + 2.06 = 3.74$

Total for neutral:  $0.8 + 14.22 + 1.71 = 16.73$

Total for negative:  $2.33 + 3.13 + 5.44 = 10.99$

Total for overall Personal:  $2.61 + 1.95 + 4.78 = 31.37$

Statistically significant at the .05 level

## VI. COMMUNICATING

### Teachers

$\chi^2 =$	O	E	O-E	(O-E) <sup>2</sup>	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
Positive	112	116	-4	16	.14
Neutral	24	21	3	9	.43
Negative	7	6	1	1	0.17
Overall					0.74

### Administrators

Positive	19	17	2	4	0.24
Neutral	1	3	-2	4	1.33
Negative	1	1	0	0	0.00
Overall					1.57

Counselors					
Positive	21	19	2	4	.21
Neutral	3	4	-1	1	.25
Negative	0	1	-1	1	0.00
Overall					1.46

Value of  $\chi^2$

Total for positive:  $.14 + 0.24 + 0.21 = 0.59$

Total for neutral:  $0.43 + 1.33 + 0.25 = 2.01$

Total for negative:  $0.17 + 0.00 + 1.00 = 1.17$

Total for overall Personal:  $0.59 + 2.01 + 1.17 = 3.77$

Not statistically significant at the .05 level

## VII. CONSULTING

Teachers					
$\chi^2 =$	O	E	O-E	(O-E) <sup>2</sup>	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
Positive	160	166	-6	36	.22
Neutral	22	18	4	16	.89
Negative	8	6	2	4	.67
Overall					1.78

Administrators					
Positive	25	24	1	1	0.04
Neutral	2	3	-1	1	0.33
Negative	0	1	-1	1	1.00
Overall					1.37

---

Counselors					
Positive	32	28	4	16	.57
Neutral	0	3	-3	9	3.00
Negative	0	1	-1	1	0.00
Overall					4.57

---

Value of  $\chi^2$

Total for positive:  $.22 + 0.04 + 0.57 = 0.83$

Total for neutral:  $0.89 + 0.33 + 3.00 = 4.22$

Total for negative:  $0.67 + 1.00 + 1.00 = 2.67$

Total for overall Personal:  $0.59 + 2.01 + 1.17 = 7.72$

Not statistically significant at the .05 level

---

The  $\chi^2$  test yields a value which is produced by the disparity in each of the data categories or cells between expected and observed frequencies. If the sample distribution were perfectly normal, there would be no difference in any

category between expected and observed frequencies and the resulting value of  $\chi^2$  would be zero. The greater the disparity between the observed and the expected frequencies, the larger  $\chi^2$  becomes.

The statistics for  $\chi^2$  were computed for all seven major sections in the questionnaire for each of the three groups who responded to the questionnaire and for the three variables--positive, neutral, and negative. A total is given for each of the seven areas.

#### Summary of Sections

Table 6 presents the chi-square values and the probability levels for ratings of 5 or 4 (high), 3 (neutral), and 2 or 1 (low) for the seven sections on the questionnaire. There were significant differences between the perceptions of the three groups to the items on the questionnaire in four areas: Personal Development ( $\chi^2 = 7.46$ ,  $p < .05$ ), Educational Development ( $\chi^2 = 14.02$ ,  $p < .001$ ), Career Development ( $\chi^2 = 16.4$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and Coordinating ( $\chi^2 = 16.7$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

The different perceptions of the stakeholder groups were analyzed. A decision was made by the researcher, utilizing information gained from the literature review, as to how this would impact the content of the evaluation model. Personal Development and Educational Development were significantly different for the three stakeholder groups in their neutral rating. Eight percent of teachers gave the Personal Development section a neutral

Table 6

Chi-square and Probability Levels

Section	Chi-square			Probability Level		
	High	Neutral	Low	High	Neutral	Low
Goals:						
Personal Development	0.58	7.46	1.30	NS	.05	NS
Educational Development	2.10	14.02	5.33	NS	.001	NS
Career Development	7.60	16.40	10.20	0.05	.001	0.01
Counselor Role & Function:						
Counseling & Guidance	3.40	4.40	1.29	NS	NS	NS
Coordinating	3.70	16.70	11.00	NS	0.001	0.01
Communicating	.59	2.00	1.20	NS	NS	NS
Consulting	.83	4.20	2.70	NS	NS	NS

$\chi^2 (2, N=63) = 5.99, p < .05$ ;  $\chi^2 7.8, p < .02$ ;  $\chi^2 9.2, p < .01$ ;  $\chi^2 13.8, p < .001$

rating, 0% of the counselors gave the section a neutral rating, and 2% of administrators rated it neutral. In the Educational Development section, the difference between groups was caused by 21% of teachers rating the items neutral and 8% of administrators compared to none of the counselors. The Career Development section was statistically different between the groups at the high, neutral, and low ratings. Teachers and administrators rated the items in the Career Development section significantly lower than the counselors. The mean ratings for the eight items in the Career Development section were: teachers 3.84; administrators, 3.71; and counselors, 4.46. Only 68% of teachers and 63% of administrators gave a high rating to the items in this section compared to 97% of counselors rating the items high. Twenty-four percent of teachers and 38% of administrators gave neutral ratings to the items compared to counselors at 3%.

The Coordinating section was statistically different between groups for the neutral and low ratings. Fifteen percent of teachers gave a low rating to these items compared to none of the administrators or counselors. Fourteen percent of administrators gave it a neutral rating compared to 2% of teachers and none of the counselors.

Table C-1 through C-28 (see Appendix C) allowed the researcher to analyze each item on the questionnaire and the perceptions of the three stakeholder groups. The information gained from this analysis and the review

of the literature was then used in the formulation of the content for the evaluation model that was developed for this study.

### Personal Development

Statement one in the Personal Development section under Goals on the questionnaire was, “The guidance and counseling program will assist students to develop an understanding of and methods used to cope with rapid and erratic physical and emotional changes typical of early adolescence and the effects these have upon attitudes, behavior and interpersonal relationships.” One hundred percent of the counselor respondents rated this item high, that is, they gave this item a 5 or a 4 rating. All counselors rated all eight items very important in the Personal Development of the questionnaire. This means that counselors agreed with the items in this section as being important goals for middle school counseling and guidance (see Appendix C, Table C-1).

All mean ratings by the administrators on the Personal Development section fell in the high rating category, with the highest standard deviation, .58, which was considered low. Item 5, understanding the impact of drugs, received the lowest rating a 4 with a standard deviation of .58 (see Appendix C, Table C-2).

The mean teacher ratings in the Personal Development section fell between a low of 4.5 (“understand impact of drugs”) and the high of 5 (“understand self-discipline and self-motivation”), all of which were

considered in the high range. The standard deviation ranged from .28 to .82 which suggests that there was substantial agreement among the teachers in their responses to the items in this section of the questionnaire. (See Appendix C, Table C-3).

Of the eight items in the Personal Development section, “Developing Communication Skills” had the lowest mean rating from all respondents, 4.5 with a standard deviation of .76. The highest mean rating was 4.9 with a standard deviation of .53; this was in the area of “Self-discipline.” All groups tended to have similar ratings for items in this section. The overall mean rating from all respondents for the Personal Development section was 4.68, with 93% percent of all respondents giving it a high rating; 6%, neutral; and only 1% negative (see Appendix C, Table C-4). Table 7 presents a summary of the mean ratings and the standard deviations on all items for the three groups on the Personal Development section, statements one through eight.

#### Educational Development

Counselors had a mean rating of 5 for two items in the Educational Development section, “planned program of studies” and “maximize academic potential.” The lowest rating in this section from counselors, 4.4, was for “evaluate ability level in interest areas.” There was agreement among the counselors, and they rated this section very high overall (see Appendix C, Table C-5).



Twenty-nine percent of the administrators gave a neutral rating to-- “understand their ability in interest areas,” which caused the lowest mean rating, 3.7. One hundred percent gave a high rating, 4.4, and a standard deviation of .53 to “understand alternative career choices” (see Appendix C, Table C-6).

Ninety percent of teachers on the Educational Development section rated “accept responsibility for learning” high,  $M = 4.5$ ,  $SD = .73$ , while “understand their ability in interest areas” had the lowest mean rating ( $M = 3.8$ ,  $SD = .97$ ) with only 63 rating it high and 31% of teachers rating the item neutral, (see Appendix C, Table C-7).

On the Educational Development section, 90% of all respondents rated “accept responsibility for learning” high,  $M = 4.4$ ,  $SD = .65$ . Only 68% rated “understand their ability in interest areas” high. This item had the lowest mean rating,  $M = 3.8$ ,  $SD = 1.07$  (see Appendix C, Table C-8). Table 7 presents the mean rating and the standard deviation for the three groups and a total for the Educational Development section on the questionnaire, statements 9 through 15.

### Career Development

On the Career Development section 75% of the counselors rated “understand changes in society and the effect they have on occupations” low

Table 7

Summary Ratings for the Personal Development Section

Goals section	Counselors		Administs.		Teachers		Total	
	Personal Development							
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. cope with changes	5.0	0	4.3	.5	4.7	.7	4.7	.8
2. accept themselves	5.0	0	5.0	0	4.7	.6	4.8	.7
3. understand self-discipline & self-motivation	5.0	0	4.6	.5	5.0	0	4.9	.5
4. understand impact of behavior	5.0	0	4.9	.4	4.8	.54	.8	.3
5. understand impact of drugs	5.0	0	4.0	.6	4.5	.7	4.5	.4
6. acquire decision-making skills	5.0	0	4.1	.4	4.6	.8	4.6	.7
7. recognize effects of stress	5.0	0	4.9	.4	4.5	.8	4.6	.7
8. develop communication skills	5.0	0	4.4	.5	4.5	.8	4.5	.8

N = 63

(4.1), and 25% rated it neutral. One hundred percent rated “plan educational needs” high (4.8) (see Appendix C, Table C-9).

Seventy-one percent of administrators rated “lifelong learning habits and skills” neutral, and only 28% rated it high on the Career Development section. This item received the lowest rating (3.3). On “career planning,” 71% of administrators rated it high (4) (see Appendix C, Table C-10).

On the Career Development section, 29% of teachers rated “develop career skills” neutral, with only 63% rating it high. It received the lowest rating (3.6). “Life long learning habits and skills” received the highest rating (4.1) (see Appendix C, Table C-11).

Seventy-six percent of all respondents rated “relate personal abilities to career goals” high, with a mean rating of 4 on the Career Development section. “Develop career skills” received the lowest rating (3.7) with 24% rating it neutral. Table 9 presents a summary of mean ratings and standard deviations for the three groups for the Career Development section of the questionnaire, statements 16 through 23.

### Counseling and Guidance

On the Counseling and Guidance section, 100% of counselors responded high to all items (see Appendix C, Table C-13). “Crisis counseling” and “identifying special need students” received the highest rating

Table 8

Summary Ratings for the Educational Development Section

Educational Development		Counselors		Administs.		Teachers		Total	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
9. pursue a									
planned program	5	0	4.1	.4	4.2	.9	4.3	.7	
10. use study skills	4.9	.4	4.1	.4	4.1	1.	4.1	.9	
11. understand their									
interests	4.4	.5	3.7	.5	3.8	1.	3.8	1.0	
12. understand career									
goals	4.5	.5	4.3	.8	4.0	.9	4.1	.9	
13. understand alter-									
native career	4.8	.5	4.4	.5	4.3	.7	4.3	.9	
14. accept respon-									
sibility for									
learning	4.8	.5	4.0	.6	4.5	.74	.4	.7	
15. maximize academic									
potential	5	0	4.3	.5	4.1	.9	4.3	.7	
N = 63									

(5) from administrators on the Counseling and Guidance section. "Professional competence" received the lowest rating (4), with 13% of administrators rating it neutral (see Appendix C, Table C-14).

