



Public Schools of North Carolina
State Board of Education
Department of Public Instruction

Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee

**Implementation of State Board Policy QP-C-012
Policy Delineating the Job Description and
Performance Criteria for School Counselors**

Session Law 2006-176, Section 2

(Senate Bill 571)

Date Due: November 2007
Report #: 57
DPI Chronological Schedule, 2007 - 2008

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

HOWARD N. LEE
Chairman :: Raleigh

KATHY A. TAFT
Greenville

ROBERT "TOM" SPEED
Boone

WAYNE MCDEVITT
Vice Chair :: Asheville

KEVIN D. HOWELL
Raleigh

MELISSA E. BARTLETT
Raleigh

BEVERLY PERDUE
Lieutenant Governor :: New Bern

SHIRLEY E. HARRIS
Troy

JOHN A. TATE III
Charlotte

RICHARD MOORE
State Treasurer :: Kittrell

EULADA P. WATT
Charlotte

PATRICIA N. WILLOUGHBY
Raleigh

NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

June St. Clair Atkinson, Ed.D., State Superintendent

301 N. Wilmington Street :: Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-2825

In compliance with federal law, NC Public Schools administers all state-operated educational programs, employment activities and admissions without discrimination because of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, color, age, military service, disability, or gender, except where exemption is appropriate and allowed by law.

Inquiries or complaints regarding discrimination issues should be directed to:

Robert Logan, Associate State Superintendent :: Office of Innovation and School Transformation
6301 Mail Service Center :: Raleigh, NC 27699-6301 :: Telephone 919-807-3200 :: Fax 919-807-4065

Visit us on the Web: www.ncpublicschools.org

Report on the Implementation of State Board Policy QP-C-012 Policy Delineating the Job Description and Performance Criteria for School Counselors

Executive Summary

The North Carolina School Counselor Job Description (QP-C-012), which delineates the appropriate roles and primary responsibilities of school counselors, was approved by the State Board of Education in June of 2006 (Appendix A). At the end of the 2006-2007 school year, school counselors and Local Education Agency (LEA) directors/coordinators of student support services were surveyed to assess how many school counselors had received job description training, what barriers the school counselors may have experienced in implementing the job description, how their time is utilized, means of evaluation and employment trend data. At the beginning of the 2007-2008 school year, follow up surveys were conducted to assess the trends related to the school counselor job description as the new school year began.

Seventy-eight percent of the school counselors indicated having received some type of training, but there was great variation as to how in-depth the training had been. Regarding implementation, the majority of school counselors surveyed responded that an inordinate amount of their time is being spent on non-counselor duties such as testing coordination (64%), and clerical/administrator duties. Rigid and/or excessive classroom guidance schedules to provide duty-free periods for teachers was also noted by many respondents as a barrier to implementation. Two hundred and thirty-one school counselors (17%) reported leaving employment of a school due to an overwhelming amount of non-counseling duties. That number nearly tripled to 656 (49%) when asked if they had considered leaving employment of a school due to the non-counseling duties.

In a second school counselor survey conducted at the end of September of the 2007-2008 school year, responses were similar to the survey done at the end of the previous school year. When asked if they were currently able to implement the counselor job description, the largest percentage of answers were for "Somewhat" at 46%. Only 20% responded "Yes." Twenty-one percent selected "A little" and 13% selected "No." Only 10% of the school counselors responded that they have had no obstacles to implementation. Testing coordination and counselor-to-student ratio were noted most frequently as obstacles to implementation with 40% selecting testing coordination and 41% selecting counselor-to-student ratio.

In the directors/coordinators of student support services surveys, 89% of the respondents reported that they had received some level of training on the school counselor job description. Seventy-seven percent indicated that steps had been taken to align school district school counselors' job responsibilities to the new state job description; however, only 42% indicated that their LEA had a formal plan to do so. The overarching themes from the directors' responses were reflective of the counselors' with lack of adequate understanding of the relationship between school counselor and student achievement, lack of adequate district level support, lack of adequate school personnel to staff teacher planning periods and elective courses and lack of adequate available school counselors required to reduce the high counselor-to-student ratio.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA
SESSION 2005

SESSION LAW 2006-176
SENATE BILL 571

AN ACT DIRECTING THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO REPORT ON THE
ROLE SCHOOL COUNSELORS PLAY IN PROVIDING DROPOUT
PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION SERVICES TO STUDENTS IN MIDDLE
AND HIGH SCHOOL AND ON THE STATE BOARD'S IMPLEMENTATION OF
ITS POLICY REGARDING SCHOOL COUNSELORS.

The General Assembly of North Carolina enacts:

SECTION 1. Research shows that school counselors can provide effective services to students that encourage them to stay in school, succeed in school, and graduate from high school. Research also shows that middle school is a critical time for students who are at risk of dropping out of school. The General Assembly currently provides funding that local school administrative units may use to hire school counselors; it is unclear, however, what role school counselors play in providing effective and efficient dropout prevention and intervention services to students in middle and high school. The General Assembly needs additional information to determine whether adjustments should be made in funding for school counselors or assignment of duties to school counselors; therefore, the State Board of Education shall report the following information to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee prior to March 15, 2007.

- (1) The counselor-to-student ratio in schools with a sixth grade or higher grade;
- (2) The source of funds used for each of these counselors;
- (3) A review and analysis of the counselors' primary duties by school;
- (4) A summary and description of school-based dropout prevention and intervention services provided directly to students in the sixth grade and higher grades, including the role of school counselors in providing the services; and
- (5) The number of school counselors and other individuals per local school administrative unit whose primary responsibility is to provide school-based dropout prevention and intervention services and the percentage of their time spent providing these services.

SECTION 2. The State Board of Education shall report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee prior to November 1, 2007, on the implementation of State Board Policy QP-C-012, Policy Delineating the Job Description and Performance Criteria for School Counselors.

SECTION 3. This act is effective when it becomes law. In the General Assembly read three times and ratified this the 18th day of July, 2006.


s/ Beverly E. Perdue
President of the Senate

s/ James B. Black
Speaker of the House of Representatives

s/ Michael F. Easley
Governor

Approved 5:57 p.m. this 1st day of August, 2006

**Report on the
Implementation of State Board Policy QP-C-012
Policy Delineating the Job Description and
Performance Criteria for School Counselors**



Public Schools of North Carolina
State Board of Education
Department of Public Instruction
Innovation and School Transformation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
School Counselor Survey Findings	4
Director of Student Support Services Survey Findings	31
Appendices	39
Appendix A – NC School Counselor Job Description (QP-C-12).....	41
Appendix B – State Allotment Program Report Code: 007 Instructional Support Personnel – Certified.	51
Appendix C – Summary of NCDPI 2000 Report “ <i>How School Counselors Spend Their Time</i> ”	55
Appendix D – Summary of NCDPI 2003 Informal E-mail Survey “ <i>From the Frontline: What’s Really Going on with Testing Coordination</i> ”	59
Appendix E – NC School Counselor Association Government Relations Job Responsibility Survey Results September 2006	63
Appendix F – 2007 Survey Results for SL 2006-176 Section 2	67

Report on the Implementation of State Board Policy QP-C-012 Policy Delineating the Job Description and Performance Criteria for School Counselors

Introduction

North Carolina Session Law 2006-176, Section 2, requires that the State Board of Education report on the implementation of State Board Policy QP-C-012, the policy delineating the job description and performance criteria for school counselors in the public schools of North Carolina. Policy QP-C-012, which defines the appropriate roles and primary responsibilities of school counselors, was approved by the State Board of Education in June of 2006 (Appendix A). The accompanying evaluation instrument is still in development due to being delayed by lack of funding.

The North Carolina School Counselor Job Description (Policy QP-C-012) was prepared collaboratively by representatives from school districts, institutions of higher education, professional organizations and the Department of Public Instruction. This advisory committee aligned the School Counselor Job Description with national best practices, university standards and State statutes and policies. The following is stated in the School Counselor Job Description:

In North Carolina, one has to complete an approved master's degree counselor education program in a regionally-accredited college or university in order to be a licensed school counselor. Within these counselor education programs, several standards are studied such as the professional identity of school counseling, cultural diversity, human growth and development, and career development. Also required are the core components for helping relationships, group and individual work, assessment, research and program evaluation, knowledge and requirements for school counselors, contextual dimensions of school counseling, foundations of school counseling and an internship under a highly qualified school counselor.

School counselors are expected to apply their professional training in schools in order to support student success. Through comprehensive school counseling programs of developmental, preventive, remedial, and responsive services, school counselors address academic development, career development, and personal/social development of students. This job description is a guide for the implementation of such comprehensive school counseling programs in the public schools of North Carolina.

Once the school counselor job description was approved by the State Board of Education, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) Student Support Services Consultant, in collaboration with the North Carolina School Counselor Association (NCSCA), provided trainings on the job description across the state. Although NCDPI does not have any staff dedicated full time to school counseling, approximately 1500 school personnel were provided training on the North Carolina School Counselor Job Description during the 2006-2007 school year. Because the North Carolina School Counselor Job Description is so well aligned with national best practices, the training for the job description is almost identical to the training for *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs*. NCDPI and

NCSCA began trainings in North Carolina on the ASCA National Model in 2004. Therefore, school personnel who attended the ASCA National Model training in previous school years did not need to attend the job description trainings during the 2006-2007 school year. Nearly 1200 school personnel had been trained on the ASCA National Model in those previous two school years.

The State Board of Education and NCDPI adopted the new School Counselor Job Description in an effort to support the most effective use of school counseling staff in the public schools of North Carolina. The General Assembly provides State funding for school counselors and other instructional support personnel through Program Report Code 007 (PRC 007) (Appendix B). The designated purpose for this funding is stated as follows:

Provides funding for salaries for certified instructional support personnel to implement locally designed initiatives that provide services to students who are at risk of school failure as well as the students' families. It is the intent of the General Assembly that the positions must be used first for counselors, then for social workers and other instructional support personnel that have a direct instructional relationship to students or teachers to help reduce violence in the public schools. They shall not be used as administrators, coordinators, supervisors, or directors.

Due in part to local control and conversion provisions/budget flexibility, not all staff who are being funded with monies allocated to PRC 007 are actually being utilized to provide the services described in this funding purpose statement.

School counselors have increasingly expressed for several years that a major barrier to their capacity to provide intervention services is that their time is monopolized by non-counseling duties that prevent them from having sufficient time to work with students and families. Legislation has previously been proposed, but not yet passed, to protect school counselor time such as House Bill 92 in 1991 and House Bill 836 in 2005 for just a couple of examples. NCDPI conducted a survey in 2000 which indicated that non-counseling duties were significantly hindering school counselors' capacities to deliver counseling services (Appendix C). With school-level testing coordination being the most commonly noted non-counseling duty taking substantial amounts of time, an informal e-mail survey was conducted in 2003 to assess the issues related to counselors serving as test coordinators (Appendix D). In their responses, school counselors not only indicated the services they were unable to provide students as a result of coordinating testing, many also indicated valuable services they were able to implement once testing coordination had been removed from their responsibilities.

National best practice guidelines recommend that school counselors spend 80% of their time in the delivery functions included in the North Carolina School Counselor Job Description.¹ Since the adoption of this new School Counselor Job Description, The North Carolina School Counselor Association conducted a survey related to school counselor duties which indicated that, out of 480 responses, 31% were able to spend 80% of their time in the delivery functions and 56% were still being utilized as testing coordinators (Appendix E).