Ninety-six percent of teachers rated "identifying special need students" and 98% rated "crisis counseling" high (4.8). "Professional competence," 73%, received the lowest rating (3.9), with 17% rating it neutral and 10%, low (see Appendix C, Table C-15).

"Crisis counseling" received the highest rating, 98% from all respondents and a mean rating of 4.9 on the Counseling and Guidance section. "Developing professional competence" received the lowest rating (4) with only 77% rating it high and 14% rating it neutral. Table 10 presents the mean ratings and the standard deviations for the three groups for the Counseling and Guidance section of the questionnaire, statements 24 through 28.

### Coordinating

One hundred percent of counselors rated "encouraging teacher referrals" and "student centered program" high (4.8). "Student cumulative records" received the lowest rating (3.1), with 25% rating it low on the Coordinating section. "Research and pilot programs" was rated 3.5, with 50% giving it a neutral rating. Eighty-eight percent did rate "using an evaluation model" high. Fifty percent of counselors rated "advisory committee" neutral (see Appendix C, Table C-17).

Table 9

Summary Ratings for the Career Development Section

Career Development	Counselors		Administs.		Teachers		Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Assist students to:								
16. understand relation of work to self- fulfillment	4.5	.5	3.6	.83	.9	.9	4.	.9
17. plan educa- tional needs	4.8	.5	3.9	.7	3.8	1	3.9	.9
18. academic plans in line with career plans	4.6	.5	3.9	.43	.8	13	.9	1
19. lifelong learning habits and skills	4.3	.5	3.3	.5	4.1	.9	4.1	.9
20. relate personal abilities to career goal	4.6	.5	3.4	.5	4.	.9	4.	.9
21. understand career planning	4.5	.5	4.0	.8	3.7	13	.8	.9
22. develop career skills	4.3	.5	3.9	.4	3.6	.9	3.7	1
23. understand changes in society	4.1	.8	3.7	.5	3.8	1	3.8	.9
N = 63								

Table 10

Summary Ratings for the Counseling and Guidance Section

Counseling & Guidance		Counselors		Administs.		Teachers		Total	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Functions of the Counselor could include:									
24. identifying special									
need students		4.9	.4	5	0	4.8	.5	4.8	.9
25. individual and									
group counseling		4.9	.4	4.9	.4	4.5	.6	4.6	.5
26. crisis counseling		5	0	5	0	4.8	.4	4.9	.6
27. professional									
competence		4.6	.5	4	.6	3.9	1	4.0	.4
28. group guidance		4.8	.5	4.3	.5	4.1	1	4.2	1.0
N = 63									

“Encouraging teacher referrals” received the highest rating (4.9) from 100% of administrators on the Coordinating Section. “Showing the relationship between course content and careers” received the lowest rating (3). All administrators gave it a neutral rating, (see Appendix C, Table C).

Ninety-one percent of teachers rated “encouraging teacher referrals” high (4.5) on the Coordinating Section. “Research and pilot programs” and “using an evaluation model” had the lowest rating (3.4). Thirty-three percent of teachers rated “using an evaluation model” neutral and 12% low (see Appendix C, Table C-19).

Ninety-one percent of all respondents rated “encouraging teacher referrals” high (4.5) on the Coordinating section. “Research and pilot programs” and “using an evaluation model” received the lowest ratings (3.5) (see Appendix C, Table C-20). Table 11 presents a summary of the mean ratings and the standard deviations for the three groups for the Coordinating section of the questionnaire, statements 29 through 42.

### Communicating

All counselors rated “communicating program activities” and “communicating with stakeholder groups” high on the Communicating section. “Communicating the results of evaluations” received the lowest rating (3.8), with 38% rating it neutral (see Appendix C, Table C-21).

All administrators rated “communicating program activities” high on the Communicating section. “Communicating the results of evaluations” received the lowest rating (3.9) with 14% rating it low (see Appendix C, Table C-22).

“Communicating with stakeholder groups” and “communicating program activities” received the highest rating (4.1) from teachers on the Communicating



Table 11Summary Ratings for the Coordinating Section

Coordinating	Counselors		Administs.		Teachers		Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Functions of the counselor could include:								
29. coordinating services	4.1	.4	4.6	.8	4.2	.8	4.3	.9
30. coordinating testing	4.3	.5	4.0	.6	4.1	1.	4.1	.8
31. educational placement	4.5	.5	3.6	.8	3.7	1.	3.8	.9
32. orientation programs	4.3	.7	4.3	.8	4.1	.9	4.2	1.
33. research pilot programs	3.5	.5	3.1	.4	3.4	1.	3.5	.8
34. using an evaluation model	3.9	.4	3.7	.5	3.4	1.	3.5	.9
35. encouraging								
teacher referrals	4.8	.5	4.9	.4	4.5	.9	4.5	1.
36. student records	3.1	.8	3.3	1.	4.3	1.	4.0	.9
37. student centered program	4.8	.5	4.3	.5	4.4	.9	4.4	1.
38. a mission statement, goals,								
and philosophy	4.5	.5	3.7	.5	3.8	1.	3.9	.8
39. needs assessment	4.1	.4	3.9	1.	4.1	.9	4.1	1.
40. advisory committee	3.8	.9	3.1	1.	3.8	1.	3.7	.9
41. relation-ship between								
course content & careers	3.9	.6	3.0	0	3.6	1.	3.6	1.
42. coordinating								
advisor/advisee	4.3	.5	4.1	.7	3.9	1.	4.0	1.

N = 63

section. “Communicating the results of evaluations” received the lowest rating (3.9) with 14% rating it low (see Appendix C, Table C-22).

“Communicating with stakeholder groups” and “communicating program activities” received the highest rating (4.1) from teachers on the Communicating section. “Communicating the results of evaluations” received the lowest rating (3.9) with 17% rating it neutral (see Appendix C, Table C-23).

Eighty-six percent of all respondents rated “communicating program activities” high (4.3) on the Communicating section. “Communicating the results of evaluations” received the lowest rating (3.9) (see Appendix C, Table C-24). Table 12 presents the mean rating and the standard deviation for the three groups for the Communicating section of the questionnaire, statements 43 through 45.

### Consulting

All counselors gave a high rating to all items on the Consulting section. “Consulting with others about student adjustment problems,” “consulting with others about student developmental needs,” and “providing information about the curriculum” all received a high rating of 5. “Consultant to core teams” received the lowest rating in this group (4.9) which is still very high (see Appendix C, Table C-25).

Table 12

Summary Ratings for the Communicating Section

Coordinating	Counselors		Administs.		Teachers		Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Functions of the counselor could include: communicating:								
43. with stake-								
holder groups	4.6	.5	4.1	.7	4.1	.9	4.2	1.
44. program								
activities	5.	0	4.3	.5	4.1	1.	4.3	.9
45. the results								
of evaluations	3.8	.7	3.9	.9	3.9	1.	3.9	.9

N = 63

“Consulting with teachers and others on the developmental needs and concerns of students” and “providing information about the curriculum” received the highest rating (5) from administrators on the Consulting section. “Consulting with core teams” received the lowest rating of 3.9, with 14% rating it neutral (see Appendix C, Table C-26).

Ninety-six percent of teachers rated “consulting with others about student adjustment problems” high (4.6) on the Consulting section.

“Providing information about the curriculum for student program planning”

received the lowest rating (3.8), with 25% rating it neutral (see Appendix C, Table C-27).

Ninety-seven percent of all respondents rated “consulting with others about student adjustment problems” high (4.7). “Providing information about curriculum for student program planning” received the lowest rating (4), with 21% rating it neutral (see Appendix C, Table C-28). Table 13 presents the mean ratings and the standard deviations for the three groups for the Consulting section of the questionnaire, statements 46 through 49.

#### Summary

Table 14 presents teacher, administrator, and counselor ratings for the seven major sections of the questionnaire. There were only six “no opinion” ratings given for items in the questionnaire, and these were for different items. In the high rating category, teachers rated the items from a 91% high rating in the Personal Development section to a 68% high rating for the Career Development section. The teachers’ highest neutral rating was also in the Career Development section with 24% of the teachers rating this section neutral.

Ninety-eight percent of administrators rated Personal Development high, and 95% rated Counseling and Guidance high. Their lowest rating was also in the Career Development section with a high rating of 63%.

Table 13

Summary Ratings for the Consulting Section

Coordinating	Counselors		Administs.		Teachers		Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Consulting with others about student:								
46. adjustment								
problems	5.0	0	5.0	0	4.6	0.6	4.7	1.0
47. develop								
mental needs	5.0	0	5.0	0	4.5	0.8	4.6	0.6
48. curriculum	5.0	0	4.3	0.8	3.8	1.0	4.0	0.8
49. needs in their								
core teams	4.9	0.4	3.9	1.2	4.1	1.0	4.1	1.0

N = 63

Counselors were more inclined to rate most items higher than the other two groups. They gave a high rating of 100% to four sections: (a) Personal Development, (b) Educational Development, (c) Counseling and Guidance, and (d) Consulting. Their lowest in the high rating was in the Coordination section with an 85%.

All three groups were in high agreement with the items in the Personal Development section of the questionnaire with a mean high rating of 93%.

The section with the highest percentage of low ratings was the Coordination section, (9%) and these were from teachers. Overall, there were few low ratings given to the items; most items were given a high rating, and the section with the highest neutral rating was the Career Development section with a mean from the three groups of 23%.

Table 15 presents the percentage of high, neutral, and low ratings from all respondents for the seven sections on the questionnaire and the mean rating. The Personal Development section received the highest mean rating from all respondents with a 4.7. Ninety-three percent gave it a high rating; 6%, a neutral rating; and 1%, a low rating. There was agreement in the perceptions of the three stakeholder groups with the statements on the questionnaire in this section. The Career Development section received the lowest rating (3.9). Seventy-one percent of the respondents gave it a high rating; 23% a neutral rating; and 6%, a low rating. The perceptions of the stakeholders with the statements in this section were not all in agreement. Eight percent of the respondents gave the Coordinating section a low rating which was the highest of the low ratings. Overall, with the mean ratings for all respondents ranging from a low of 3.9 to a high of 4.7, there was agreement between the three groups in their perceptions of the goals of middle school counseling and the role and function of the counselor. This information was utilized in the development of the evaluation model.

Table 14

Counselors, Administrators, and Teachers Ratings

Counselors (C), Administrators (A), Teachers (T)									
Section	Rating								
	% High			% Neutral			% Low		
	T	A	C	T	A	C	T	A	C
Personal Dev.	91	98	100	8	2	0	1	0	0
Educational Dev.	76	92	100	20	8	0	4	0	0
Career Dev.	68	63	97	24	38	3	8	0	0
Counsel & Guidance	88	95	100	9	5	0	3	0	0
Coordination	73	38	85	17	57	13	9	5	0
Communication	78	90	88	17	5	13	5	5	0
Consulting	83	89	100	11	7	0	4	0	0

Evaluation Model Validation

Twenty-five supervisors/coordinators of guidance from school systems in Virginia were selected to participate in the validation process. The supervisor/coordinator of guidance from all systems that had at least three middle schools in their school system was asked to participate (see Appendix B). A cover letter and the evaluation model were sent to the responses. Six

supervisors that responded to the validation process and checked the responses to the items, indicated which items were already being done in their division. A large majority of the items received a “yes” answer from the supervisor/coordinator of guidance in each of these school systems. Twenty supervisors/coordinators returned the model to the researcher. This represented a return rate of 80%.