In order to conduct a current assessment for Session Law 2006-176, Section 2, the student support services consultants of NCDPI posted two sets of on-line surveys to gather information on the implementation of the State School Counselor Job Description (Appendix F). The first set of surveys was made available for on-line access from May through August. There was a survey for school counselors and a separate survey for LEA directors/coordinators of student support services. There were 1370 completed and 159 partially completed school counselor surveys for a total of 1529 which is approximately half of the public school counselors in North Carolina. The school counselor survey gathered information such as if the school counselor had attended job description training, what barriers the school counselor may have experienced to implementation of the job description, how their time was utilized and employment trend data.

Seventy-one LEA directors/coordinators of student support services surveys were completed and 25 were partially completed. No charter schools responded. The LEA directors/coordinators of student support services survey posed questions regarding School Counselor Job Description training, steps taken to align school counselor responsibilities with the State job description, barriers to implementation of the job description and means of evaluation.

The second set of surveys was made available for on-line access in September. Once again, there was a survey for school counselors and a separate survey for LEA directors/coordinators of student support services. Both of these surveys included just three questions to assess the level of implementation and barriers to implementation at the beginning of the 2007-2008 school year. There were 927 completed school counselor surveys, no partially completed. Thirty-one percent (36) of LEA directors/coordinators of student support services surveys were completed.

The findings of these surveys can be found beginning on page 4 and in Appendix F. There is great variation across the state in implementation of the School Counselor Job Description, from LEAs where they are actively striving to implement the job description and to utilize school counselors effectively, to the opposite extreme of an LEA central office staff member stating that his LEA would follow the new School Counselor Job Description when someone made it too uncomfortable not to. Many schools with the good intentions of utilizing their school counselors effectively are struggling with the fact of there being more duties than there are staff to carry them out. In essence, although almost every North Carolina public school has personnel funded to be school counselors, the majority of these counselors are not able to function in the appropriate functions of their job description due to non-counseling duties.

-
1. American School Counselor Association (2003). *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

School Counselor Surveys

The surveys utilized to gather information from school counselors on the implementation of the North Carolina School Counselor Job Description were inclusive of questions regarding training on the School Counselor Job Description, the appropriate counselor roles documented in the School Counselor Job Description, *non-counselor* duties which school counselors have previously indicated interfere with their capacity to implement comprehensive school counseling programs, how their time is utilized and employment trend data. For the 2006-2007 Year-end School Counselor Survey, there were 1370 completed and 159 partially completed school counselor surveys for a total of 1529 which is approximately half of the public school counselors in North Carolina. For the follow-up survey at the end of September of the 2007-2008 school year, 927 surveys were completed. Survey results are described in this section of the report and can be found in a table format in Appendix F. *Note that some responses total more than 100% because respondents could select more than one answer in some questions.*

2006-2007 Year-end School Counselor Survey

The first survey question asked school counselors about what training they had received on the school counselor job description. Once the school counselor job description was approved by the State Board of Education, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) Student Support Services Consultant, in collaboration with the North Carolina School Counselor Association (NCSCA), provided trainings on the job description across the state. Regional training information was sent via the NCDPI Student Support Services e-group/Listserv, via e-mail and United States Postal Service to Local Education Agency (LEA) directors of student support services and to every public school in North Carolina via United States Postal Service mailing. Ten three-hour trainings and six one-and-half-hour overviews were conducted across the state during the 2006-2007 school year. Overviews were for administrators only; however, three-hour trainings were open to school counselors and administrators. Ten LEAs received five-hour trainings by request. Four additional LEAs requested and received three-hour trainings. In addition, a two-hour training was conducted at the NCSCA fall conference and one five-hour training was held at Appalachian State University with surrounding LEAs invited to participate. In total, approximately 1500 school personnel received training on the North Carolina School Counselor Job Description during the 2006-2007 school year. School personnel who attended the ASCA National Model training in the previous two school years did not need to attend the job description trainings during the 2006-2007 school year because the two trainings are almost identical. Nearly 1200 school personnel had been trained on the ASCA National Model in those previous two school years.

Responses to question 1, "Have you attended any of the following on the NC School Counselor Job Description or the ASCA National Model: Framework for School Counseling Programs?" can be found in figure 1 on the next page. All grade levels had comparable responses to this item. Seventy-eight percent of the school counselors indicated having received some type of training, but there was great variation as to how in-depth the training had been.

<i>Answer Choice</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
Conference break out session	265	27%
DPI/NCSCA three-hour 1/2 day training	326	33%
DPI/NCSCA five-hour full day training	235	24%
ASCA on-line training	10	1%
Other, please specify	295	30%




Figure 1. School Counselor responses to question one, "Have you attended any of the following on the NC School Counselor Job Description or the ASCA National Model: Framework for School Counseling Programs?"

Of the 295 selections for "Other," 155 (52%) respondents indicated that they had received information within their LEAs, varying from a meeting discussion to intensive, ongoing professional development. Most of these made no specific reference as to who provided the training; however, of the ones which specifically cited LEAs, Wake County Schools, Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools and Guilford County Schools were most frequently referenced. Ten of the LEA trainings made specific reference to having actually been provided by NCDPI. As many as 72 more may have been conducted by NCDPI, but lack of specificity made it impossible to determine with certainty. Sixty-five (22%) of the "Other" responses were to indicate that no training had been attended. Thirty-two (11%) noted that training had been received as part of their graduate counselor education program.

Question 2 inquired "What, if any, obstacles have prevented you from attending a NC School Counselor Job Description or a ASCA National Model training?" The highest percentages of responses were for "I had no barriers to attending training" at 47% and "My schedule prevents me from leaving my school" at 25% (*see figure 2*). School counselors who served combination elementary and middle schools or school counselors who served all grade levels (K-12) responded slightly higher than other counselors regarding their schedule being a barrier.

Interestingly, 218 respondents (19%) selected “I was unaware of any trainings” although notification of trainings were sent addressed to school counselors in every public school in North Carolina via United States Postal Service mailing, via the NCDPI Student Support Services e-group/Listserv and via e-mail and United States Postal Service to Local Education Agency (LEA) directors of student support services.

<i>Answer Choice</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
My schedule prevents me from leaving my school	284	25%
My school administrator will not approve for me to attend	28	2%
My school system will not approve for me to attend	9	1%
I was unaware of any trainings	218	19%
I have had no barriers to attending training	531	47%
Other, please specify	173	15%




Figure 2. School Counselor responses to question two, “What, if any, obstacles have prevented you from attending a NC School Counselor Job Description or an ASCA National Model training?”

Many of the responses included in “Other” could be sorted into categories, the most common being 42 related to not being able to leave their schools due to numerous duties and full schedules. The majority of these 42 responses were non-specific; however, 13 specifically stated testing.

Conflict with the expenses of attending was the next most common response for “Other” with 30 comments. Most of these comments related to participants not being able to get their LEAs to pay for their registration fee and travel. The NCDPI regional trainings were held in eleven cities in nine counties across the state which resulted in some level of travel for those wishing to attend. Since NCDPI had no budget for school counseling, a \$30 registration fee was charged to help cover the cost of the training book for each participant, *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs*. For trainings conducted at the individual LEA level rather than regionally, the LEAs were responsible for purchasing the training books.

Additional trends in the “Other” responses included 20 personal conflicts such as family responsibilities or illnesses; 16 already having received the training; 15 due to the training dates conflicting with other scheduled activities; and 12 being employed to their positions after the trainings had occurred.

The third question in the school counselor survey asked survey respondents to indicate how much of their time was being spent in the appropriate roles of Guidance Curriculum, Student Planning, Preventive and Responsive Services, System Support of the Counseling Program, Accountability, and Development and Management of the Counseling Program. Figures 3, 5 and 8 indicate appropriate percentage of time ranges for the different grade levels as defined by national best practices and aligned with the School Counselor Job Description. Figures 4, 6, 7, 9 10 and 11 on pages 9 through 12 show the actual number and the percentage of respondents who indicated the designated percentage of time in each function area. Responses that are **not** shaded are in the appropriate ranges.

Approximately 51% of the elementary, 12% of the middle school and 31% of the high school respondents noted appropriate time allocation within the Guidance Curriculum function of the job description. Middle school responses for the 11% to 25% range might also include additional appropriate time allocation since the estimated appropriate time for middle school guidance is 25% to 35% which slightly overlaps two choice options on the survey. It is the role of the school counselor to provide leadership and collaborate with other educators on the school-wide integration and implementation of the State Guidance Curriculum. The State Guidance Curriculum is designed to integrate guidance components into the regular classroom rather than being a separate, stand alone curriculum delivered by the school counselor(s).

For Student Planning, school counselors assist students individually and in groups with developing personal future goals and plans. Forty percent of the elementary, 44% of the middle school and 36% of the high school respondents indicated appropriate time allocation in this function area.

Within the Preventive and Responsive Services area, 36% of the elementary, 33% of the middle school and 31% of the high school respondents noted appropriate time allocation. The Preventive and Responsive Services counselor function is for the purposes of addressing students’ needs and concerns. Many of these types of activities directly impact dropout prevention.

The system support function of the School Counselor Job Description consists of management activities related to the school counseling program that establish, maintain and enhance the total program such as personal professional development and assisting teachers, parents/guardians and other stakeholders in interpreting and understanding student data. Since the appropriate range of 10-15% or 20% overlaps across two selections in the survey, it is difficult to determine exactly how many are actually in the appropriate time allotment; however, it is at least 51% and possibly as much as 85% of the elementary responses are in this range. At least 40%, as much as 80%, of the middle school and at least 50%, as much as 83%, of the high school respondents indicated appropriate time in this area.

Fifty-nine percent of the elementary, 49% of the middle school and 51% of the high school respondents indicated the appropriate amount of time usage within the Accountability component. Fifty-four percent of the elementary, 55% of the middle school and 60% of the high school respondents provided appropriate time allocation for Development and Management of the School Counseling Program. These two areas are for planning a data-driven, comprehensive school counseling program to meet the needs of students.

There were several respondents who served grade levels that spanned across usual categorical levels such as combination elementary and middle school, combination middle and high school, all K-12 grade levels and "other." Because of the added demand of serving multiple grade levels, these school counselors would need more flexibility with time allocation. Responses for the combination grade spans can be found in figures 7, 10 and 11. A total of ten respondents indicated K-12 and

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL:

Function	Percent of Time						
	0-10%	11-25%	26 - 40%	41 - 55%	55-70%	71-85%	>85%
Guidance Curriculum			35-45%				
Student Planning	5-10%						
Preventive & Responsive Services			30-40%				
System Support of the school counseling program	10-15%						
Accountability	< 10%						
Development and Management of the School Counseling Program	< 10%						

Figure 3. Table represents where appropriate percent of time responses for elementary school would be indicated as defined by national best practices and aligned with the School Counselor Job Description.

Function	Percent of Time						
	0-10%	11-25%	26 - 40%	41 - 55%	55-70%	71-85%	>85%
	Number and Percent of Responses						
Guidance Curriculum	48	132	170	91	37	23	7
	9%	26%	33%	18%	7%	5%	1%
Student Planning	203	208	63	18	9	4	3
	40%	41%	12%	4%	2%	1%	1%
Preventive & Responsive Services	59	166	182	50	32	12	7

	12%	33%	36%	10%	6%	2%	1%
System Support of the school counseling program	261	172	47	14	11	3	0
	51%	34%	9%	3%	2%	1%	0%
Accountability	298	120	52	20	11	5	2
	59%	24%	10%	4%	2%	1%	0%
Development and Management of the School Counseling Program	272	157	44	13	13	4	5
	54%	31%	9%	3%	3%	1%	1%

Figure 4. Table represents the actual number and the percentage of elementary respondents who indicated the designated percentage of time in each function area. The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

MIDDLE SCHOOL:

Function	Percent of Time						
	0-10%	11-25%	26 - 40%	41 - 55%	55-70%	71-85%	>85%
Guidance Curriculum			25-35%				
Student Planning		15-25%					
Preventive & Responsive Services			30-40%				
System Support of the school counseling program	10-15%						
Accountability	< 10%						
Development and Management of the School Counseling Program	< 10%						

Figure 5. Table represents where appropriate percent of time responses for middle school would be indicated as defined by national best practices and aligned with the School Counselor Job Description.

Function	Percent of Time						
	0-10%	11-25%	26 - 40%	41 - 55%	55-70%	71-85%	>85%
	Number and Percent of Responses						
Guidance Curriculum	122	142	38	15	3	2	0
	38%	44%	12%	5%	1%	1%	0%
Student Planning	60	141	88	15	10	6	2
	19%	44%	27%	5%	3%	2%	1%
Preventive & Responsive Services	22	81	106	62	31	14	6
	7%	25%	33%	19%	10%	4%	2%
System Support of the Counseling Program	130	128	37	13	10	2	2
	40%	40%	11%	4%	3%	1%	1%
Accountability	158	105	27	15	7	7	3
	49%	33%	8%	5%	2%	2%	1%
Development and Management of the School Counseling Program	177	101	20	12	7	3	2
	55%	31%	6%	4%	2%	1%	1%

Figure 6. Table represents the actual number and the percentage of middle school respondents who indicated the designated percentage of time in each function area.

COMBINATION ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL

Function	Percent of Time						
	0-10%	11-25%	26 - 40%	41 - 55%	55-70%	71-85%	>85%
	Number and Percent of Responses						
Guidance Curriculum	4	6	9	4	1	0	1
	16%	24%	36%	16%	4%	0%	4%
Student Planning	7	14	3	1	0	0	0
	28%	56%	12%	4%	0%	0%	0%
Preventive & Responsive Services	3	6	11	3	1	1	0
	12%	24%	44%	12%	4%	4%	0%
System Support of the Counseling Program	13	8	4	0	0	0	0
	52%	32%	16%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Accountability	17	5	3	0	0	0	0
	68%	20%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Development and Management of the School Counseling Program	18	6	1	0	0	0	0
	72%	24%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 7. Table represents the actual number and the percentage of respondents serving a combination of both elementary and middle school levels who indicated the designated percentage of time in each function area.

HIGH SCHOOL:

Function		Percent of Time						
		0-10%	11-25%	26 - 40%	41 - 55%	55-70%	71-85%	>85%
1	Guidance Curriculum		15-25%					
2	Student Planning			25-35%				
3	Preventive & Responsive Services			25-35%				
4	System Support of the school counseling program	10-20%						
5	Accountability	< 10%						
6	Development and Management of the School Counseling Program	< 10%						

Figure 8. Table represents where appropriate percent of time responses for high school would be indicated as defined by national best practices and aligned with the School Counselor Job Description.

Function	Percent of Time						
	0-10%	11-25%	26 - 40%	41 - 55%	55-70%	71-85%	>85%
	Number and Percent of Responses						
Guidance Curriculum	238	129	32	8	7	2	2
	57%	31%	8%	2%	2%	0%	0%
Student Planning	20	107	149	81	34	20	7
	5%	26%	36%	19%	8%	5%	2%
Preventive & Responsive Services	79	122	129	64	12	9	3
	19%	29%	31%	15%	3%	2%	1%
System Support of the Counseling Program	207	138	40	17	8	6	2
	50%	33%	10%	4%	2%	1%	0%
Accountability	213	118	41	17	16	8	5

	51%	28%	10%	4%	4%	2%	1%
Development and Management of the School Counseling Program	251	109	34	12	4	7	1
	60%	26%	8%	3%	1%	2%	0%

Figure 9. Table represents the actual number and the percentage of high school respondents who indicated the designated percentage of time in each function area.

COMBINATION MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL

Function	Percent of Time						
	0-10%	11-25%	26 - 40%	41 - 55%	55-70%	71-85%	>85%
	Number and Percent of Responses						
Guidance Curriculum	21	18	6	4	2	1	0
	40%	35%	12%	8%	4%	2%	0%
Student Planning	11	12	18	6	4	0	1
	21%	23%	35%	12%	8%	0%	2%
Preventive & Responsive Services	5	16	17	6	2	4	2
	10%	31%	33%	12%	4%	8%	4%
System Support of the Counseling Program	20	19	7	3	3	0	0
	38%	37%	13%	6%	6%	0%	0%
Accountability	20	19	5	3	2	1	2
	38%	37%	10%	6%	4%	2%	4%
Development and Management of the School Counseling Program	20	20	8	2	2	0	0
	38%	38%	15%	4%	4%	0%	0%

Figure 10. Table represents the actual number and the percentage of respondents serving a combination of both middle and high school levels who indicated the designated percentage of time in each function area.

COMBINATION K-12

Function	Percent of Time						
	0-10%	11-25%	26 - 40%	41 - 55%	55-70%	71-85%	>85%
	Number and Percent of Responses						
Guidance Curriculum	2	3	2	2	1	0	0
	20%	30%	20%	20%	10%	0%	0%
Student Planning	1	3	4	0	2	0	0
	10%	30%	40%	0%	20%	0%	0%
Preventive & Responsive Services	2	3	3	1	1	0	0
	20%	30%	30%	10%	10%	0%	0%
System Support of the Counseling Program	3	4	0	2	0	1	0
	30%	40%	0%	20%	0%	10%	0%
Accountability	4	4	0	2	0	0	0
	40%	40%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%
Development and Management of the School Counseling Program	2	5	2	0	1	0	0
	20%	50%	20%	0%	10%	0%	0%

Figure 11. Table represents the actual number and the percentage of respondents serving a combination of grades K-12 who indicated the designated percentage of time in each function area. The areas not shaded are representative of appropriate ranges for elementary, middle and secondary.

For question 4, respondents were asked “Do you serve as testing facilitator/coordinator in any of the following capacities?” Testing facilitation/coordination is the most commonly cited non-counselor duty that school counselors attest absorbs their time, preventing them from implementing the appropriate functions found in their job description. Most grade spans were fairly comparable with their answers to this question, except high school counselors reported school-wide testing coordination at almost half the frequency as other grade levels at 24%. It should be noted that the majority of high schools have several school counselors who often share the testing responsibilities for many college preparatory tests.

As seen in figure 12, in total results, just over a third of the respondents (36%) stated **not** being used as a testing facilitator/coordinator, while nearly two-thirds indicated performing these duties either school-wide (42%), for a specific grade level (4%), “other” (22%) or a combination of these.

<i>Answer Choice</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
No	491	36%
School-wide	574	42%
Specific grade level	60	4%
Other, please specify (specific test, group, etc)	302	22%




Figure 12. The table and chart represent the actual number and percentages of responses related to testing coordination/facilitation.

The 302 responses of “other” clearly reflected two trends. One-hundred and forty-eight of the “Other” responses were to identify specific tests of which the school counselors were responsible such as Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), Advanced Placement (AP) and American College Testing (ACT). The second trend was in the 116 responses that reported some capacity of assisting with testing such as sharing the responsibility with other school staff, administering make-up tests and securing and serving as testing proctors.

Question 5 delved a little deeper into testing coordination/facilitation by inquiring “If you serve as testing facilitator/coordinator, please indicate which month this duty most interferes with your capacity to deliver a comprehensive counseling program.” Respondents were asked to not select more than three months. Although all months except the summer months were chosen by more than a 100 respondents, the large majority of responses (68%) were for the month of May when End-of-Grade testing occurs (*see figure 13*).

School counselor quote regarding issues of testing:

“Last year I was written up over testing when a teacher did not follow directions. I tried to communicate the problem to administration on many times but was met with ‘not now’ or they would not get back to me.”

<i>Answer Choice</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
N/A	261	24%
None	17	2%
July	6	1%
August	98	9%
September	159	14%
October	193	17%
November	105	9%
December	106	10%
January	155	14%
February	111	10%
March	308	28%
April	280	25%
May	754	68%
June	224	20%




Figure 13. Responses as to which month testing most interferes with delivering a comprehensive program.

In question 6, school counselors were asked “Do any of the following non-counseling duties take up more than 5% of your time?”(see figure 14). Almost half (49%) of the respondents indicated that “Clerical duties not related to the counseling program” took up more than 5% of their time. When broken down by grade spans, middle school, high school, combination middle and high school and K-12 school counselors reported higher regarding clerical duties. Nearly a third of the total respondents indicated “Miscellaneous Duties/Other” (30%) and “No” (29%)

concerning the duties taking more than 5% of their time. Although only 3% documented expending an excess of 5% of their time on “Teaching Content Areas,” this is still a major concern. Not only is this an inappropriate use of the school counselor’s time, school counselors are not trained to be content area teachers and, therefore, do not meet No Child Left Behind requirements of being “Highly Qualified” to teach the subjects. Counselor education programs in institutes of higher education prepare individuals to be school counselors; they do not provide instruction on lesson plans and teaching subject areas.

School counselor quote regarding what the non-counseling duties are that are taking time away from counseling:

“Anything that is not specific to another department”

Most of the 261 comments for “Other” related to program or committee coordination and testing. Although testing was previously addressed in questions 4 and 5, 98 respondents reiterated their concern with its time consumption in their response to question 6. Ninety-four responses specified various roles of coordination such as 504, Student Assistance Team, school volunteers and McKinney-Vento Homeless Education. Other common responses for “Other” included 23 related to teaching or covering classes for teachers to have planning time; 13 regarding working on the master schedule or scheduling students; and 12 related to administrator and/or discipline. The school counselor serving in the role of disciplinarian is a major conflict to their appropriate roles in that counselors need to exhibit unconditional positive regard to their students in order to effectively maintain a trusted counseling relationship. A student may very well be less likely to seek counseling services from a school counselor who has disciplined that student.

<i>Non-counseling Duties</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
No	383	29%
Clerical Duties not related to counseling program (SIMS/NCWISE data entry, cumulative records, registering all students beyond assistance with course selection, etc.)	651	49%
Administrative Duties (disciplinary actions, administrative reports, etc.)	243	18%
Teaching Content Areas (teaching reading, math, science, social studies, etc.)	37	3%
Miscellaneous Duties/Other (Bus duty, cafeteria duty, club advisement, etc.)	402	30%
Other, please specify	261	19%




Figure 14. Responses on which non-counselor duties take more than 5% of the school counselor's time.

In conversations, many school counselors have expressed that policies to protect teacher time have resulted in their being given more duties or rigid schedules to alleviate those duties from teachers. Question 7 sought to gather data on this issue by asking “How have policies to protect teacher time impacted your schedule or capacity to deliver a comprehensive school counseling program?” (see figure 15). Over a third (35%) of the respondents indicated “Rigid and/or excessive classroom guidance schedule.” Many school counselors, especially elementary counselors, have reported that they are scheduled into the rotation with “specials,” such as art, music and physical education, to provide teachers with a duty-free period rather than have counselor guidance activities being based on student needs. Ironically, teachers are supposed to stay in their classrooms when counselors provide classroom guidance in order to support and integrate the information. When the data was broken down by grade level, rigid or excessive classroom guidance schedule was reported much higher by elementary counselors (54%) and combination elementary/middle school counselors (68%).

Over half of the total respondents selected “Other” for question 7. Some of the statements for “Other” were repetitious of the other three options provided for in this question. For example, 12% of the 157 comments provided by elementary school counselors were in reference to rigid and/or excessive classroom guidance. Many of them expressed that because of this, they are now being regarded as resource teachers rather than counselors. Some were even designated their topics such as “character education.” Other grade levels did not indicate as much concern with this issue.

*Elementary school counselor
quote regarding affects of
policies to protect teacher time:*

*“Having to teach three classes
per day on character education”*

Elementary counselor responses also included 16% related to testing such as not being allowed access to students for counseling during instructional time of tested subjects. Thirty-five percent of the 124 middle school comments expressed this same concern and nearly half (49%) of the 143 high school responses related to this issue.