The supervisors/coordinators varied in their comments on the model. One model was returned with no comment at all and one supervisor offered to help get the model published when it was completed. The indications from the returned models were that the instructions were clear and that it was not too difficult. Seven supervisors wanted a copy of the final model. Seven respondents chose to mark the answer for each of the items in the model as they pertained to their school system. One respondent who answered the model had 52 “yes” responses, six “no” responses, and two “uncertain” responses. Six supervisors that responded to the validation process and checked the responses to the items, indicated which items were already being done in their division. A large majority of the items received a “yes” answer.

Overall, there was acceptance and validation of the evaluation model, its contents, and the format. Comments from the supervisors of guidance indicated they thought there was a need for research in this area, a need for middle school counseling evaluation, and this document would be extremely



Table 15

Percentage of High, Neutral, Low, and Mean Ratings for All Respondents

All Respondents				
Sections	Pct. High	Pct. Neutral	Pct. Low	Mean Rating
Personal	93	6	1	4.7
Educational	81	16	3	4.2
Career	71	23	6	3.9
Counseling & Guidance	90	7	3	4.5
Coordinating	73	19	8	4.0
Communicating	80	15	4	4.1
Consulting	87	10	3	4.4
N = 63				

helpful to them. Two supervisors thought the model was long, but felt everything included was necessary and that it would be difficult to make it shorter. Most of the comments from the supervisors had to do with the wording of the items, for example, the use of the words “annually” or “yearly” and “user” or “client” survey. The comment was that the researcher

needed to be consistent. One supervisor added a #16 to the Input section, “District supervisor plays a role in the guidance program.” The suggestion here indicated that the introduction could contain a statement that each school or division can add an item, or items, to the model to make it a more appropriate instrument for them.

Virginia mandates that middle school counselors spend 60% of their day doing individual or small group counseling. One supervisor suggested the researcher reverse the words “guidance and counseling” to “counseling and guidance” since the emphasis is on counseling. After reading this suggestion, the researcher changed the order of the words throughout the dissertation.

No supervisor/coordinator suggested that the evaluation model’s content or format was inappropriate for evaluating middle school counseling and guidance. All comments and suggestions from the supervisors/coordinators of guidance were considered and an updated version of the evaluation model was developed (see Appendix B).

## Chapter V

### Summary and Conclusions

#### Introduction

The first four chapters presented the purpose and the objectives of the study, a selected review of the literature, a summary of methods and procedures, and an analysis of the findings. Chapter V provides a summary of the study and its findings with conclusions and recommendations. Included are suggestions for further study.

#### Purpose

The purpose of this study was to develop an evaluation model that could be used to evaluate urban, rural, or suburban middle school counseling and guidance. In addition, the study provided a questionnaire to gather information on perceptions of counselors, teachers, and administrators on the goals of middle school counseling and guidance and on the role and function of the middle school counselor. The analysis of the data from the questionnaire and the information provided by the review of the literature were crucial to identifying the components necessary to adapt the CIPP Model to a middle school counseling and guidance evaluation model.

#### Objectives

There were four objectives for this study. The first objective was to develop, administer, and analyze results of a questionnaire: (a) to determine

whether evaluations were being performed in counseling and guidance; (b) to determine whether a specific model was used and, if so, which one; and (c) to provide information for the contents of the evaluation model on goals of middle school counseling and guidance and the role and function of the middle school counselor. The last objective was to identify, adapt, and validate an evaluation model (see Appendix B) that could be used to evaluate urban, rural, or suburban middle school counseling and guidance.

### Literature

A review of the literature revealed that middle school counseling and guidance programs are not being evaluated by counselors. Counselors resist program planning and evaluation for many reasons (Lombana, 1985). The literature suggests that counselors do not evaluate the program because:

- (a) they do not know how (Myrick, 1990); (b) because they have not been trained to evaluate programs (Lewis, 1983); (c) they do not understand the importance of evaluation (Aubrey, 1982); (d) middle school counseling and guidance lacks identified goals and objectives (Burck & Peterson, 1975);
- (e) there is confusion over research, supervision, and evaluation (Campbell & Robinson, 1990); (f) they feel they do not have time to evaluate (Humes, 1972a); and (g) counselors are threatened by what they perceive could be the negative results of an evaluation of the program (Burck & Peterson, 1975).

Sources in the literature agree that one of the major obstacles to counseling and guidance evaluation is the lack of an evaluation model that could be followed by the urban, rural, and suburban middle school counselor. The literature suggests that it is likely that counselors have resisted program planning and evaluation efforts primarily because most of the evaluation models available to them have been confusing or inappropriate for school situations. Present information about evaluation needs to be expanded into a comprehensive model that is flexible and practical for use in middle school counseling and guidance (Lombana, 1985). According to the literature, no one generally accepted evaluation model has been found that could be used by counselors to evaluate urban, rural, or suburban middle school counseling and guidance.

### Methods

Various sources provided information on goals of middle school counseling and guidance and on the role and function of the middle school counselor. These included: (a) PSYCHLIT database search and Education Resources Information Center database searches, (b) journal articles, books, and their references, (c) the state of Virginia's counseling and guidance standards of learning objectives, (d) The American School Counselor Association's Position Statements, (e) The American Association for

Counseling and Development, (f) The Virginia Counselors Association, (g) information requested and received from other states, and (h) other questionnaires.

A questionnaire was developed, piloted, and administered to teachers, administrators, and counselors in three middle schools in one school system in Virginia. Eighty percent of the questionnaires distributed were returned. Forty-eight teachers, seven administrators, and eight counselors responded to the questionnaire. The data received from the returned questionnaires on the goals of counseling and guidance and the role and function of the counselor were analyzed and used to develop the contents for the evaluation model. The framework from Daniel Stufflebeam's CIPP Evaluation Model was used to develop the evaluation model, which could then be used by middle school counselors to evaluate counseling and guidance. The evaluation model developed by this study was sent to 25 specialists in the counseling field. They were asked to validate the model by offering suggestions and comments for improvement. Twenty supervisors/coordinators of guidance returned the model with their comments and suggestions for improvement. The evaluation model was revised using the suggestions made by the specialists (see Appendix B).

## Results

Personal development. Results of a chi-square analysis indicated that there was no statistically significant difference among the three groups in their ratings

for the goals of counseling and guidance in the Personal Development section of the questionnaire. One hundred percent of the counselors, 98% of the administrators, and 91% of the teachers agreed with the selected goals, thought they were important, and gave them a high rating. Personal Development items were considered important and received the highest average rating from all respondents, a 4.7. This information was then used to form the contents of the evaluation model.

Educational development. In the area of Educational Development, there was a statistically significant difference in the neutral or somewhat important rating. One hundred percent of the counselors gave the items in this section a high or important rating, as did 92% of the administrators. Twenty-one percent of the teachers gave the items a neutral or somewhat important rating; this caused the statically significant difference. Five teachers gave a low or not important rating to one item that suggested a goal of counseling and guidance was to assist students with effective study skills. They may feel the entire faculty works together to meet the goals of counseling and guidance, not the counselors alone. Teachers are involved in assisting students to learn effective study skills because most curricula include study skills as a goal. In response to this interpretation, counselors need to communicate to the faculty the important role that everyone plays in meeting the needs of the students. In

many instances, the counselor acts as a consultant or coordinator to the faculty to meet the goals of counseling and guidance. Six counselors cannot meet the needs of 2000 students without assistance from the faculty, parents, and the community.

The average rating from all respondents in the Educational Development section was a 4.2, which is considered a high or important rating. This information was utilized in the evaluation model by including an item that suggests using other personnel in preparing strategies to meet objectives.

Career development. There was a statistically significant difference between groups on the high or important rating for the Career Development area. Ninety-seven percent of the counselors gave a high or important rating to the Career Development section compared to 63% of administrators and 68% of teachers who gave the career section a high or important rating. No administrator gave any item a low or not important rating but did give items neutral or somewhat important ratings. More teachers rated the items in the Career section neutral and low compared to the other two sections. Thirty-three percent of the teachers did not feel that assisting students to understand career planning was an important goal for counseling and guidance at this level. All teachers and their curricula are important in assisting students to



understand career planning and the impact education has on the development of career skills. Counselors need to convey this important message to teachers and parents. The average rating from all respondents for the Career section was a 3.9, the lowest for all seven sections.

Role and function of counselor. There were four areas under this section on the questionnaire: (a) counseling and guidance, (b) coordinating, (c) communicating, and (d) consulting. There was no statistically significant difference in three areas (a) counseling and guidance, (b) communicating, and (c) consulting. The statistically significant difference was in the area of coordinating. Counselors gave neutral or low ratings to two items-- "responsibility for student records" and "conducting research." Eighty-eight percent did agree that it was important to evaluate counseling and guidance.

Administrators gave low ratings to "the responsibility of the counselor to coordinate efforts among the teachers to show the relationship between course content and careers." Only 14% of the administrators favored counselors doing research, and 28% thought a guidance advisory committee was important. In contrast, the supervisors/coordinators responses indicated that the advisory committee to be an important aspect in the counseling and guidance program and should be a part of the evaluation. Many of the supervisors/coordinators indicated that an advisory committee was already

operating in their Virginia school system. The importance of implementing an advisory committee within the school system is also supported by current literature.

Teachers also did not give a high rating to counselors doing research, and only 52% gave a high rating to evaluation. This was in contrast to supervisors and the literature which states there is a need for evaluation in counseling and guidance.

### Conclusions

The analysis of the data from the questionnaire suggests that the goals of middle school counseling and guidance should emphasize the counselor in the areas of Personal Development and Educational Development. Teachers are involved in assisting students in the area of Career Development because it is incorporated into their curricula. The counselor can act more as a coordinator or consultant in this area especially in suggesting activities for an advisor/advisee program.

The need for a counseling advisory committee was rated neutral or low by the respondents. It is a relatively new trend in schools today to form committees that include parents and students to help formulate policy for many aspects of schools. To meet the needs of students, this committee would be an asset to the counseling department to have such a committee.

Teachers (79%) and counselors (38%) were in disagreement about counselors having the responsibility for students' records in middle schools. If counselors do not have the responsibility, then it becomes the responsibility of core teachers in many schools. This perception would account for the difference in the responses to this question. Some schools have a secretary that takes care of records. Record keeping should be a shared responsibility by both groups to insure accuracy in the contents of each student's cumulative record.

The three stakeholder groups agreed with most of the items on the questionnaire. The same items tended to receive a neutral rating from the three groups. Few respondents gave low ratings to any items. Information for the contents of the evaluation model was garnered from the demographic pages, data from the questionnaire, and information found from all other sources that were reviewed for this study. The basic design of Stufflebeam's CIPP Evaluation Model was used as a framework and guide for the information identified as necessary to conduct a counseling and guidance evaluation in middle schools.

### Discussion and Implications

This study provides an evaluation model that can be used by urban, rural, and suburban middle school counselors to evaluate counseling and

guidance. In addition, it provides information on the goals of middle school counseling and guidance, the role and function of the counselor, and different stakeholders' perceptions of them. This study adds to the very limited literature on middle school counseling and guidance and, in particular, middle school counseling and guidance evaluation. This study provides many reasons counselors need to do evaluations and the many reasons given by counselors for not doing evaluations. Lack of an evaluation model for counselors to follow is one reason counselors do not evaluate counseling and guidance. Counselors are not knowledgeable about evaluation instruments or techniques. The few models found in the literature are inappropriate or not tailored to the particular needs of counselors.