Regarding extra duties being assigned due to policies to protect teacher time, 22% of elementary responses and 21% of middle school responses were related to this issue. High school responses were half as frequent at 10%.

Otherwise, all grade levels were inclusive of 40% to 50% of their comments in “Other” being that they had not yet been impacted. Several shared concern that this would be an issue in the following school year. A few school counselors complimented their administrators for having included them in the efforts to protect time.

<i>Duties</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
Rigid and/or excessive classroom guidance schedule	292	35%
Cafeteria duty in excess of what other staff perform	130	16%
Having to teach content such as reading or math	20	2%
Other, please specify	459	55%




Figure 15. Responses to “How have policies to protect teacher time impacted your schedule or capacity to deliver a comprehensive school counseling program?”

In relation to scheduled classroom guidance provided by the school counselor, a student in crisis should always take precedence over a guidance schedule. To assess if this is possible for school counselors, question 8 posed the following:

It is a highly recommended best practice, due to student safety and school liability, that when a school counselor is placed in a position of choosing between a scheduled classroom guidance session or responding to the needs of a student in crisis, that the crisis always takes precedence over the classroom guidance schedule. Are you allowed to follow this best practice at your school?

As represented in figure 16 the majority (70%) of school counselors conferred that they are allowed to give precedence to a student in crisis; however, 5% (67) said that they were not and 14% (186) indicated that they could sometimes. All grade levels were comparable on this question.

School counselor quotes regarding capacity to prioritize students in crisis over a guidance schedule:

“I’ve made several comments to our administrator and have been told to stop complaining.”

“I am currently working at two schools, one school I am in the exploratory schedule to teach classes and I have been told that is my #1 priority..... The other school I work at allows the needs of the student to take precedence over classroom guidance.”

“My principal protects counselor time as rigorously as teacher time.”

“My administrators support a comprehensive counseling program.”

<i>Response</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	956	70%
No	67	5%
Sometimes	186	14%
I do not provide classroom guidance	153	11%
<i>Total</i>	<i>1362</i>	<i>100%</i>




Figure 16. Responses as to whether the school counselor is allowed to prioritize a student in crisis.

To further review the status of the issue of “guidance schedule” versus “crisis intervention,” question 9 asked “If you answered “no” or “sometimes” to question 7, have you had a formal discussion with your school administrator regarding this recommended best practice?” (see figure 17). Nearly the same number had the discussion (51%) as did not have the discussion (49%). One hundred and twenty-seven comments were provided for question 9. Nineteen school counselors acknowledged administrator support. In contrast to this, 27 statements related to lack of administrator support or administrator insistence to stay on schedule. Several stated that the administrator would handle the crisis rather than have the counselor come out of the classroom guidance schedule. Should the crisis escalate, this could be a potential liability issue since the principal is not trained in counseling.

Twenty-two comments for question 9 were to express that teacher scheduling needs and complaints were always prioritized over counseling. Seven comments stated that testing was a bigger conflict with handling crises.

Response	#	%
Yes	180	51%
No	172	49%
Total	352	100%




Figure 17. How many respondents had a formal discussion with their school administrators regarding prioritizing a student in crisis over a classroom guidance schedule.

Question 10 sought to assess if school counselors being written into Individual Education Plans (IEPs) of special needs students might be interfering with their capacity to implement comprehensive counseling programs. When asked “Are you written into student Individual Education Plans to provide in-depth counseling services such as weekly counseling?”, a third (34%) of the respondents indicated that they are written into IEPs for on-going counseling services for special needs students (see figure 18).

Due to mental health reform, many special needs students who previously received services from local mental health centers are no longer meeting the criteria for those services, thus the local mental health centers were to assist schools with locating private providers. Many schools have not found this process to be successful in identifying and securing services. In response to the need for counseling services, some schools have written into student IEPs that the school counselor would provide the long-term, ongoing counseling. School counselors do not have the capacity to

School counselor quote regarding being written into IEPs to provide long-term counseling:

“Having been a counselor for 20 years in another state, I have never encountered this use of the school counselor’s time until I was contracted in NC.”

provide ongoing, frequent therapy to multiple select students and still provide comprehensive services for all students. Services provided by the school counselor to special needs students are supposed to be consistent with those services provided to all students. For a school counselor to be able to provide comprehensive services, they need to follow the best practice guideline of referring to outside providers any students, regular education or special needs, who require more than four to six consecutive counseling sessions. In addition, there is a liability issue for the school if a school counselor is documented in the IEP to provide weekly counseling and is unable to do so.

<i>Response</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	446	34%
No	879	66%
<i>Total</i>	<i>1325</i>	<i>100%</i>




Figure 18. Responses as to whether the school counselors are written into IEPs to provide long-term counseling services.

Question 11 of the school counselor survey asked respondents to rank eleven items in order of which most prevented them from implementing the school counselor job description with 1 being what most prevented implementation and 11 being what least prevented implementation. Responses can be found in figure 19. Highest percentages, in excess of 10%, are printed in bold italics. For most items, a large percentage of respondents selected "N/A." Otherwise, items showing highest percentages were "Testing facilitation/coordination," "Non-Counseling duties other than testing or registrar" and "Counselor to student ratio."

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Testing facilitation/coordination	386	126	78	65	60	60	45	63	52	66	53	316
	28%	9%	6%	5%	4%	4%	3%	5%	4%	5%	4%	23%
Functioning as a school registrar	71	131	91	86	72	58	65	56	79	73	68	520
	5%	10%	7%	6%	5%	4%	5%	4%	6%	5%	5%	38%
Non-Counseling duties other than testing or registrar	75	157	180	141	110	95	90	93	92	96	60	181
	5%	11%	13%	10%	8%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	4%	13%
Rigid and/or excessive classroom guidance schedule	89	69	63	79	65	59	89	104	102	121	103	427
	6%	5%	5%	6%	5%	4%	6%	8%	7%	9%	8%	31%
Counselor to student ratio	216	158	139	132	122	104	80	89	84	66	65	115
	16%	12%	10%	10%	9%	8%	6%	6%	6%	5%	5%	8%
Have not had any training on the new job description	30	53	51	41	51	68	69	80	81	95	70	681
	2%	4%	4%	3%	4%	5%	5%	6%	6%	7%	5%	50%
Need additional training on the new job description	14	48	84	68	87	100	113	100	87	73	65	531
	1%	4%	6%	5%	6%	7%	8%	7%	6%	5%	5%	39%
Did not know there was a new job description	42	21	17	24	31	25	37	42	45	72	97	917
	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	5%	7%	67%


Lack of school administrator support	35	82	81	96	110	97	101	92	86	115	85	390
	3%	6%	6%	7%	8%	7%	7%	7%	6%	8%	6%	28%
Lack of LEA central office support	47	65	88	103	118	121	89	91	94	75	85	394
	3%	5%	6%	8%	9%	9%	6%	7%	7%	5%	6%	29%
Lack of administrator knowledge or understanding of the appropriate roles of school counselors	73	94	119	113	97	126	86	74	85	66	80	357
	5%	7%	9%	8%	7%	9%	6%	5%	6%	5%	6%	26%

Figure 19. The top number in this table is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option. Highest percentages in excess of 10% are printed in **bold italics**.

To try to assess how much of an impact non-counseling duties were having on school counselor vacancies and turn-over rate, questions 12 through 16 asked respondents about their employment. Question 12 asked the respondents if they had ever left employment at a school due to an overwhelming amount of non-counseling duties and question 13 asked if they had ever considered doing so (see figure 20). Two hundred and thirty-one school counselors (17%) reported leaving employment of a school due to an overwhelming amount of non-counseling duties. That number nearly tripled to 656 (49%) when asked if they had considered leaving employment of a school due to the non-counseling duties. These percentages were somewhat comparable when broken down by grade levels. This data tells us how many school counselors left one school for another due to an overwhelming amount of non-counseling duties. What it does not tell us is how many completely left the school counseling profession due to these duties.

Question 12

<i>Response</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	231	17%
No	1123	83%
<i>Total</i>	<i>1354</i>	<i>100%</i>



Question 13

<i>Response</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	656	49%
No	672	51%
<i>Total</i>	<i>1328</i>	<i>100%</i>




Figure 20. The table and chart on the left reflects the number and percentage of respondents who had actually left employment of a school due to an overwhelming amount of non-counseling duties. The table and chart on the right reflects the number and percentage of respondents who had considered leaving employment of a school due to an overwhelming amount of non-counseling duties.

Two hundred and fifty-nine comments were provided for question 12. Testing was referenced in 143 (45%) of the comments as the reason for having left employment of a school. One hundred and two comments (32%) referenced having to function in administrative or clerical roles such as filing in as the assistant principal, handling discipline and maintaining student records. Of these 102 administrative/clerical comments, 46 (45%) were in regards to handling scheduling or functioning as registrar.

Fifty three (17%) comments were provided relating to having to function in teaching capacities. Most of these were in reference to having classroom guidance converted into a class included in a rigid, excessive schedule. Others were predominantly about functioning as a substitute teacher or actually having to teach subjects.

There were a few references (4%) to counselor to student ratios being their reason for leaving. School counselors cited such caseloads as 450, 500, 600, 680, 740, 850 and 1200. The recommended ratio by the American School Counselor Association is one counselor to every 250 students.

School counselor quote regarding reasons for having left employment of a school:

“Testing demands have grown to such ridiculous proportions that they have essentially eclipsed my job as a counselor.... It’s an unconscionable misapplication of resources to have master’s level counselors consumed by academic testing tasks and it makes me angry that my talents are being wasted while children are neglected because of some foolish economization at the system and/or state level.”

School counselor quote regarding reasons for having left employment of a school:

“Registering students for classes
 Answering telephone
 Secretarial duties
 Covering classes for teachers
 Testing coordination
 SSMT Coordinator
 SACS Chairperson
 Student Mentor
 Daily Morning car duty
 Daily afternoon car duty
 Gate duty (sports)
 Dance duty
 Helping change students who had accidents in pants
 Getting principals’ coffee”

Most of the additional comments were in regards to various miscellaneous duties (such as excessive lunch and bus duty) and program and committee coordination responsibilities. Some respondents specifically referenced “lack of knowledge” of administrators on the appropriate roles of school counselors (2%). The North Carolina standards for higher education preparation programs for school administration are not inclusive of classes on effective utilization of school counselors or other student support services staff such as school social workers.

Although there were nearly twice as many comments for question 13 as there were for question 12, the breakdown was basically the same. For question 13 “Have you ever considered leaving employment of a school due to an overwhelming amount of non-counseling duties?,” 51% references testing, 33% administrative/clerical duties, 12% functioning as classroom/guidance teachers to give teachers breaks, 3% lack of administrator knowledge or support and 1% counselor to student ratios. Several

school counselors reported having to perform nursing related duties. Twenty-six respondents stated “same as question 12” for question 13; however, it was not possible to match the responses to question 13 to the same respondents as in question 12.

With more and more schools implementing the *ASCA National Model* and the North Carolina School Counselor Job Description, a new trend in school counselor employment has begun to emerge. School counselors are declining employment offered to them by schools where there is an abundance of non-counseling duties included in the school counselor position. To obtain actual data on this trend, question 14 asked “Have you ever turned down employment of a school due to an overwhelming amount of non-counseling duties said to be included with the position?” Two hundred and thirty-six school counselors (18%) reported having turned down employment due to the non-counseling duties.

<i>Response</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	236	18%
No	1105	82%
<i>Total</i>	<i>1341</i>	<i>100%</i>




Figure 21. The table and chart reflect responses to whether the school counselors had declined employment of a school due to an abundance of non-counseling duties.

The 176 comments for question 14 reflected the same patterns as questions 12 and 13 with 83 references to testing, 44 references to relieving teachers/guidance teacher and 48 references to administrative/ clerical roles. Sixteen responses expressed that they would turn down employment due to non-counseling duties if presented the opportunity.

School counselor quote regarding turning down employment due to non-counseling duties:

“Certain schools get reputations and that can determine if you accept a job or not.”

To gauge the level of experience of the respondents, question 15 asked “How many years have you been a school counselor?” A third (33%) had five or fewer years of experience as a school counselor. Seventeen percent had more than twenty years of experience (see figure 22).

<i>Years Experience</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
0-5 years	454	33%
6-10 years	284	21%
11-15 years	227	17%
16-20 years	166	12%
21-25 years	115	8%
more than 25 years	116	9%
<i>Total</i>	<i>1362</i>	<i>100%</i>




Figure 22. The table and chart indicate the respondents' years of experience as school counselors.

In order to disaggregate data by grade level if necessary, respondents were asked to indicate in question 17 the grade levels with which they work. Figure 23 represents the grade levels indicated.

<i>Grade Levels</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
Elementary	508	37%
Middle/Jr. High	322	24%
High/Secondary	418	31%
Elementary and Middle	25	2%
Middle and High/Secondary	52	4%
K-12	10	1%
Other, please specify	29	2%
<i>Total</i>	<i>1364</i>	<i>100%</i>




Figure 23. The table and chart represent the grade levels with which respondents work.

Question 18 asked respondents to share any additional relevant comments. Additional comments were provided by 498 of the respondents. Themes for the open-ended comments were obvious with the majority being in relation to testing coordination, administrative/clerical duties, functioning as classroom/guidance teachers to give teachers breaks, lack of administrator knowledge or support and counselor-to-student ratios. Samples of respondent comments can be found beginning on page 26 and in text boxes found throughout this report.

For the purposes of assessing how many LEAs were represented in the survey responses, question 19 requested that respondents indicate in which LEA they were employed. Based on the 1338 responses to this question, all but eight LEAs had at least one school counselor respond for representation from 93% of the 115 LEAs. Three charter school counselors and one Health and Human Services school counselor also participated in the survey. One hundred and ninety-one respondents did not indicate their LEAs.

2007-2008 Beginning of Year School Counselor Survey

The second school counselor survey consisted of just three questions to assess how the school year had begun in relation to implementation of the school counselor job description. School counselors were asked (1) As you begin the 2007-2008 school year, are you able to implement the NC School Counselor Job Description/ASCA *National Model: Framework for School Counseling Programs* at your school?, (2) What are your primary obstacles to implementing the NC School Counselor Job Description/ASCA *National Model: Framework for School Counseling Programs* (please select no more than three)? and (3) Please share additional comments that you feel are relevant to this school counselor survey, but were not captured in the questions included.

Question 1 gave respondents four answer options of “Yes,” “Somewhat,” “A little,” and “No.” The largest percentage of answers was for “Somewhat” at 46%. Only 20% responded “Yes.”

Response	#	%
Yes	187	20%
Somewhat	427	46%
A little	192	21%
No	125	13%
Total	931	100%




Figure 24. Responses regarding if school counselors are able to implement their job description.

Question 2 inquired about primary obstacles to implementing the job description (*see figure 25*). Only 10% responded that they have had no obstacles to implementation. Testing coordination and counselor-to-student ratio were noted most frequently with 40% selecting testing coordination and 41% selecting counselor-to-student ratio as obstacles to implementation.

Thirty percent indicated that coordinating the Student Assistance/Support Management Team was interfering with their capacities to implement the school counselor job description. This is a team to which teachers refer any students whom they are having difficulty teaching. Every situation is individual, but these difficulties can be as simple as a personality conflict between the teacher and student to a need for evaluation for a serious handicapping condition. Paper work for this team is supposed to be shared by all of the team members and the referring teacher; however, the chair of the team (often the school counselor) is frequently encumbered with the tasks without assistance. For schools with large student body populations, the numbers of referrals can be immense.

Serving as a registrar was selected by 20% of the respondents. School counselors helping students with selecting appropriate classes has inappropriately grown into performing all registration tasks in many schools. As this became more common at the high school level, it infiltrated down to some middle and elementary schools as well.

Rigid classroom guidance schedule was selected as a barrier to job description implementation by 15% of the respondents. Many school counselors have reported this to have evolved from policies to protect teacher time. In response, many school counselors have been scheduled to teach in rotation with such classes as art, music and physical education in order to provide the teachers with a duty-free period. This is a more common problem at the elementary level, but is starting to appear at other grade levels as school administrators seek to fill time slots on block schedules. Also in relation to affects of policies to protect teacher time are extra duties such as supervising during student lunches, student arrival and bus departure and substitute teaching for teachers who need to be out of their classrooms. Twelve percent of the respondents presented this to be a problem.

School counselor quote:

“There are many times I wonder if I am making a difference and if there is another field that I would feel more useful at.”

Providing ongoing IEP counseling was selected by 5% of the respondents. Two percent indicated teaching or tutoring content areas as a barrier.

<i>Response</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>%</i>
I have had no obstacles to implementation	90	10%
Testing coordination	369	40%
Serving as a registrar	181	20%
Teaching or tutoring content areas	23	2%
Rigid classroom guidance schedule including, but not limited to, being in the master schedule with courses such as art, music, PE, etc.	139	15%
Extra duties assigned in order to protect teacher time	111	12%
Student Assistance/Support Management Team Coordination	279	30%
Providing ongoing IEP counseling	43	5%
Counselor-to-Student ratio	383	41%

Figure 25. Responses regarding primary obstacles to implementing the school counselor job description.

Both the first and second school counselor surveys concluded with open-ended items of which respondents could provide comments that they felt were relevant, but not fully captured in the survey questions. Nearly 500 comments were shared in the first survey and 331 were shared in the second. The same patterns as in previous open-ended comments were obvious with the majority being in relation to testing coordination, administrative/clerical duties, functioning as classroom/guidance teachers to give teachers duty-free periods, lack of administrator knowledge or support and counselor-to-student ratios.

There were also some very clear expressions of appreciation from school counselors who stated that their administrators were supportive of their functioning in appropriate roles; however, most expressed the belief that adherence to their job description needed to be mandated or it would

otherwise not occur. Many school counselors stated that administrators should be required to have training in the appropriate roles of school counselors. Feelings of being unvalued and “dumped on” were very obvious in the school counselor responses. A significant number of responses were concerning the lack of equity in benefits and consideration for school counselors in comparison to teachers. Also, included in relation to the inequity issues were comments that although school counselors are required to have master’s degrees and are frequently given administrator duties, they are still on the same pay scale as teachers while school psychologists and speech language pathologists have higher pay scales.

Below are a few samples of the over 800 comments shared by school counselors who completed the surveys.

Quotes from School Counselor Survey Respondents

“HELP us in the field, please, before we choose different career paths, I CARE about my students and have tried SO hard to make a difference in our school, but we MUST have support. Please.”

“I’ve always had to handle clerical duties and non-counselor duties to the detriment of my students. I’ve tried to manage the best I can so the students don’t suffer. However, I am tired of hearing students say their counselor is too busy to talk to them.”

“It is heartbreaking to have previously suicidal/self-injurious students you cannot see due to testing.”

“I was given a disciplinary letter for being 10 minutes late to a class when dealing with a student whose family had been evicted from their home.”

“I believe that if counselors were free to do their jobs, dropout rates would greatly improve across the state.... I certainly would feel more self worth about counseling if I had time to save a few kids by establishing rapport instead of being asked to fill out a drop out report on a student I never had time to know.”

“I am currently considering early retirement (against my financial well-being) because of testing.”

“(Assistant superintendent and LEA name omitted to protect privacy) has specifically stated that they will not relieve counselors of Testing Coordination in spite of what the state says.”

“I was expected to teach in the special rotation as well as function as the testing coordinator. I had bus duty every morning and car duty every afternoon. I was also expected to perform receptionist duties while the secretary went to lunch.” *(In response to have you ever left employment due to non-counseling duties)*

“When I complained crying to the central office that I was overworked and working on Sat. to do all the clerical work to get the job done without a secretary, I was told to take some time off for stress. It was not stress; it was overworked and commitment to my job. I almost made myself physically sick from overwork.”

"The title school counselor is a misrepresentation of what we are expected and allowed to do. That is very discouraging. I did not become a school counselor to manage paperwork or provide planning time for teachers."

"No one can know all that is involved until you are required to be the testing coordinator. I do not have a 6 year master's degree in counseling to count test books and bubble answer sheets."

"Until something is done from the top, we must do what we are told to do or lose our jobs."

"Counselors at my school are not respected. We are not given the freedom to do our job. We get marked down for not attending our scheduled lunch duty when we are with a student, and we are told to not make parent conferences during lunch duty."

"The principal's commitment to the model is imperative for success."

"Until it is mandated from the higher level that Counselors should NOT be in the master schedule or serve as Testing coordinators, the county level will do as they please."

"School counseling has evolved into a profession with the goal in mind of helping students explore careers and cope with life. At this point, we are used for testing and registration and data entry in SIMS.... My office has students in it every day taking a moment to get a handle on themselves emotionally or exploring possibilities for their futures or learning about studying or social skills. During testing and whenever a new student walks in to register, I am expected to put these students aside and tell them I am unavailable."

"My principal is committed to allow me to do what a school counselor is supposed to do and I APPRECIATE her."

"I am working at a different school than I was the last two years. My previous school did not implement the ASCA model at all. My position as a school counselor was approximately 60% testing, 15% scheduling/scheduling changes, 20% other duties 504/meetings/classroom guidance/etc. and 5% counseling. My new school is dedicated to implementing the ASCA model. Most of my professional duties are direct services to the students. This is an exciting and welcome change."

"I wish that those educators/legislators would have the opportunity to deal with or hear the tragic circumstances that our children face on a daily basis. Maybe they would begin to understand that learning cannot take place if students' emotional, mental and physical needs are not being met."

"I find it extremely frustrating that the State gives us directives without funding. For example, everyone recognizes that counselors do not need to be test coordinators but there are no funds provided to create positions or even to protect the ones we have."

"We have been told that the new counselor job description is a recommendation, not a mandate, and as long as that is the case, it probably won't be implemented here.... You will probably find my cold dead body slumped over a number two pencil before it changes here!"

"It seems the local LEA's and others in administration are not aware of the Master's level training and education school counselors are required to complete. Most of our education and

training is in counseling, and it seems that is the least activity we do. Yet when an outside agency comes into the school to provide counseling to a student, they are given priority. What does that say to the school counselor about the professional respect and status?"

"I am in a different school since responding to the first survey. I have gone from seriously considering leaving the school system after 14 years to being in a wonderful supportive school. I am now working my dream job at the high school level. The difference is tremendous. It is such a change for the better. I am valued and encouraged each day by a knowledgeable and dependable staff."

"I do not mind doing my part, but it isn't equitable to have teachers having 1.5 hours to plan and eat and counselors having no time....why do I, a Certified School Counselor with a Masters Degree in Education not have the same protected time that teachers do? I am certified and certainly work just as hard or harder now that this new law for teachers is in effect. Is my time and contribution to education not deserving of anything more than being a body to cover for teachers who have rights by law that I do not?"

"I work in a K-2 setting and took the national job description (ASCA), outlined it and created a program for our school that fits the model. The other Counselor and I created most of the classroom guidance sessions from scratch because very few packaged programs are geared towards kids who can't yet read or who don't enjoy coloring. We created activities that are much more interactive – it took some time, but now we've got a great program in place for next year."