#### Problems and Limitations

Counselors will be concerned about the time required to evaluate counseling and guidance. They must be convinced that the time will be well spent because the results of the evaluation will help them: (a) to meet the needs of the students, (b) to communicate their goals to the stakeholders, and (c) to provide the reasons for the selected goals. The model has four sections: (a) context, (b) input, (c) process, and (d) product. At first glance, it appears to be a very long instrument. Three specialists who validated the model noted the length of the model, but they indicated they could find nothing to omit.

Counselors need to understand that they can start with one section of the evaluation model and become comfortable with it before they attempt another section. They need to realize that all four sections will not be needed all the time. For example, they can choose section one alone or in combination with any of the other three sections. The type of evaluation needed by the counselor will suggest which section of the model to use. A context evaluation will provide direction for program improvement by identifying student needs, adjusting goals, and targeting specific objectives. It also will provide a means to communicate with the stakeholders and gain support for the program.

There is literature to support the idea that middle school counselors need to understand the importance of evaluating middle school counseling and guidance. Counselors need to be encouraged to perform an evaluation. They need an evaluation model that they can understand and that will provide meaningful and valuable information for them to use in planning a comprehensive and developmentally-appropriate program for the special needs of middle school students. Twenty specialists thought there was a need for an evaluation instrument and validated the model that was developed in this study.

The limitation of this study was that the model developed to evaluate counseling and guidance only pertains to middle schools. Identification of the goals of middle school counseling and guidance and the role and function of

the middle school counselor is one practical implication of this study. Another practical implication is that an evaluation model is available for middle school counselors to use to evaluate their program. There are 15 items in each section of the model. The model has flexibility in that more items can be added or items can be changed to tailor the model to meet the evaluation needs for a particular school or division.

#### Suggestions for Further Research

The data from the questionnaire in this study provided evidence that evaluation of middle school counseling and guidance is not being done, and there is no accepted evaluation model for middle school counselors to use. Middle school counseling and guidance evaluation was the focus of this study. Recommendations for further research could be to study the perceptions of stakeholders in elementary or secondary schools as to the goals of the program and the role and function of the counselor. Another study could develop an appropriate evaluation model for elementary or secondary counseling and guidance as there is a lack of an appropriate evaluation model at these levels also.

## References

- Alexander, W. M., & McEwin, C. K. (1989). Schools in the middle: Status and progress. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.
- American School Counselor Association. (1978b). The unique role of the middle/junior high school counselor. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 12(3), 203-205.
- Atkinson, D. R., Furlong, M. J., & Janoff, D. S. (1979). A four-component model for proactive accountability in school counseling. The School Counselor, 26(4), 222-228.
- Aubrey, R. F. (1979). Relationship of guidance and counseling to the established and emerging school curriculum. The School Counselor, 26(3), 150-162.
- Aubrey, R. F. (1982). Program planning and evaluation: Road map of the 80s. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 17(1), 52-60.
- Barret, R. L., & Schmidt, J. (1986). School counselor certification and supervision: Overlooked professional issues. Counselor Education and Supervision, 26, 50-55.
- Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives handbook 1: The cognitive domain. New York: David McKay Co.

- Bohlinger, T. (1976). Middle school guidance: Problems in comprehensiveness and implementation. Middle School Journal, 4, 7.
- Borders, L. D., Bernard, J. M., Dye, H. A., Fong, M. L., Henderson, P., & Nance, D. W. (1991). Curriculum guide for training counseling supervisors: Rationale, development, and implementation. Counselor Education and Supervision, 31, 58-80.
- Burck, H. D., & Peterson, G. W. (1975). Needed: More evaluation, not research. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 53(8), 563-569.
- Bureau of the Census. (1984). Projections of the population by age, sex, and race for the United States: 1983-2080, Middle series. Current Population Reports Series P-25, no. 952. Washington, D.C.
- Campbell, C. A., & Robinson, E. H. (1990). The accountability and research challenge. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 25(1), 72-78.
- Carnegie Task Force on the Education of Young Adolescents. (1989). Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development of the Carnegie Corporation.
- Carroll, M. R. (1985). School counseling - What does the future hold? NASSP Bulletin, 69(485), 2-5.
- Carter, D. G. (1974). Accountability on stage ... again. NASSP Bulletin, 58(374), 37-44.



- Cole, C. (1979). A model for a middle school guidance program. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 13(2), 292-298.
- Crabbs, M. A. (1983). Computer-assisted accountability. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 18(1), 41-45.
- Cronbach, L. T. (1980). Toward reform of program evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Daniels, M. H., Mines, R., Gressard, C. (1981). A meta-model for evaluating counseling programs. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 59(9), 578-582.
- Eisner, E. W. (1967). Educational objectives: Help or hindrance? The School Review, 75, 250-260.
- Fitz-Gibbon, C. T., & Morris, L. L. (1987). How to design a program evaluation. New York: SAGE.
- Gibson, R. L., Mitchell, M. H., & Higgins, R. E. (1983). Development and management of counseling programs and guidance services. New York: Macmillan.
- Gubser, M. M. (1974). Performance-based counseling: Accountability or liability? The School Counselor, 21(4), 296-302.
- Henerson, M. E., Morris, L. L., & Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. (1987). How to measure attitudes. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

- Hoffman, L. R. (1991). A temporary win for school counseling. The Virginia Counselor, 33(4), 1.
- House, E. R. (1978). Assumptions underlying evaluation models. Educational Researcher, 7(8), 4-12.
- Humes, C. W. (1972a). Accountability: A boon to guidance. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51(4), 21-26.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1981a). Standards for evaluations of educational programs, projects, and materials. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1981b). Principles and by-laws. Western Michigan University Evaluation Center.
- Krumboltz, J.D. (1974). An accountability model for counselors. The Personnel & Guidance Journal, 52(10), 639-646.
- Lewis, J. D. (1983). Guidance program evaluation: How to do it. The School Counselor, 31(2), 111-119.
- Lombana, J. H. (1985). Guidance accountability: A new look at an old problem. The School Counselor, 32(5), 340-346.
- Madaus, G. F., Scriven, M. S., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (Eds.). (1983). Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.

- Mathison, S. (1991). What do we know about internal evaluation? Evaluation and Program Planning, 14(3), 159-165.
- Metfessel, N. S., & Michael, W. B. (1967). A paradigm involving multiple criterion measures for the evaluation of the effectiveness of school programs. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 27, 931-943.
- Miller, G. M. (1988). Counselor functions in excellent schools: Elementary through secondary. The School Counselor, 36(2), 88-93.
- Miller, J. V., & Grisdale, G. A. (1975). Guidance program evaluation: What's out there? Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 8(3), 145-154.
- Miller, G. M., & Pappas, J. P. (1978). Middle school counselors view their priorities. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 12(4), 289-293.
- Myrick, R. D. (1990). Retrospective measurement: An accountability tool. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 25(1), 21-29.
- Patton, M. Q. (1978). Utilization-focused evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Pine, G. J. (1975). Evaluating school counseling programs: Retrospect and prospect. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 8(3), 136-144.
- Popham, W. J. (1971). Criterion-referenced measurement. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

- Provus, M. M. (1969). Discrepancy evaluation model. Pittsburgh, PA: Pittsburgh Public Schools.
- Provus, M. M. (1971). Discrepancy evaluation. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Provus, M. M. (1971). Discrepancy evaluation for educational program improvement and assessment. Beverly Hills, CA: McCutchan.
- Pulvino, C. J., & Sanborn, M. P. (1972). Feedback and accountability. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51(8), 15-20.
- Rogers, C. (1942). Counseling and psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rye, D. R., & Sparks, R. (1991). Planning and management: Keys to a successful K-12 counseling program. The School Counselor, 38(4), 263-267.
- Scales, P. C. (1991). A portrait of young adolescents in the 1990s: Implications for promoting healthy growth and development. Carrboro, NC. Center for Early Adolescence: The University of NC at Chapel Hill.
- Scriven, M. S. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. In R. E. Stake (Ed.), Curriculum evaluation. AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, Book 1. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Scriven, M. S. (1975). Evaluation bias and its control. Kalamazoo: The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University.

- Shami, M. A., Hershkowitz, M., & Shami, K. K. (1974). Dimensions of accountability. NASSP, 58(401), 1-12.
- Stake, R. E. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation. Teachers College Record, 68, 523-540.
- Stamm, M., & Nissman, B. (1979). Improving middle school guidance: Practical procedures for counselors, teachers and administrators. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Strang, R. (1953). The role of the teacher in personnel work. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1968). Evaluation as enlightenment for decision making. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Evaluation Center.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., Foley, W. J., Gephart, W. J., Guba, E. G., Hammond, R. L., Merriman, H. O., Provus, M. M. (1971). Educational evaluation and decision-making. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan Study Committee on Education.
- Stufflebeam, D., Foley, W. J., Gephart, W. J., Guba, E. G., Hammond, R., Merriman, H. O., & Provus, M. M. (1971). Educational evaluation and decision making. Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1978). Meta evaluation: An overview. Evaluation and the Health Profession, 2, 1.

- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1983). The CIPP model for program evaluation. In G. G. Madaus, & M. Scriven, & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), Evaluation models. Boston, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., McCormick, C. H., Brinkerhoff, R. D., Nelson, C. O. (1985). Conducting educational needs assessment. Hingham, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (1985). Systematic evaluation: A self-instructional guide to theory and practice. Boston, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Terrill, J. L. (1990). Toward the 1990s: Emerging themes in school counseling. NASSP Bulletin, 74(527), 84-88.
- Traxler, A. E. (1957). Techniques of guidance. New York: Harper.
- Trembley, E. L., & Bishop, J. B. (1974). Counseling centers and the issue of accountability. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 52(6), 647-652.
- Tyler, R. W. (1967). Changing concepts of educational evaluation. In: R. E. Stake (Ed.), Perspectives of curriculum evaluation, (Vol. 1). New York: Rand McNally.
- Weinrach, S. G. (1975). How effective am I? Five easy steps to self-evaluation. The School Counselor, 22(3), 202-205.
- Wiggins, J. D. (1977). Some counseling does help. The School Counselor, 25(1), 48-51.

- Wiggins, J. D. (1981). Steps to take in evaluating a school's guidance program. NASSP Bulletin, 66(447), 29-33.
- Wiggins, J. D. (1985). Six steps toward counseling program accountability. NASSP BULLETIN, 69(485), 28-31.
- Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. (Eds.). (1973). Educational evaluation: Theory and practice. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Zytowski, D. G. (1975). Editor's page. Measurement & Evaluation in Guidance, 8(3), 132-133.

**Appendix A**  
**Questionnaire**  
**and Related Materials**



## Pilot Letter

Ann S. Harrison  
Salem Middle School  
March 16, 1992

Dear Colleague:

I am writing my dissertation in the area of middle school counseling and guidance. One section of my dissertation is a questionnaire on the goals and objectives of the middle school guidance and counseling program and the role and function of the counselor. The questionnaire has been constructed and now needs to be piloted for necessary revisions. A sample of middle school core teachers, middle school counselors, and middle school administrators will be asked to complete the questionnaire. The title page and the demographic page are different for counselors and teachers/administrators, but the questions in the questionnaire are the same.

It would help me if you would read it with the following questions in mind:

1. Are the instructions specific and unambiguous?
2. Is there a simpler or more direct way to ask the question?
3. Are there confusing words in the statement?
4. Is the vocabulary appropriate for the respondents?
5. Is it too long? If so, what would you remove?
6. Is it too difficult?
7. Any comments or suggestions would be greatly appreciated. Please make them right on the questionnaire.

I do know how busy you are at this time of year and I am asking you to do one more thing. Sorry.

Please return the questionnaire and your comments to me at Salem Middle School.

Thank you in advance for your time,

Ann Harrison

## Principal's Letter

Ann S. Harrison  
1620 Westerfield Road  
Virginia Beach, VA 23455  
May 18, 1992

Dear Principal:

I appreciate your school system's willingness to allow me to distribute a questionnaire concerning the middle school counseling and guidance. Any assistance that you or your designee can provide me in distributing these questionnaires in your school will be greatly appreciated. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to facilitate this endeavor.

There are two forms; one is green for the counselors, and the other is brown for administrators and core teachers in grades six, seven, and eight. I am asking that they be returned to you by May 27th. I will pick them up on Thursday, May 28th, 1992.

Respectfully,

Ann S. Harrison  
2380 Lynnhaven Parkway  
Virginia Beach, VA 23464  
(H) 464-0737  
(W) 474-8412

## Teacher and Administrator Letter

Ann S. Harrison  
1620 Westerfield Road  
Virginia Beach, VA 23455  
May 11, 1992

Dear Middle School Teacher or Administrator:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Ph.D. degree in Urban Services from Old Dominion University, I am conducting research on the goals of the middle school counseling program and the role and function of the middle school counselor. This information will then be used in developing an evaluation model for the middle school guidance and counseling program. The Chesapeake school system has been selected to participate in this study, and you are being asked to respond to a questionnaire.

The research on school counseling is very limited in the area of middle school and middle school program evaluation. Most research is done on the elementary or secondary level. The middle school counselor and the program need an identity of their own to best meet the special needs of early adolescence.

I would appreciate it if you would take time from your busy schedule, especially at this time of the year, and answer this Middle School Guidance and Counseling Program Goals and Counselor Role and Function Questionnaire, and return it to the appropriate person at your school by May 27, 1992. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call me at home (464-0737) or at work (474-8412).

I am most grateful for your time and concern for middle level students.

Sincerely yours,

Ann S. Harrison

## Counselor Letter

Ann S. Harrison  
1620 Westerfield Road  
Virginia Beach, VA 23455  
May 11, 1992

Dear Middle School Counselor:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Ph.D. degree in Urban Services from Old Dominion University, I am conducting research on the goals of the middle school counseling program and the role and function of the middle school counselor. This information will then be used in developing an evaluation model for the middle school guidance and counseling program. Your school system has been selected to participate in this study, and you are being asked to take part in this study.

The research on school counseling is very limited in the area of middle school and middle school program evaluation. Most research is done on the elementary or secondary level. The middle school counselor and the program need an identity of their own to best meet the special needs of early adolescence.

I would appreciate it if you would take time from your busy schedule at this time of the year and answer this Middle School Guidance and Counseling Program Goals and Counselor Role and Function Questionnaire, and return it to the appropriate person at your school by May 27, 1992. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call me at home (464-0737) or at work (474-8412).

I am most grateful for your time and concern for middle level students.

Sincerely yours,

Ann S. Harrison

The following is a list of the 49 items contained in the questionnaire.

Personal Development

The Counseling and Guidance program will assist students to:

1. develop an understanding of and methods used to cope with rapid and erratic physical and emotional changes typical of early adolescence and the effects these have upon attitudes, behavior and interpersonal relationships.
2. learn to respect, understand, and accept themselves in order to improve self-esteem and responsible behavior.
3. develop an understanding of the importance of self-discipline, self-motivation, and school attendance and how these relate to school achievement.
4. develop an understanding of the impact personal behavior has upon others (all backgrounds), methods of enhancing those interactions, and to take personal responsibility for these actions.
5. develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes which enable understanding of the emotional and physical dangers of the effects of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs.
6. develop effective decision-making/problem-solving skills and accept responsibility for making decisions.

7. recognize the effects of stress and demonstrate appropriate methods for coping with life's pressures, challenges, defeats, and successes.
8. develop communication skills for effective interpersonal relationships with family, peers, and significant others.

#### Educational Development

The counseling and guidance program will assist students to:

9. pursue a planned and balanced program of studies consistent with abilities, interests, and present and future educational needs.
10. gain knowledge of effective study skills.
11. identify basic skills needed in various interest areas and evaluate for their own level of ability.
12. acquire knowledge of curricular alternatives available in the school and the career goals to which they may lead.
13. become informed about alternative educational and vocational choices and the preparation needed for them.
14. maintain their motivation to learn, striving to help them fulfill their potential and helping them to accept responsibility for their own learning and to seek out new learning experiences.
15. maximize their academic potential and incorporate exploratory career concepts into their educational experiences.

Career Development

The counseling and guidance program will assist students to:

16. develop an understanding of the relation of work to self-fulfillment and to the needs of the family and society.
17. complete an individual education and career plan for middle school and high school.
18. choose academic and extra-curricular activities consistent with their career goals.
19. learn effective learning habits and skills that are transferable to career and learning situations.
20. relate personal interests, values, abilities, and skills to occupational areas.
21. know the meaning of career planning and what resources are available in the career center.
22. develop general career skills, aptitudes, and work habits, and make a self-assessment of career prospects.
23. understand the effect a changing society and technology have on occupations.

### Counselor Role and Function

Listed below are functions that could be performed by a middle school counselor. Please indicate the relative importance the function has to you as you take into account the restraints of time, money, and resources.

Functions of the counselor could include:

#### Counseling and Guidance

24. identifying students in need of special assistance and providing counseling or referring them and their parents to the appropriate community agency or support service.
25. providing individual and on-going group counseling for life adjustment and personal development issues.
26. providing crisis counseling as needed, individually or in small groups.
27. developing professional competence and an awareness of contemporary trends in counseling.
28. conducting group guidance sessions for educational, career, or personal issues to foster goal setting, problem solving, and decision-making.

#### Coordinating

29. coordinating services for students and their parents, both within and outside the school, to insure communication and to avoid duplication.



30. coordinating, implementing, and interpreting achievement, aptitude, and interest testing programs to students and parents.
31. being responsible for educational placement within the school.
32. providing orientation programs so that a smooth transition occurs between the elementary, middle, and secondary levels of school.
33. conducting research and presenting data on pilot programs for implementation.
34. utilizing a program evaluation model for the purpose of accountability and continued program analysis and refinement.
35. encouraging teachers to refer students, and providing a systematic means to provide appropriate feedback.
36. being responsible for the students' cumulative records.
37. organizing and administering a comprehensive, developmental guidance and counseling program which is student centered.
38. establishing a mission statement, philosophy, and goals for the guidance and counseling program which are reviewed annually.
39. conducting a student needs assessment.
40. providing for a guidance advisory committee with staff, parents, and students as members.

- 41. coordinating efforts among the staff to show the relationship between course content and careers.
- 42. coordinating structured opportunities for students through advisor/advisee time in areas such as test-taking skills, study skills, problem solving, and decision-making skills.

#### Communicating

- 43. fostering communication by linking students, parents, community, and the school.
- 44. communicating the guidance program and its services to students, school personnel, parents, and the community.
- 45. communicating evaluation results and program planning to the different interested groups.

#### Consulting

- 46. consulting with parents, teachers, and others on developmental or adjustment problems of the student.
- 47. consulting with teachers, parents, and others on student developmental needs and concerns.
- 48. providing information about curriculum for student program planning.
- 49. serving as a member of core teams and consultant to advisory teachers to coordinate guidance programs and advisor/advisee programs.

**TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR  
QUESTIONNAIRE**

**MIDDLE SCHOOL  
GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING  
PROGRAM GOALS  
AND  
COUNSELOR ROLE AND FUNCTION**

Ann S. Harrison  
1620 Westerfield Road  
Virginia Beach, VA 23455  
(804) 464-0737

Director of Guidance  
Salem Junior High School  
1620 Lynnhaven Parkway  
Virginia Beach, VA 23462  
(804) 474-8412

## TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

### DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

**PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.**

#### **PERSONAL DATA**

1. Position in a middle school:  
☐ a. principal  
☐ b. assistant principal  
☐ c. teacher
2. Gender:  
☐ a. male  
☐ b. female
3. Age:  
☐ a. under 30  
☐ b. 31 - 40  
☐ c. 41 - 50  
☐ d. over 50
4. Years of experience in current position:  
☐ a. less than 5  
☐ b. between 5 and 15  
☐ c. between 16 and 25  
☐ d. over 25
5. Years of experience in a school:  
☐ a. less than 5  
☐ b. between 5 and 15  
☐ c. between 16 and 25  
☐ d. over 25
6. Years of experience in a middle school:  
☐ a. less than 5  
☐ b. between 5 and 15

- \_\_\_ c. between 16 and 25  
 \_\_\_ d. over 25

7. Education:  
 \_\_\_ a. bachelors  
 \_\_\_ b. masters  
 \_\_\_ c. Ed.S./CAS  
 \_\_\_ d. doctorate

This questionnaire lists possible goals of a middle school guidance and counseling program and the role and function of the counselor. Please circle one number for each statement which most nearly represents your opinion.

#### KEY

- 5 = Very important  
 4 = Important  
 3 = Somewhat Important  
 2 = Of little Importance  
 1 = Not Important  
 0 = No Opinion

## GOALS OF THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM

### PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

The guidance and counseling program will assist students to:

Degree of  
Importance

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. develop an understanding of and methods used to cope with rapid and erratic physical and emotional changes typical of early adolescence and the effects these have upon attitudes, behavior and interpersonal relationships. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 2. learn to respect, understand, and accept themselves in order to improve self-esteem  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. develop an understanding of the importance of self-discipline, self-motivation, and school attendance and how these relate to school achievement.   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 4. develop an understanding of the impact personal behavior has upon others (all backgrounds), methods of enhancing those interactions, and to take personal responsibility for these actions. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 5. develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes which enable understanding of the emotional and physical dangers of the effects of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs.                              | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 6. develop effective decision making/problem solving skills and accept responsibility for making decisions.  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 7. recognize the effects of stress and demonstrate appropriate methods for coping with life's pressures, challenges, defeats, and successes.   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 8. develop communication skills for effective interpersonal relationships with family, peers and significant others.   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

**KEY****5 = Very important****4 = Important****3 = Somewhat Important****2 = Of Little Importance****1 = Not Important****0 = No Opinion**

## EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The guidance and counseling program will assist students to:

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| 9. pursue a planned and balanced program of studies consistent with abilities, interests, and present and future educational needs.  | 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 10. gain knowledge of effective study skills.  | 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 11. identify basic skills needed in various interest areas and evaluate for their own level of ability.  | 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 12. acquire knowledge of curricular alternatives available in the school and the career goals to which they may lead.  | 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 13. become informed about alternative educational and vocational choices and the preparation needed for them.  | 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 14. maintain their motivation to learn, striving to help them fulfill their potential and helping them to accept responsibility for their own learning and to seek out new learning experiences. | 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 15. maximize their academic potential and incorporate exploratory career-concepts into their educational experiences.  | 5 4 3 2 1 0 |

## CAREER DEVELOPMENT

The guidance and counseling program will assist students to:

16. develop an understanding of the relation of work

to self- fulfillment and to the needs of the family and society.	5	4	3	2	1	0
17. complete an individual education and career plan for middle school and high school.	5	4	3	2	1	0
18. choose academic and extra-curricular activities consistent with their career goals.	5	4	3	2	1	0
19. learn effective learning habits and skills that are transferable to career and learning situations.	5	4	3	2	1	0
20. relate personal interests, values, abilities, and skills to occupational areas.	5	4	3	2	1	0
21. know the meaning of career planning and what resources are available in the career center.	5	4	3	2	1	0
22. develop general career skills, aptitudes, and work habits and, make a self-assessment of career prospects.	5	4	3	2	1	0
23. understand the effect a changing society and technology have on occupations.	5	4	3	2	1	0

## COUNSELOR ROLE AND FUNCTION

Listed below are functions that could be performed by a middle school counselor. Please indicate the relative importance the function has to you as you take into account the restraints of time, money, and resources. Please circle one response to each statement WHICH MOST NEARLY REFLECTS YOUR OPINION.