"The frustration of school counselors is the main reason why there is so many of my colleagues going back to school to receive another degree and pursue another field."

"If you complain or voice your concerns you are singled out and they make your life become a daytime nightmare. I pray continually that someone somewhere with the power will awake some day and make things right."

"School counselors are on the same pay scale as teachers but do not receive all the benefits of teachers (ie personal leave days). In addition, my hours (as told to me by the administration) are 7:30 until 4 pm (minimum). Teachers are told 7:45 to 3:15.... Also, teachers have allotted times for planning & lunch but I always work through lunch to be able to do some of the counselor duties instead of just testing."

"This state is not taking care of the caretakers/caregivers!"

"I'm so glad to have the state asking these questions FINALLY."

"Administrators and above need to be trained on how to use their counselors. We do have Master's Degrees and knowledge so treat us like the professionals we are."

"700 students attend this K-2 school and there is 1 counselor here. All classes scheduled for classroom guidance every other week with classes back to back with only a lunch break of 35-40 minutes. The counselor pushes a cart to all classes (31) and has time to see individual students only during her lunch...."

“We have had several tragedies at our school, including suicide, murders, teacher death, students natural death and the Counselors have never been called in to help advise or to be apprised of the situation.”

“I am getting tired of completing surveys when there is no result. Change needs to occur from the state level down to support counselors jobs and our purpose in schools.”

“I probably picked a bad time to complete this survey since day 3 of EOGs was yesterday and I stayed at the school, alone, counting, recounting, organizing test books and answer sheets and bubbling sheets and header sheets until 2:18am this morning.”

“Schools of administration should have classes to teach future administrators about counselors job description. Also, in-services for current administrators may be helpful.”

“We are professional counselors who choose to work in a school setting. We are not trained to perform as teachers, since many of us have no past experience as a classroom teacher. I think our state must decide what it is we want.”

“I don’t see myself continuing in this position as it is for much longer, as a newer counselor I am surprised to admit that I already feel disheartened and ‘burned out’ on the job. A sad predicament for those of us entering the field, but equally sad for the system that continues to allow it to happen!”

“I am concerned about the message this sends children about the importance of testing versus their needs.”

“I think the people at DPI and our own central office who make up all the forms, testing requirements, etc. should have to come into a school and understand the manpower it takes to implement all of the programs and paperwork that is imposed on us.”

“The needs of the students should drive the counseling program; and the counseling program should drive the prioritized use of the counselor’s time, NOT the scheduling needs of the school driving the use of the counselor’s time.”

“The new job description targets what school counseling is all about but if we are not free to implement it then it’s bogus.”

“Thanks for caring about what counselors do in their roles to better serve students.”

Directors of Student Support Services Survey Results

An electronic survey was also distributed to the Directors of Student Support Services in each LEA. The purpose of the survey was to collect information and examine the level of implementation of the new job description during the school year. A sixty percent benchmark for success was established by the Department of Public Instruction Student Support Services Consultant to interpret the survey results. The 17-item survey was distributed electronically to 115 LEAs. Data was submitted and compiled from 62% (71) of the 115 LEAs. Twenty-five partially completed surveys were not used to interpret the level of implementation. Survey items that requested respondents to select one answer and provide an optional comment do not equal 100 %. Appendix F displays the completed survey responses only.

The directors of student support services indicated their awareness of the new school counselor job description and the training that has been offered. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents have participated in job description training (*See Figure 1*).




Figure 1: Job Description Training Attendance

As previously mentioned in this report, the new school counselor job description is aligned to the American School Counselor Association's national model. Job description training sessions were provided throughout the 2006-07 school year and have continued into the 2007-08 school year. North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) Student Support Services Consultants, in collaboration with the North Carolina School Counselor Association (NCSCA), provided the job description/ASCA National Model training throughout the state upon request. Ongoing training sessions have been provided at the NCSCA's annual fall conference since 2006.

The training session provide the context for effective, efficient 21st century school counselors. The significance of this training is reflected through 77% of the respondents indicating steps had been taken to align school district school counselors' job responsibilities to the new state job description. In addition, respondents were asked to provide evidence of this endeavor through an open-ended response. The open-ended responses ranged from very positive reception from counselors and administrators to resistance. To further illustrate the importance of the new job description, 73% of the directors have taken steps to ensure that the new school counselor hires are prepared to fulfill the requirements of the new job description. However, when respondents were asked if their district had developed a formal plan to implement the new job description only 42% responded affirmatively (*See Figure 2*). The low incident of district planning may suggest a greater need for district level support to ensure school counselors are being used appropriately.




Figure 2: Development of Formal Plan

The school counselor job description training presents a standardized framework that describes the role of the school counselor in student achievement. The framework provides the structure for school districts and counselors to develop then implement a comprehensive school counseling program. The system support function of the job description consists of management activities that establish, maintain, and enhance the total school counseling program such as professional development. Seventy-three percent (49) of the school district respondents had provided school counselors professional development regarding the new job description. Ongoing professional development is vital in strengthening the system support component of the new job description. However, when asked if the training had been provided to the school administrator only 50% (33) of the respondents had provided training to district level administrators. This data suggest the need to continue educating administrators on the pivotal role counselors' play in student achievement (*See Figure 3*).




Figure 3: School District Sponsored Administrator Training

Respondents were asked to address their districts' plan for implementing the new job description during the 2007-08 school year. A review of the open-ended responses reflect the following implementation strategies monthly counselor meetings, principal meetings, periodic assessments of school counselor job duties, and ongoing professional development. These selected quotes that follow taken from the respondents seem to suggest that various internal obstacles may exist in some school settings that may potentially hinder counselors from performing some of the duties reflected in the SBE approved job description. Selected quotes from a Director of Student Support Services Survey Respondent:

- "We have no plans at this time for counselors in grades K-8, but we will continue with implementation of ASCA in high schools. Any new counselors will be given a copy of the new job description and we will review it. It would be difficult to implement the new job description when our counselors are still responsible for testing coordination."
- "I plan for all counselors to receive the training; re-invite DPI for a second training, yet until I stop meeting resistance from curriculum, I will not have the support to reinforce the need for counselors to be counselors."
- "Everyone needs to understand that principals determine what counselors can and cannot do, not counselors. When counselors' plates are overflowing with "other" responsibilities, they are limited in what they can accomplish."

- “Counselors will fulfill job responsibilities based on how they are evaluated and what is required of them by administration. The reality is that the new job description cannot be fully implemented until there is a funded alternative to address testing duties currently assigned to counselors.”

Sixty-two percent of the local education agencies participating in this survey reflect a total of 766 elementary counselors, 673 middle school counselors, and 890 high school counselors. Figure 4 illustrates the percentage of the represented school counselors who were used as testing coordinators.




Figure 4: Percentage of School Counselors Used as Testing Coordinators in 2006-2007

When queried about the barriers to implementing the new school counselors’ job description four overarching themes emerged.

1. The lack of adequate understanding of the relationship between school counselor and student achievement,
2. The lack of adequate district level support,
3. The lack of adequate school personnel to staff teacher planning periods and elective courses, and
4. The lack of adequate available school counselors required to reduce the high counselor-to-student ratio.

The selected quotes below from a Director of Student Support Services Survey Respondent on barriers to implementing the job description represent concerns regarding the SBE approved job description.

- “Many principals at elementary level still want to use the counselor as a “Special [Teacher]” (art, music, and PE).”

- “No funding for testing coordinators, ESL contacts, and other non-counseling duties”
- “School counselors used as testing coordinators. Principals using counselors as administrators to do some of their duties or assigning duties that should not be performed by counselors.”
- “There are so many... primarily the lack of support and the desire not to change. I hear a lot of who else within our school can coordinate SAT, testing, registration, enrollment, and other administrative duties. Until the state gives us money for testing coordinators, or until the state tells us (passes the bill) that says we cannot use counselors for administrative duties then we continue as is. Testing coordination is just one item that needs to be removed from counselors.”
- “Counselors are required to teach guidance classes all day as a part of electives rotation.”
- “Superintendent level inability to understand job description and needs of student clients.”
- “Most of the counselors are assigned the duty of testing coordinators. Over 50% of their time is utilized for testing. Funding for testing coordinators is the key to implementing the new job description.”
- “We have 1050 students with two full-time counselors and one part- time counselor from the Exceptional Children’s Department. Also, one counselor is [the] test coordinator which dominates her time for several weeks out of year when students are on campus.”
- “Historically, barriers have included limited number of other personnel to complete various duties including hall, breakfast, lunch, bus, etc. An on-going expectation, due to staffing patterns, for the counselors to take a very active role in coordinating/implementing the high stakes testing programs at each school.”
- “Counselors have to spend 80% of their time testing.”
- “Too much time is spent on testing in our county. Students must take benchmark test every nine weeks, followed by the writing test, computer skills, Extend II, EOG, Field Test, NAEP, Algebra I and now a science EOG in the 8th grade. The whole month of May is now spent on preparing to test and testing. This is the first year that we have ever had to test students on the last school day! Our other huge problem this year has been getting people to volunteer to proctor. A huge amount of time was spent on this with less than half showing up the first day of EOG testing. NAEP does not require the use of proctors. This is a national test. Testing has become overwhelming and even unmanageable even with a testing coordinator. Our school has 600 students and it takes two of us to even be able to attempt the process.”

Respondents indicated a concern regarding the lack of uniformity in the appraisal instrument used to evaluate school counselors’ performance. There are various appraisal instruments being

used across the state including the current state school counselor's appraisal instrument, principal preference, and district developed. Additional concern was expressed regarding school counselors being evaluated by administrators who may not have a clear understanding of their role.

Respondents were given the opportunity to share additional information they felt was relevant but was not captured in the electronic survey. The selected quotes that follow from Directors of Student Support Services Survey Respondents capture some of the concerns:

- "In order for students to be more successful, we need to be addressing the physical, social, and emotional barriers; however, the only individuals trained in our schools to do so are burdened with clerical and administrative duties (i.e. testing). Testing and accountability management is in and of itself a full-time position, as it has grown immensely over the past decade."
- "I have examples after examples when students needed to see a counselor and they were not available because they were at CO [Central Office] dropping off testing materials, proctoring. I have examples after examples of counselor primarily responsible for registration and testing and during those weeks, we've had students die, and counselors are unavailable. I would think folks would immediately say, "Who else can cover for the counselors while they go and meet with the students, but no." Please mandate these requests - if not, we are powerless to respond."
- "Administrators - principals and superintendents - truly don't understand the counseling role in the school. They take advantage of anyone that does not have a homeroom. Strict guidelines from the state on use of counselors and funds for counselors need to be given and adhered to at [the] local level. Counselors need to counsel not be a substitute anything and everything!"
- "Elementary and middle school counselors' classroom guidance is built into the teachers' schedule. Teachers are not in the classroom during sessions."
- "Job description is a joke unless local school superintendents are mandated to implement them."
- "Our counselors are required to do many things that a high school graduate could do with some training. These things prevent them from doing the things ONLY they are trained to do. They have little time to make a difference in areas such as the dropout rate."
- "Survey superintendents on their role implementation of the new job description."

To ensure a comprehensive review of the state's new implementation of the job description, a follow-up survey was sent to the Directors of Student Support Service at the beginning of the 2007-08 school year to obtain the most recent information (*Appendix F*). For consistency, a sixty percent benchmark for success was established to interpret this data. Thirty-one percent (36) of the 115 local education agencies completed the follow-up survey. The respondents

reported varying levels of implementation of the new job description. Only 28% of the district level respondents indicated that all their district's school counselors are able to implement the new job description.