### KEY

5 = Very Important



- 4 = Important  
 3 = Somewhat Important  
 2 = Of Little Importance  
 1 = Not Important  
 0 = No Opinion

**FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNSELOR COULD INCLUDE:**  
**COUNSELING and GUIDANCE**

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24. identifying students in need of special assistance and providing counseling or referring them and their parents to the appropriate community agency or support service. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 25. providing individual and on-going group counseling for life adjustment and personal development issues.   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 26. providing crisis counseling as needed, individually or in small groups.   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 27. developing professional competence and an awareness of contemporary trends in counseling.   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 28. conducting group guidance sessions for educational, career, or personal issues to foster goal setting, problem solving and decision-making.                             | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

**COORDINATING**

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29. coordinating services for students and their parents both within and outside the school to insure communication and to avoid duplication. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 30. coordinating, implementing, and interpreting achievement, aptitude, and interest testing programs to students and parents.                | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31. being responsible for educational placement within the school.  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 32. providing orientation programs so that a smooth transition occurs between the elementary, middle, and secondary levels of school. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 33. conducting research and presenting data on pilot programs for implementation.   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 34. utilizing a program evaluation model for the purpose of accountability and continued program analysis and refinement.             | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 35. encouraging teachers to refer students, and providing a systematic means to provide appropriate feedback.                         | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 36. being responsible for the students' cumulative records.   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 37. organizing and administering a comprehensive, developmental guidance and counseling program which is student centered.            | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 38. establishing a mission statement, philosophy, and goals for the guidance and counseling program which are reviewed annually.      | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 39. conducting a student needs assessment.  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 40. providing for a guidance advisory committee with staff, parents, and students as members.   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 41. coordinating efforts among the staff to show the relationship between course content and careers.                                 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 42. coordinating structured opportunities for students through advisor/advisee time in areas  |   |   |   |   |   |   |

such as test taking skills, study skills, problem solving, and decision making skills.

5 4 3 2 1 0

### COMMUNICATING

43. fostering communication by linking students/parents/ community and the school.

5 4 3 2 1 0

44. communicating the guidance program and its services to students, school personnel, parents, and the community.

5 4 3 2 1 0

45. communicating evaluation results and program planning to the different interested groups.

5 4 3 2 1 0

### CONSULTING

46. consulting with parents, teachers, and others on developmental or adjustment problems of the student.

5 4 3 2 1 0

47. consulting with teachers, parents, and others on student developmental needs and concerns.

5 4 3 2 1 0

48. providing information about curriculum for student program planning.

5 4 3 2 1 0

49. serving as a member of core teams and consultant to advisory teachers to coordinate guidance programs and advisor/advisee programs.

5 4 3 2 1 0

**COUNSELOR  
QUESTIONNAIRE**

**MIDDLE SCHOOL  
GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING  
PROGRAM GOALS  
AND  
COUNSELOR ROLE AND FUNCTION**

Ann S. Harrison Director of Guidance  
1620 Westerfield Road  
Salem Junior High School Virginia Beach, VA 23455  
1620 Lynnhaven Parkway  
Virginia Beach, VA 23462  
(804) 464-0737  
(804) 474-8412

## COUNSELORS

### DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

**PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.**

#### PERSONAL DATA

1. Position:  
☐ a. counselor  
☐ b. director of guidance
2. Gender:  
☐ a. male  
☐ b. female
3. Age:  
☐ a. under 30  
☐ c. 41 - 50  
☐ b. 31 - 40  
☐ d. over 50
4. Years of school counseling experience:  
☐ a. less than 5  
☐ c. between 16 and 25  
☐ b. between 5 and 15  
☐ d. over 25
5. Years of school counseling in a middle school:  
☐ a. less than 5  
☐ b. between 5 and 15  
☐ c. between 16 and 25  
☐ d. over 25
6. Education:  
☐ a. bachelors  
☐ c. Ed.S/CAS  
☐ b. masters  
☐ d. doctorate

**COUNSELOR/PROGRAM DATA**

1. Number of counselees assigned:  
  - ☐ a. under 200
  - ☐ c. between 300 and 350
  - ☐ b. between 200 and 300
  - ☐ d. over 350
2. Assignment of students by:  
  - ☐ a. grade level
  - ☐ c. core
  - ☐ b. alphabetically
  - ☐ d. other
3. Is there a written philosophy for your guidance program?  
  - ☐ a. yes
  - ☐ b. no
4. Are there written goals for your guidance program?  
  - ☐ a. yes
  - ☐ b. no
5. Is there an established system wide guidance curriculum?  
  - ☐ a. yes
  - ☐ b. no
6. Is there a job description for guidance counselors?  
  - ☐ a. yes
  - ☐ b. no
7. Do you coordinate the HOMEbase/Advisor/advisee program?  
  - ☐ a. yes
  - ☐ b. no

8. Is a formal evaluation of the guidance program done regularly?

- ☐ a. yes
- ☐ b. no

9. If yes, do you have a particular model that you follow?

- ☐ a. yes
- ☐ b. no

Name of model \_\_\_\_\_

10. What percentage of the counselor's time is spent in individual or small group counseling?

- ☐ a. 30% - 40%
- ☐ b. 40% - 50%
- ☐ c. 50% - 60%
- ☐ d. 60% - 70%
- ☐ e. 70% - 80%

**Appendix B**  
**Evaluation Model**  
**and Related Materials**



The following information was used to identify the supervisors/coordinators of guidance in Virginia: Virginia Educational Directory, 1992 and Virginia Department of Education

Twenty-five counties/cities in Virginia have three or more middle schools with no ninth grade.

This study's evaluation model was sent to supervisors/coordinators of guidance for validation to the following 25 counties/cities.

COUNTIES	MIDDLE SCHOOLS	GRADES
Accomack	3	6-8
Albemarle	4	6-8
Arlington	4	6-8
Augusta	3	6-8
Bedford	3	(2)7-8 (1)6-8
Chesterfield	10	6-8
Fairfax	20	(2)6-8 (18)7-8
Hanover	3	6-8
Henrico	6	6-8
Henry	4	6-8
Loudoun	4	6-8
Prince William	11	6-8
Roanoke	4	(2)6-9 (1)7-9 (1)6-8
Rockingham	4	6-8
Spotsylvania	4	6-8
Stafford	4	6-8
Tazewell	3	6-8
Washington	3	6-8
York	3	7-8

<b>CITIES</b>	<b>MIDDLE SCHOOLS</b>	<b>GRADES</b>
Hampton	5	6-8
Lynchburg	3	6-8
Newport News	7	6-8
Norfolk	8	6-8
Richmond	6	6-8
Roanoke	5	6-8
Suffolk	3	6-8

Ann S. Harrison  
1620 Westerfield Road  
Virginia Beach, VA 23455  
(804) 464-0737  
July 11, 1992

Dear Supervisor/Coordinator of Guidance;

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Ph.D degree in Urban Services from Old Dominion University, I am conducting research in the area of middle school guidance and counseling evaluation. I have constructed, piloted, and distributed a questionnaire that has been sent to middle school counselors, teachers, and administrators. The information gained from the questionnaire was used in developing an evaluation model for middle school guidance and counseling. This model is based on Daniel Stufflebeam's (1971) CIPP Model (Context, Input, Process, and Product).

The research on school counseling is very limited in the area of middle school and middle school guidance and counseling evaluation. Most research is done on the elementary or secondary level. The middle school counselor and the program need an identity of their own to best meet the special needs of early adolescence.

I would appreciate it if you would take time from your busy schedule to look over the evaluation model that I have constructed. It would help me if you would read it with the following questions in mind:

1. Are the instructions specific and clearly stated?
2. Is there a simpler or more direct way to make the statements?
3. Are there confusing words in the statements?
4. Is the vocabulary appropriate for counselors?
5. Is it too long? If so, what would you remove?
6. Is it too difficult?
7. Any comments or suggestions that you care to make would be greatly appreciated. Please make them right on the model.

Please return the model to me in the enclosed, stamped envelope by August 12, 1992, (if you do not receive this before the due date, please return at your earliest convenience). Please feel free to call me collect at my home -

804-464-0737 if you have any questions. After compiling the results, I will send you an analysis if you will include your name and address on the model.

I am most grateful for your time and concern for middle level students.

Sincerely yours,  
Ann S. Harrison

### Revised Version of the Evaluation Model

This middle school guidance and counseling program evaluation model has been developed because, as a part of the evolving middle school movement, counselors working at this level have been seeking an identity for themselves and their programs apart from those described for elementary schools and high schools. In addition, middle school counseling programs need to provide evidence of their accomplishments and their relevance to the special needs of early adolescent students. The information in the model was generated, in part, by a questionnaire answered by middle school counselors, teachers, and administrators. This model has been validated by twenty supervisors/coordinators in Virginia.

The evaluation model is divided into four sections based on Daniel Stufflebeam's CIPP Model of Evaluation. The four types of evaluations in this model correspond to the four types of guidance decisions that must be made.

1. Context Evaluation - providing direction for improving counseling and guidance by identifying client needs, adjusting goals, and targeting specific objectives.

2. Input Evaluation - structuring decisions for designing programs and activities.

3. Process Evaluation - implementing decisions for using, monitoring, and improving these procedures.

4. Product Evaluation - recycling decisions for judging and reacting to the outcomes produced by those procedures.

The advantage of this model is that it consists of four distinct evaluation types that allows the evaluator to use one evaluation type, some combination of evaluation types, or all four evaluation types (CONTEXT, INPUT, PROCESS, OR PRODUCT), depending on the needs of the audiences. This evaluation model requires documentation to be included in the evaluation to further insure accountability of middle school guidance and counseling and the role and function of the counselor. Accountability can help improve the counseling and guidance situation. For example, after an evaluation, there can be evidence that the secretarial help assigned to the counseling department is inadequate and more should be provided.

Another advantage of this model is that individual schools or school systems can add to the statements, making it more appropriate for their needs.

#### CONTEXT EVALUATION

**OBJECTIVE:** To define the middle school guidance and counseling program framework, to identify opportunities for addressing the needs, to

diagnose problems underlying the needs, and to judge whether proposed objectives are sufficiently responsive to the assessed needs.

A “YES” answer for number 1 would indicate that there is an advisory committee in place. Documentation would then be labeled **CONTEXT EVALUATION - DOCUMENTATION #1** and could include, for example, the names of those serving on the committee, evidence of scheduled meetings, and a mission statement for the advisory council.

A “YES” answer for number 2 would indicate that there is a written philosophy for the guidance and counseling program. This documentation would be labeled **CONTEXT EVALUATION - DOCUMENTATION #2** and would include the philosophy of the program.

The completed evaluation form and the documentation would be available to anyone (principal, supervisor) who needs to see the evaluation of the program.

PLEASE PLACE A CHECK IN THE  
APPROPRIATE COLUMN.

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
1. A guidance advisory committee has been formed and meets regularly.	—	—	—
2. A philosophy and the goals of the guidance and counseling program have been written and are reviewed annually.	—	—	—
3. Needs assessment instruments have been selected and administered.	—	—	—
4. Students' needs, those identified by the needs assessment, have been prioritized.	—	—	—
5. The results of the needs assessment are used in planning programs and activities.	—	—	—
6. Proposed objectives are responsive to the assessed needs of the different populations served.	—	—	—



	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
7. Strategies/activities have been developed to achieve the stated objectives.	—	—	—
8. Personnel, resources, time, and facilities have been identified in the preparation for each strategy/activity.	—	—	—
9. A written, publicized program of services reflects the prioritized needs of the different populations served.	—	—	—
10. An evaluation component is included in planned activities.	—	—	—
11. There is a K-12 Guidance Curriculum consisting of structured, developmental experiences presented systematically through classroom and group activities.	—	—	—
12. The students receive a schoolwide system of guidance with teachers and all curriculums involved.	—	—	—

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
13. A client survey is conducted to determine how they (students, parents, teachers, administrators, and counselors) perceived middle school counseling and guidance.	—	—	—
14. The strengths and weaknesses of counseling and guidance have been identified by using client surveys or interviews.	—	—	—
15. Needed changes in the program have been identified.	—	—	—
16.	—	—	—
17.	—	—	—

## PROCESS EVALUATION

**OBJECTIVE:** To identify or predict, while the activity is taking place, problems in the design or its implementation, to provide information for the decisions that were made, and to record and judge procedural events and activities..

A "YES" answer for number 1 would indicate that program activities are monitored in terms of process as they are being delivered. Documentation would be labeled **PROCESS EVALUATION - DOCUMENTATION # 1** and could include the name of a particular activity, how it was monitored, and the final evaluation of the activity by the counselor and the students.

YES NO UNCERTAIN

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Program activities are monitored in terms of process as they are being delivered, looking for unanticipated results. | <div style="display: inline-block; width: 50px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-right: 20px;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 50px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-right: 20px;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 50px; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></div> |
| 2. | Program activities are monitored to see if they are on schedule.   | <div style="display: inline-block; width: 50px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-right: 20px;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 50px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-right: 20px;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 50px; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></div> |

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
3. Program activities are monitored to see if they are being carried out as planned.	—	—	—
4. Program activities are monitored to see if the available resources, materials and personnel, are being used in an efficient manner.	—	—	—
5. Program activities are monitored to see if they correspond to the systems K-12 guidance curriculum.	—	—	—
6. Program activities are monitored to see if the activities are developmentally appropriate for early adolescents.	—	—	—
7. As a result of monitoring the programs: there are records of the programs; how they were actually implemented; how they compared to what was intended; and how observers, participants, and			

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
providers judged the quality of the programs.	—	—	—
8. A process is in place for using other professional resources of the school and community to refer students when appropriate, and a record is maintained of these referrals.	—	—	—
9. The process of identifying student needs is evaluated and updated.	—	—	—
10. The goals and objectives of the total program are evaluated and updated.	—	—	—
11. The process of identifying new resource materials is evaluated and updated.	—	—	—
12. The process of identifying the programs strengths and weaknesses is evaluated and updated.	—	—	—

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
13. The process of interpreting standardized testing information to teachers, students, and parents is evaluated and updated.	—	—	—
14. The orientation program developed to acquaint staff, students, and parents with the goals and purposes of the guidance program is reviewed and updated.	—	—	—
15. The process of coordinating the advisor/advisee program is monitored and updated.	—	—	—
16.	—	—	—
17.	—	—	—

## PRODUCT EVALUATION

**OBJECTIVE:** To collect descriptions and judgments of outcomes and to relate them to objectives and to context, input, and process information, and to interpret their worth and merit.

A "YES" answer for number 1 would indicate that there are small group counseling sessions as a part of the guidance program. Documentation would be labeled **PRODUCT EVALUATION - DOCUMENTATION #1** and could include the topics of the groups, the number of groups held, the number of students who participated in the groups, evaluations of the group sessions and evaluation of individual students who participated in the groups by the students themselves, counselor, teachers, or parents. A "YES" answer for number 2 - documentation could include the number of students seen individually during a designated time period.

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
1. The guidance program provides for small group counseling sessions.	—	—	—
2. The guidance program provides for individual counseling with students.	—	—	—

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
3. The guidance program provides for classroom guidance sessions.	—	—	—
4. The guidance program provides for coordinating services for students and their parents both within and outside the school.	—	—	—
5. The guidance program provides for coordinating, implementing, and/or interpreting achievement, aptitude, and interest testing programs to students and parents.	—	—	—
6. The guidance program provides for educational placement within the school.	—	—	—
7. The guidance program provides an orientation for a smooth transition between the elementary, middle, and secondary levels of school.	—	—	—



	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
8. The guidance program provides a system for promoting staff referrals and providing appropriate feedback.	—	—	—
9. The guidance department organizes and provides a comprehensive, developmental guidance and counseling program which is student centered.	—	—	—
10. The guidance program coordinates structured opportunities for students through advisor/advisee time in areas such as test taking skills, study skills, problem solving, and decision making skills.	—	—	—
11. The guidance program assists faculty and parents to understand the academic abilities of students.	—	—	—

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
12. The guidance program facilitates consulting with parents, teachers and others on developmental or adjustment problems of the student.	—	—	—
13. The guidance program provides information about the curriculum to the student and parent for program planning.	—	—	—
14. The guidance program fosters communication by linking students/parents/community and the school.	—	—	—
15. The guidance program assists students in understanding and developing their aptitudes and abilities as they pertain to school and the world of work.	—	—	—
16.	—	—	—
17.	—	—	—

## Appendix C

### Tables Referred to in Chapter IV

Table C-1

Counselor Ratings for the Personal Section

Counselors						
Goals section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD	
Personal Development	No. %	No. %	No. %			
The guidance and counseling program will assist students to:						
1. cope with changes	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0	
2. accept themselves	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0	
3. understand self-discipline & self-motivation	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0	
4. understand impact of behavior	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0	
5. understand impact of drugs	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0	
6. acquire decision-making skills	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0	
7. recognize effects of stress	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0	
8. develop communication skills	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0	

Table C-2

Administrator Ratings for the Personal Section

Administrators					
Goals section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Personal Development	No. %	No. %	No. %		
The guidance and counseling program will assist students to:					
1. cope with changes	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.3	.49
2. accept themselves	7 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0.0
3. understand self-discipline & self-motivation	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.6	.53
4. understand impact of behavior	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.9	.38
5. understand impact of drugs	6 86	1 14	0 0	4.0	.58
6. acquire decision-making skills	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.1	.38
7. recognize effects of stress	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.9	.38
8. develop communication skills	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.4	.53

Table C-3

Teacher Ratings for the Personal Development Section

Teachers					
Goals section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Personal Development	No. %	No. %	No. %		
The guidance and counseling program will assist students to:					
1. cope with changes	44 92	3 6	1 2	4.7	.69
2. accept themselves	45 94	3 6	0 0	4.7	.58
3. understand self- discipline & self-motivation	48 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	.28
4. understand impact of personal behavior	47 98	1 2	0 0	4.8	.45
5. understand impact of drugs	42 88	6 13	0 0	4.5	.71
6. acquire decision making skills	42 48	5 10	1 2	4.6	.75
7. recognize effects of stress	40 83	7 15	1 2	4.5	.82
8. develop communication skills	42 88	5 10	1 2	4.5	.76

Table C-4

All Respondents Ratings for the Personal Development Section

All Respondents						
Goals section:	High		Neutral		Low	
Personal Development	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
The guidance and counseling program will assist students to:						
1. cope with changes	59	94	3	5	1	2
2. accept themselves	60	95	3	5	0	0
3. understand self- discipline & self-motivation	63	100	0	0	0	0
4. understand impact of personal behavior	62	98	1	2	0	0
5. understand impact of drugs	56	89	7	11	0	0
6. acquire decision-making skills	57	90	5	8	1	2
7. recognize effects of stress	55	87	7	11	1	2
8. develop communication skills	57	90	5	8	1	2

Table C-5

Counselor Ratings for the Educational Development Section

Counselors					
Goals Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Educational Development	No. %	No. %	No. %		
The guidance and counseling program will assist students to:					
9. pursue a planned program of studies	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0.0
10. use effective study skills	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.9	.35
11. understand their ability in interest areas	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.4	.52
12. understand their career goals	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.5	.53
13. understand alternative career choices	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.8	.46
14. accept responsibility for learning	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.8	.46
15. maximize academic potential	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0.0



Table C-6

Administrator Ratings for the Educational Development Section

Administrators					
Goals Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Educational Development	No. %	No. %	No. %		
The guidance and counseling program will assist students to:					
9. pursue a planned program of studies	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.1	.38
10. use effective study skills	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.1	.38
11. understand their ability in interest areas	5 71	2 29	0 0	3.7	.49
12. understand their career goals	6 86	1 14	0 0	4.3	.76
13. understand alternative career choices	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.4	.53
14. accept responsibility for learning	6 86	1 14	0 0	4.0	.58
15. maximize academic potential	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.3	.49

Table C-7

Teacher Ratings for the Educational Development Section

Teachers					
Goals Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Educational Development	No. %	No. %	No. %		
The guidance and counseling program will assist students to:					
9. pursue a planned program of studies	35 73	11 23	2 5	4.2	.93
10. use effective study skills	36 75	7 15	5 10	4.1	1.16
11. understand their ability in interest areas	30 63	15 31	3 6	3.8	.97
12. understand their career goals	35 73	12 25	1 2	4.0	.89
13. understand alternative career choices	42 88	6 13	0 0	4.3	.66
14. accept responsibility for learning	43 90	4 8	1 2	4.5	.73
15. maximize academic potential	36 75	11 23	1 2	4.1	.91

Table C-8

All Respondents Ratings for the Educational Development Section

All Respondents					
Goals Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Educational Development	No. %	No. %	No. %		
The guidance and counseling program will assist students to:					
9. pursue a planned program of studies	50 79	11 17	2 3	4.3	.72
10. use effective study skills	51 81	7 11	5 8	4.1	.86
11. understand their ability in interest areas	43 68	17 27	3 5	3.8	1.07
12. understand their career goals	49 78	13 21	1 2	4.1	.91
13. understand alternative career choices	57 90	6 10	0 0	4.3	.86
14. accept responsibility for learning	57 90	5 8	1 2	4.4	.65
15. maximize academic potential	51 81	11 17	1 2	4.3	.72

Table C-9

Counselor Ratings for the Career Development Section

Counselors					
Goals Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Career Development	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Assist students to:					
16. understand relation of work to self-fulfillment	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.5	.53
17. plan educational needs	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.8	.46
18. academic plans in line with career plans	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.6	.52
19. lifelong learning habits and skills	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.3	.46
20. relate personal abilities to career goal	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.6	.52
21. understand career planning	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.5	.53
22. develop career skills	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.3	.46
23. understand changes in society	6 75	2 25	0 0	4.1	.83

Table C-10

Administrator Ratings for the Career Development Section

Administrators					
Goals Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Career Development	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Assist students to:					
16. understand relation of work to self-fulfillment	3 43	4 57	0 0	3.6	.79
17. plan educational needs	5 71	2 29	0 0	3.9	.69
18. academic plans in line with career plans	6 86	1 14	0 0	3.9	.38
19. lifelong learning habits and skills	2 28	5 71	0 0	3.3	.49
20. relate personal abilities to career goal	3 43	4 57	0 0	3.4	.53
21. understand career planning	5 71	2 29	0 0	4	.82
22. develop career skills	6 86	1 14	0 0	3.9	.38
23. understand changes in society	5 71	2 29	0 0	3.7	.49