The obstacles to implementing the new job description remained constant in the 2007-08 follow-up survey (*See Figure 5*). These were the key barriers that district level respondents felt prevented the school counselors from functioning as effective, efficient 21st century school counselors who address achievement gap issues such as literacy, attendance, social-emotional needs, and dropout. Other denotes a combination of many of the items listed in Figure 5 such as testing coordination, registrar, and a rigid classroom schedule.

Testing coordination	28%
Counselor-to-student ratio	17%
Clerical duties not related to counseling program (SIMS/NCWISE data entry, cumulative records, registering all students beyond assistance with course selection, etc.)	8%
Rigid classroom guidance schedule including, but not limited to, being in the master schedule with courses such as art, music, PE, etc.	8%
Miscellaneous duties/other (bus duty, cafeteria duty, club advisement, etc.)	8%
Extra duties assigned in order to protect teacher time	6%
Serving as a registrar	6%
Have not had any training on the new job description/ASCA National Model	6%
They have had no obstacles to implementation	3%
Student Assistance/Support Management Team Coordination	3%
Teaching or tutoring content areas	0%
Providing ongoing IEP counseling	0%
Administrative duties (disciplinary actions, administrative reports, etc.)	0%
Other, please specify	8%

Figure 5: Barriers to Implementing the New Job Description

Respondents provided additional information that would be helpful in completing this assessment. They indicated rigid classroom guidance to support teacher planning, testing coordination, clerical responsibilities, administrative duties, high counselor to student ratio, loss of counselor positions, and coordination of ancillary services as impediments to implementing the new job description.

Quotes from a Director of Student Support Service from the 2007-08 Survey

“The obstacles vary from school to school. The smaller the school, the more rigid the classroom guidance schedule is to insure teacher-planning time.”

“There truly are multiple reasons for the difficulty in implementation. For some, it is rigid classroom guidance schedule, for others it is coordination of SST/504/participation in IEP team meetings, for others it is "extra duties" such as lunch, bus, student check-in, etc. in order to protect teacher time, for others it is clerical. I have no power, as the principal runs his/her school the way they see fit, to over-ride inappropriate job responsibilities that have been assigned. I have no voice on the Cabinet, the leadership group that directs the system, at this time.”

“Counselors being assigned data work or administrative work is another big area of concern for counselors in this district.”

“To a person, our counselors are awesome and perform daily miracles in the lives of children. But we don't have enough counselors; some with caseloads of over 600 students.”

“There is more than one obstacle to implementation of ASCA and the job description - testing duties (in elementary schools), a rigid guidance schedule being in the master schedule (in 2 elementary schools), SST management in almost all of our schools, counselor to student ratio (no schools in our county meet this recommended ratio), assignment of cumulative record management. We are implementing the ASCA model in HS because a test coordinator/register has been hired. Next year we will add the MS because they have hired an additional assistant principal to do test coordination. There are no plans at this time to move the elementary schools in that direction.”

APPENDICES

Appendices	39
Appendix A – NC School Counselor Job Description (QP-C-12)	41
Appendix B – State Allotment Program Report Code: 007 Instructional Support Personnel – Certified.	51
Appendix C – Summary of NCDPI 2000 Report “ <i>How School Counselors Spend Their Time</i> ”	55
Appendix D – Summary of NCDPI 2003 Informal E-mail Survey “ <i>From the Frontline: What’s Really Going on with Testing Coordination</i> ”	59
Appendix E – NC School Counselor Association Government Relations Job Responsibility Survey Results September 2006	63
Appendix F – 2007 Survey Results for SL 2006-176 Section 2	67

APPENDIX A

NC School Counselor Job Description

(Approved by the North Carolina State Board of Education on June 1, 2006)

QP-C-12

School Counselor Job Description

Process

The 2005 School Counselor Job Description was prepared collaboratively by representatives from school districts, institutions of higher education, professional organizations and the Department of Public Instruction. Department staff acknowledges with deep appreciation and gratitude the contributions of the following advisory committee members:

Name	Position	Organization
Tara W. Bissette	President of NCSCA and Elementary School Counselor	NC School Counselor Association and Wake County Schools
Cynthia Floyd	School Counseling Consultant	NCDPI
John Galassi	Professor and Coordinator of School Counseling	UNC Chapel Hill
Eleanor Goettee	Executive Director	NC Professional Teaching Standards Commission
Beverly Kellar	Assistant Superintendent	Gaston County Schools
Leah McCallum	Elementary School Counselor and USC doctoral student	Scotland County Schools
Joe Parry-Hill	Personnel Analyst	NCDPI
Pat Partin	Professor of Psychology and Counseling	Gardner-Webb University
Marrius Pettiford	Past-president of NCSCA and Dean of High School Counseling	NC School Counselor Association and Wake County Schools
Barbara Potts	Supervisor of Counseling Services	Guilford County Schools
Debra Preston	School Counseling Program Coordinator	UNC Pembroke
Kenneth Simington	Director of Student Services	Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools
Eric Sparks	Supervisor/Post-secondary Vice-President of ASCA and Director of School Counseling	American School Counselor Association and Wake County Schools
Audrey Thomasson	Director of NCSCA and Middle School Counselor	NC School Counselor Association and Wake County Schools
Jose Villalba	Assistant Professor of Counselor Education	UNC Greensboro
Florence Weaver	Professor of Counselor Education	East Carolina University

Additional input was gathered via feedback from distribution of the proposed school counselor job description draft at the NCSCA Fall Conference, e-mail to the NC Principals & Assistant Principals Association, e-mail listservs to school personnel and posting the job description on the DPI/LEARN NC

School Counseling web page. The revised job description is to be presented to the State Board of Education for consideration and action.

Purpose and Background

This document is intended for use by North Carolina schools and local education agencies which employ school counselors. The 2005 North Carolina School Counselor Job Description represents a revision of the 1987 North Carolina School Counselor Job Description. In developing the 2005 job description, a variety of documents and relevant State legislation and statutes were consulted including *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs*, the current State *Comprehensive School Counseling Standard Course of Study*, the pending 2005 draft of the North Carolina Standards for the Preparation of School Counselors (approved 11/03/2005), State Board of Education Policies QP-C-003 and QP-C-006, State Board of Education Priorities, State General Statutes 115C-333 and 115C-335, pending House Bill 836 – Duties of School Counselors, the U.S. Department of Education’s “The Guidance Counselor’s Role in Ensuring Equal Educational Opportunity” and current State educational staff job descriptions and evaluation systems.

Role of the School Counselor

In the United States, the school counseling profession began as a vocational guidance movement at the beginning of the 20th century (Schmidt, 2003, p. 6). In 1907, Jesse B. Davis became the principal of a high school and encouraged the school English teachers to use compositions and lessons to relate career interests, develop character, and avoid behavioral problems. From that grew systematic guidance programs which later evolved into comprehensive school counseling programs that address three basic domains: academic development, career development, and personal/social development.

In North Carolina, one has to complete an approved master’s degree counselor education program in a regionally-accredited college or university in order to be a licensed school counselor. Within these counselor education programs, several standards are studied such as the professional identity of school counseling, cultural diversity, human growth and development, and career development. Also required are the core components for helping relationships, group and individual work, assessment, research and program evaluation, knowledge and requirements for school counselors, contextual dimensions of school counseling, foundations of school counseling and an internship under a highly qualified school counselor.

School counselors are expected to apply their professional training in schools in order to support student success. Through comprehensive school counseling programs of developmental, preventive, remedial, and responsive services, school counselors address academic development, career development, and personal/social development of students. This job description is a guide for the implementation of such comprehensive school counseling programs in the public schools of North Carolina.

Schmidt, J.J. (2003) *Counseling in schools: Essential services and comprehensive programs*. 4th ed.
Boston: Allyn & Bacon

SCHOOL COUNSELOR STUDENT SERVICES JOB DESCRIPTION

OUTLINE

POSITION: School Counselor

REPORTS TO: Principal

PURPOSE: Utilizing leadership, advocacy, and collaboration, school counselors promote student success, provide preventive services, and respond to identified student needs by implementing a comprehensive school counseling program that addresses academic, career, and personal/social development for all students.

The major functions of the school counselor job description incorporate the North Carolina State Board of Education priorities of High Student Performance, Healthy Students in Safe, Orderly and Caring Schools, Quality Teachers, Administrators and Staff, Strong Family, Community, and Business Support and Effective and Efficient Operation.

**NOTE: As of September 2006, subsequent to the approval of this job description, the State Board of Education adopted new strategic goals of NC public schools will produce globally competitive students, NC public schools will be led by 21st Century professionals, NC public school students will be healthy and responsible, Leadership will guide innovation in NC public schools and NC public schools will be governed and supported by 21st Century systems.*

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

MAJOR FUNCTION: DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM

Plans and Maintains an Effective Comprehensive School Counseling Program

MAJOR FUNCTION: DELIVERY OF A COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM

Guidance Curriculum

Individual Student Planning

Preventive and Responsive Services

System Support

MAJOR FUNCTION: ACCOUNTABILITY

The Comprehensive School Counseling Program is data-driven

SCHOOL COUNSELOR STUDENT SERVICES JOB DESCRIPTION

POSITION: School Counselor

REPORTS TO: Principal

PURPOSE: Utilizing leadership, advocacy, and collaboration, school counselors promote student success, provide preventive services, and respond to identified student needs by implementing a comprehensive school counseling program that addresses academic, career, and personal/social development for all students.

The major functions of the school counselor job description incorporate the North Carolina State Board of Education priorities of High Student Performance, Healthy Students in Safe, Orderly and Caring Schools, Quality Teachers, Administrators and Staff, Strong Family, Community, and Business Support and Effective and Efficient Operation.

**NOTE: As of September 2006, subsequent to the approval of this job description, the State Board of Education adopted new strategic goals of NC public schools will produce globally competitive students, NC public schools will be led by 21st Century professionals, NC public school students will be healthy and responsible, Leadership will guide innovation in NC public schools and NC public schools will be governed and supported by 21st Century systems.*

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. MAJOR FUNCTION: DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM

- 1.1 Discusses the comprehensive school counseling program with the school administrator.
- 1.2 Develops and maintains a written plan for effective delivery of the school counseling program based on the NC Comprehensive School Counseling Standard Course of Study and current individual school data.
- 1.3 Communicates the goals of the comprehensive school counseling program to education stakeholders.
- 1.4 Maintains current and appropriate resources for education stakeholders.
- 1.5 Uses the majority of time providing direct services through the Guidance Curriculum, Individual Student Planning and Preventive and Responsive Services and most remaining time in program management, system support and accountability. [National standards recommend 80% of time in Guidance Curriculum, Individual Student Planning and Preventive and Responsive Services and 20% of time in program management, system support and accountability. (American School Counselor Association (2003). *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs*. Alexandria, VA)]

2. MAJOR FUNCTION: DELIVERY OF A COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM

Guidance Curriculum

- 2.1 Provides leadership and collaborates with other educators in the school-wide integration of the State Guidance Curriculum Standard Course of Study.
- 2.2 Implements developmentally appropriate and prevention-oriented group activities to meet student needs and school goals.

Individual Student Planning

- 2.3 Assists all students, individually or in groups, with developing academic, career and personal/social skills, goals and plans.
- 2.4 Accurately and appropriately interprets and utilizes student data.
- 2.5 Collaborates with parents/guardians and educators to assist students with educational and career planning.

Preventive and Responsive Services

- 2.6 Provides individual and group counseling to students with identified concerns and needs.
- 2.7 Consults and collaborates effectively with parents/guardians, teachers, administrators and other educational/community resources regarding students with identified concerns and needs.
- 2.8 Implements an effective referral and follow-up process.
- 2.9 Accurately and appropriately uses assessment procedures for determining and structuring individual and group counseling services.