Table C-11

Teacher Ratings for the Career Development Section

Teachers					
Goals Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Career Development	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Assist students to:					
16. understand relation of work to self-fulfillment	32 67	14 29	2 4	3.9	.94
17. plan educational needs	31 65	12 25	5 10	3.8	1.00
18. academic plans in line with career plans	32 67	11 23	5 10	3.8	.96
19. lifelong learning habits and skills	36 75	10 21	2 4	4.1	.89
20. relate personal abilities to career goal	37 77	8 17	3 6	4.0	.92
21. understand career planning	28 34	16 33	4 8	3.7	1.10
22. develop career skills	30 63	14 29	4 8	3.6	.92
23. understand changes in society	34 71	7 15	7 15	3.8	1.00

Table C-12

All Respondents Ratings for the Career Development Section

All Respondents					
Goals Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Career Development	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Assist students to:					
16. understand relation of work to self-fulfillment	43 68	18 29	2 3	4.0	.86
17. plan educational needs	44 70	14 22	5 8	3.9	.91
18. academic plans in line with career plans	46 73	12 19	5 8	3.9	.97
19. lifelong learning habits and skills	43 73	15 24	2 3	4.1	.92
20. relate personal abilities to career goal	48 76	12 19	3 5	4.0	.86
21. understand career planning	41 65	18 29	4 6	3.8	.89
22. develop career skills	44 70	15 24	4 6	3.7	.97
23. understand changes in society	45 71	11 17	7 11	3.8	.86

Table C-13

Counselor Ratings for the Counseling and Guidance Section

Counselors					
Role & Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Counseling & Guidance	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor					
could include:					
24. identifying special need students	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.9	.35
25. individual and group counseling	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.9	.35
26. crisis counseling	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0.0
27. professional competence	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.6	.52
28. group guidance	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.8	.46



Table C-14

Administrator Ratings for the Counseling and Guidance Section

Administrators					
Role & Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Counseling & Guidance	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor could include:					
24. identifying special need students	7 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	.00
25. individual and group counseling	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.9	.38
26. crisis counseling	7 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	.00
27. professional competence	6 86	1 13	0 0	4.0	.58
28. group guidance	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.3	.49

Table C-15

Teacher Ratings for the Counseling and Guidance Section

Teachers					
Role & Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Counseling & Guidance	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor					
could include:					
24. identifying special need students	46 96	2 4	0 0	4.8	.51
25. individual and group counseling	45 94	3 6	0 0	4.5	.61
26. crisis counseling	47 98	1 2	0 0	4.8	.44
27. professional competence	35 73	8 17	5 10	3.9	1.0
28. group guidance	38 79	7 15	3 6	4.1	.96

Table C-16

All Respondents Ratings for the Counseling and Guidance Section

All Respondents					
Role & Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Counseling & Guidance	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor could include:					
24. identifying special need students	61 97	2 3	0 0	4.8	.95
25. individual and group counseling	60 95	3 5	0 0	4.6	.47
26. crisis counseling	62 98	1 2	0 0	4.9	.58
27. professional competence	49 77	9 14	5 8	4.0	.40
28. group guidance	53 84	7 11	3 5	4.2	.96

Table C-17

Counselor Ratings for the Coordinating Section

	Counselor				
Role & Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Coordinating	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor could include:					
29. coordinating services	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.1	.35
30. coordinating testing	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.3	.46
31. educational placement	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.5	.53
32. orientation programs	7 88	1 13	0 0	4.3	.71
33. research & pilot programs	4 50	4 50	0 0	3.5	.53
34. using an evaluation model	7 88	1 13	0 0	3.9	.35
35. encouraging teacher referrals	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.8	.46
36. student records	3 38	3 38	2 25	3.1	.83
37. student centered program	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.8	.46
38. a mission statement, goals, and philosophy	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.5	.53
39. needs assessment	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.1	.35
40. advisory committee	4 50	4 50	0 0	3.8	.89
41. relationship between course content and careers	6 75	2 25	0 0	3.9	.64
42. coordinating advisor/advisee time	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.3	.46

Table C-18

Administrator Ratings for the Coordinating Section

Administrator						
Role & Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD	
Coordinating	No. %	No. %	No. %			
Functions of the counselor could include:						
29. coordinating services	6 86	1 14	0 0	4.6	.79	
30. coordinating testing	6 86	1 14	0 0	4.0	.58	
31. educational placement	3 43	4 57	0 0	3.6	.79	
32. orientation programs	6 85	1 14	0 0	4.3	.76	
33. research & pilot programs	1 14	6 86	0 0	3.1	.38	
34. using an evaluation model	5 71	2 29	0 0	3.7	.49	
35. encouraging teacher referrals	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.9	.38	
36. student records	3 43	3 43	1 14	3.3	1.25	
37. student centered program	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.3	.49	
38. a mission statement, goals, and philosophy	5 71	2 29	0 0	3.7	.49	
39. needs assessment	4 57	2 29	1 14	3.9	1.21	
40. advisory committee	2 28	4 57	1 14	3.1	1.21	
41. relationship between course content and careers	0 0	7 100	0 0	3.0	0	
42. coordinating advisor/advisee time	6 86	1 14	0 0	4.1	.69	

Table C-19

Teacher Ratings for the Coordinating Section

Teachers						
Role & Function Section: Coordinating	High No. %	Neutral No. %	Low No. %	Mean	SD	
Functions of the counselor could include:						
29. coordinating services	40 83	6 13	2 4	4.2	.82	
30. coordinating testing	37 77	8 17	3 6	4.1	1.03	
31. educational placement	29 60	12 25	7 14	3.7	1.17	
32. orientation programs	38 80	7 15	3 6	4.1	.88	
33. research & pilot programs	22 47	17 35	9 19	3.4	1.07	
34. * using an evaluation model	25 52	16 33	6 12	3.4	1.17	
35. * encouraging teacher referrals	44 91	2 4	1 2	4.5	.93	
36. student records	38 79	6 13	4 8	4.3	.97	
37. student centered program	42 87	4 8	2 4	4.4	.88	
38. a mission statement, goals, and philosophy	33 69	9 19	6 12	3.8	1.17	
39. needs assessment	42 87	3 6	3 6	4.1	.85	
40. * advisory committee	34 71	8 17	5 10	3.8	1.16	
41. * relationship between course content and careers	26 54	16 33	5 10	3.6	1.17	
42. coordinating advisor/advisee time	40 83	1 2	7 14	3.9	1.11	

\* One respondent gave a "no opinion" rating.

Table C-20

All Respondents Ratings for the Coordinating Section

All Respondents					
Role and function section: Coordinating	High No. %	Neutral No. %	Low No. %	Mean	SD
Functions of the counselor could include:					
29. coordinating services	54 86	7 11	2 3	4.3	.89
30. coordinating testing	51 81	9 14	3 5	4.1	.77
31. educational placement	40 63	16 25	7 11	3.8	.94
32. orientation programs	51 81	9 14	3 5	4.2	1.11
33. research & pilot programs	27 43	27 43	9 15	3.5	.81
34. using an evaluation model	37 59	19 30	6 9	3.5	.93
35. encouraging teacher referrals	59 94	2 3	1 2	4.5	1.02
36. student records	44 70	12 19	7 11	4.0	.86
37. student centered program	56 90	4 6	2 4	4.4	1.08
38. a mission statement, goals, and philosophy	46 73	11 17	6 9	3.9	.82
39. needs assessment	54 86	5 8	4 6	4.1	1.08
40. advisory committee	40 63	16 25	6 10	3.7	.85
41. relationship between course content and careers	32 51	25 40	5 8	3.6	1.14
42. coordinating advisor/advisee time	54 86	2 3	7 11	4.0	1.08

Table C-21

Counselor Ratings for the Communicating Section

Counselors					
Role and Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Communicating	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor could include:					
43. communicating with stakeholder groups	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.6	.52
44. program activities	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	.00
45. the results of evaluations	5 63	3 38	0 0	3.8	.71



Table C-22

Administrator Ratings for the Communicating Section

Administrators					
Role and Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Communicating:	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor could include:					
43. communicating with stakeholder groups	6 86	1 14	0 0	4.1	.69
44. program activities	7 100	0 0	0 0	4.3	.49
45. the results of evaluations	6 85	0 0	1 14	3.9	.90

Table C-23

Teacher Ratings for the Communicating Section

Teachers					
Role and Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Communicating	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor could include:					
43. communicating with stakeholder groups	36 75	10 21	2 4	4.1	.94
44. program activities	39 82	6 13	3 6	4.1	.99
45. the results of evaluations	37 77	8 17	2 4	3.9	1.03

Table C-24

All Respondents Ratings for the Communicating Section

All Respondents					
Role and Function section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Communicating:	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor could include:					
43. communicating with stakeholder groups	50 79	11 17	2 4	4.2	1.02
44. program activities	54 86	6 10	3 5	4.3	.90
45. * the results of evaluations	48 76	11 17	3 5	3.9	.93

\* One respondent gave a "no opinion" rating.

Table C-25

Counselor Ratings for the Consulting Section

Counselors					
Role and Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Consulting	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor					
could include consulting with					
others about:					
46. student adjustment	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	.00
problems					
47. developmental needs	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	.00
48. curriculum	8 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	.00
49. needs in their core teams	8 100	0 0	0 0	4.9	.35

Table C-26

Administrator Ratings for the Consulting Section

Administrators					
Role and Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Consulting	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor could include consulting with others about:					
46. student adjustment problems	7 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0.00
47. developmental needs	7 100	0 0	0 0	5.0	0.00
48. curriculum	6 86	1 14	0 0	4.3	0.76
49. * needs in their core teams	5 71	1 14	0 0	3.9	1.86

\* One respondent gave a "no opinion" rating.

Table C-27

Teacher Ratings for the Consulting Section

Teachers								
Role and Function Section:	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	SD
Consulting	No. %		No. %		No. %			
Functions of the counselor could include consulting with others about:								
46. student adjustment problems	46	96	1	2	1	2	4.6	.64
47. developmental needs	43	89	4	8	1	2	4.5	.82
48. * curriculum	32	66	12	25	3	6	3.8	1.15
49. * needs in their core teams	39	80	5	10	3	6	4.1	1.03

\* One respondent gave a "no opinion" rating.

Table C-28

All Respondents Ratings for the Consulting Section

All Respondents					
Role and Function Section:	High	Neutral	Low	Mean	SD
Consulting	No. %	No. %	No. %		
Functions of the counselor could include consulting with others about:					
46. student adjustment problems	61 97	1 2	1 2	4.7	.98
47. developmental needs	58 92	4 6	1 2	4.6	.59
48. * curriculum	46 73	13 21	3 5	4.0	.76
49. ** needs in their core teams	52 83	6 10	3 5	4.1	1.12

\* One respondent gave a "no opinion" rating.

\*\* Two respondents gave a "no opinion" rating.

### Autobiographical Statement

Ann Salisbury Harrison was born in Providence, Rhode Island on July 3, 1933. She graduated from Rhode Island College in 1957 with a Bachelors Degree in Elementary Education and from Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia in December, 1977 with a Masters Degree in Guidance and Counseling and in May, 1993 with a Ph.D. in Urban Services.

She co-authored a book, Hot Tips for Teachers, in 1983, published by Fearon Teachers Aids, Simon & Schuster, Belmont, California. In addition to teaching in elementary school for 12 years, Ms. Harrison has been a junior high school counselor and now serves as Director of Guidance in a large middle school in Virginia Beach, Virginia. She has served on the system-wide steering committee for four years as Virginia Beach prepared to move to middle school and now serves on the Middle School Advisory Committee.

She is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Virginia Counselors Association, Hampton Roads Counselor Association, and Virginia Middle School Association.