System Support

- 2.10 Provides appropriate information to staff related to the comprehensive school counseling program.
- 2.11 Assists teachers, parents/guardians and other stakeholders in interpreting and understanding student data.
- 2.12 Participates in professional development activities to improve knowledge and skills.
- 2.13 Uses available technology resources to enhance the school counseling program.
- 2.14 Adheres to laws, policies, procedures, and ethical standards of the school counseling profession.

3. MAJOR FUNCTION: ACCOUNTABILITY

- 3.1 Conducts a yearly program audit to review extent of program implementation.
- 3.2 Collects and analyzes data to guide program direction and emphasis.
- 3.3 Measures results of the school counseling program activities and shares results as appropriate.
- 3.4 Monitors student academic performance, behavior and attendance and assists with appropriate interventions.

Standards for School Counselor Evaluation

SAMPLE EVIDENCES OF DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

POSITION: School Counselor

REPORTS TO: Principal

PURPOSE: Utilizing leadership, advocacy, and collaboration, school counselors promote student success, provide preventive services, and respond to identified student needs by implementing a comprehensive school counseling program that addresses academic, career, and personal/social development for all students.

The major functions of the school counselor job description incorporate the North Carolina State Board of Education priorities of High Student Performance, Healthy Students in Safe, Orderly and Caring Schools, Quality Teachers, Administrators and Staff, Strong Family, Community, and Business Support and Effective and Efficient Operation.

**NOTE: As of September 2006, subsequent to the approval of this job description, the State Board of Education adopted new strategic goals of NC public schools will produce globally competitive students, NC public schools will be led by 21st Century professionals, NC public school students will be healthy and responsible, Leadership will guide innovation in NC public schools and NC public schools will be governed and supported by 21st Century systems.*

The following are suggested examples of each of the major functions for school counselors. Because each work situation is different, it is not likely that all of these evidences will be demonstrated by every school counselor. The evaluator is urged to develop a similar list of expectations specifically for the school counselor being evaluated. These expectations should provide indication that the three major functions are being performed.

1. MAJOR FUNCTION: DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM

- 1.1 Discusses the comprehensive school counseling program with the school administrator.
 - Completes a management agreement with the administrator.
- Develops and maintains a written plan for effective delivery of the school counseling program based on the NC Comprehensive School Counseling Standard Course of Study and current individual school data.
- 1.3 Communicates the goals of the comprehensive school counseling program to education stakeholders.
 - Publicizes newsletters, calendars, memos, web pages, etc.
 - Presents information to school improvement team, to school counselor advisory council, at parent/guardian meetings, etc.
- 1.4 Maintains current and appropriate resources for education stakeholders.
 - Maintains career resources, college and scholarship information, parent/guardian resources, teacher resources, community resources, etc.

- 1.5 Uses the majority of time providing direct services through the Guidance Curriculum, Individual Student Planning and Preventive and Responsive Services and most remaining time in program management, system support and accountability. [National standards recommend 80% of time in Guidance Curriculum, Individual Student Planning and Preventive and Responsive Services and 20% of time in program management, system support and accountability. (American School Counselor Association (2003). *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs*. Alexandria, VA)]
- Maintains calendars of activities and services of the school counseling program.

2. MAJOR FUNCTION: DELIVERY OF A COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM

Guidance Curriculum

- 2.1 Provides leadership and collaborates with other educators in the school-wide integration of the State Guidance Curriculum Standard Course of Study.
- Assists teachers with how to use the State Guidance Curriculum lesson plans in their classrooms.
 - Provides applicable materials and resources to teachers for doing guidance activities in their classrooms.
- 2.2 Implements developmentally appropriate and prevention-oriented group activities to meet student needs and school goals.
- Conducts classroom guidance lessons such as character education.
 - Conducts small and large group activities based on the guidance curriculum.

Individual Student Planning

- 2.3 Assists all students, individually or in groups, with developing academic, career and personal/social skills, goals and plans.
- Conducts counseling sessions with students.
 - Appropriately guides students in developing goals based on individual data and other relevant information.
- 2.4 Accurately and appropriately interprets and utilizes student data.
- 2.5 Collaborates with parents/guardians and educators to assist students with educational and career planning.
- Sends written communications to parents/guardians and teachers
 - Apprises teachers of adaptive materials and services that exist and are available to students.

Preventive and Responsive Services

- 2.6 Provides individual and group counseling to students with identified concerns and needs.
- 2.7 Consults and collaborates effectively with parents/guardians, teachers, administrators and other educational/community resources regarding students with identified concerns and needs.
- Advocates for equity and access for all students.
 - Provides staff with resources to accommodate individual differences and needs of students.
- 2.8 Implements an effective referral and follow-up process.
- Manages and communicates a clear means for counseling referrals and other access to counseling services.

- 2.9 Accurately and appropriately uses assessment procedures for determining and structuring individual and group counseling services.

System Support

- 2.10 Provides appropriate information to staff related to the comprehensive school counseling program.
- Informs staff of services provided by the school counselor and how to access those services.
- 2.11 Assists teachers, parents/guardians and other stakeholders in interpreting and understanding student data.
- 2.12 Participates in professional development activities to improve knowledge and skills.
- Attends professional conferences, workshops, etc. relevant to school counseling.
- 2.13 Uses available technology resources to enhance the school counseling program.
- 2.14 Adheres to laws, policies, procedures, and ethical standards of the school counseling profession.
- Monitors/supervises student activities as appropriate.

3. MAJOR FUNCTION: ACCOUNTABILITY

- 3.1 Conducts a yearly program audit to review extent of program implementation.
- 3.2 Collects and analyzes data to guide program direction and emphasis.
- 3.3 Measures results of the school counseling program activities and shares results as appropriate.
- 3.4 Monitors student academic performance, behavior and attendance and assists with appropriate interventions.

APPENDIX B

State Allotment Program Report Code: 007 Instructional Support Personnel – Certified

Allotment Policy Manual FY 2006-07

Program Report Codes

A program report code (PRC) designates a plan of activities or funding designed to accomplish a predetermined objective.

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL – CERTIFIED

PROGRAM REPORT CODE: 007

UNIFORM CHART OF ACCOUNTS CODE: XXXX-007-1XX

STATUTORY REFERENCE:

TYPE: Positions

TERM: 10 months: July 1 - June 30

PURPOSE: Provides funding for salaries for certified instructional support personnel to implement locally designed initiatives that provide services to students who are at risk of school failure as well as the students' families. It is the intent of the General Assembly that the positions must be used first for counselors, then for social workers and other instructional support personnel that have a direct instructional relationship to students or teachers to help reduce violence in the public schools. They shall not be used as administrators, coordinators, supervisors, or directors.

ELIGIBILITY: Each LEA is entitled to positions. The number of positions allotted is based on the formula listed below.

FORMULAS: These positions are allotted on the basis of one per 200.10 allotted ADM. For city LEAs with an ADM of less than 3,000, all fractions will be rounded up to the next whole position. The positions are then multiplied by the LEA's average salary plus benefits.

After the first month of school, a LEA can request additional resources due to extraordinary student population growth. Allotments will be adjusted within available funds.

All partial positions .25 and over are rounded up to the nearest whole position.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS:

1. Local boards of education may transfer any portion of a position allotment to dollar allotments only for contracted services, which are directly related to school nursing and school psychology. Transfers for this purpose should be requested in writing to the Division of School Business. Converting certified position allotments to dollars for the purpose of hiring the same type position is not allowable. The following limitations apply to the conversion:
 - a. School Nurse:
 - One nurse for every 3,000 ADM or at least one per county.
 - b. School Psychologist:
 - One for every 2,000 ADM or at least one per county.
 - Certification that the local board was unable to employ certified school psychologists.
 - Contracted services are limited to initial evaluations, revaluations for exceptional children, assessments, consultations, and counseling.

- c. Both Nurse and Psychologist:
 - Prior approval from the Division of School Business.
 - Position (whole or half) will be converted at the statewide average salary level of an Instructional Support-Certified position, including benefits.
 - The dollar amount utilized for contracted services may not exceed the amount allocated to the local school system. The dollar allotment (salary, plus benefits) will be transferred to Instructional Support Personnel – Non-certified.
2. Each LEA is responsible for the identification of Instructional Support Personnel – Certified as teachers, librarians, school counselors, school psychologists, school nurses, and school social workers.
3. Upon written notification to the Division of School Business, certified support personnel positions may be transferred to dollars for non-certified personnel. All transfer requests must be received within the fiscal year that payment to the individual is made. There will be no prior year adjustments approved. If this option is selected, the resulting positions and dollars will be transferred to a separate allotment category entitled “Instructional Support Personnel – Non-certified” which is a dollar allotment.
4. The positions can be used for teachers to reduce class size in all grades without a State Board of Education (SBE) Waiver or a transfer of funds. Funds can be transferred for any purpose by submitting an ABC transfer form.
5. Any school which is eligible for a principal and contains grades K-12, with a total student population not sufficient to generate one instructional support position (ADM less than 150) will be allotted one instructional support position, within funds available for Instructional Support. This does not include schools identified as alternative or special schools. The LEA must allocate additional positions provided under this provision to the school that generated the additional positions.
6. Schools defined as high-priority per HB 397, Section 7.9, will receive one additional instructional support position at each priority school.*

SB 622, Section 7.10 states, The State Board of Education shall allow high priority schools that have made high growth for three consecutive years to be removed from the list of High Priority schools. If a local board of education chooses to have a school removed from the list of high priority schools, the additional high priority funding for that school shall be discontinued.

7. Small Specialty High School Pilot Program – New schools within an existing school that are apart of the eight pilot sites will receive an additional instructional support position for a Guidance Counselor. (SB 622, Section 7.52)

** Subsequent to the establishment of the information detailed in item six, high priority school designation has since been undergoing a phase-out process.*

APPENDIX C

Summary of NCDPI 2000 Report *“How School Counselors Spend Their Time”*

Summary:

How North Carolina School Counselors Spend Their Time

Purpose of Study

In 2000, the National Consortium for State Guidance Leadership released a study recommending that 70 – 80% of a school counselor's time be devoted to direct student services. According to the study, these direct services should focus on students' academic, career and personal/social development. Further research, proffered by the Consortium, suggested percentages of time that guidance counselors should spend on each of the four major function areas: guidance curriculum, individual planning, responsive services and system support.

A similar study of North Carolina's student services personnel was conducted in August 2000. The purpose of this study was to find out how the use of student services personnel time compared with the Consortium's recommendations.

Methods

During the study, 3100 student services personnel from multiple levels (elementary, middle, and high school counselors, career development coordinators, and other student services personnel) were invited to respond to a survey about the use of their time. Fifty-seven percent (57%) of the surveys were returned, for a total of 1772 responses. Of those responses, more than half of the personnel had five or fewer years of counseling experience.

Findings

The following include the results from the survey responses:

- Fewer than half of the North Carolina school counselors spend the nationally-recommended amount of time in the major function areas of a comprehensive school counseling program.
- Testing coordination responsibilities have taken more and more of the elementary, middle, and high school counselors' time.
- One-third of the elementary counselors spend between 10%-30% of their time on test coordination activities.
- More than one-third of middle school counselors spend between 10%-40% of their time on test coordination activities.
- More than one-third of high school counselors spend between 10%-40% of their time on test coordination activities.
- Registering students, maintaining cumulative records and transferring student records took away from counseling activities for middle school counselors.
- Student schedule changes also took up high school counselors' time.

Conclusion

Overwhelmingly, student services personnel reported spending less time on the Consortium's recommended direct services and more time on non-counseling duties such as test coordination activities. As such, it was recommended that schools be provided additional resources so that non-counseling functions could be taken away from student services personnel.

APPENDIX D

Summary of NCDPI 2003 Informal E-mail Survey *“From the Frontline: What’s Really Going on with Testing Coordination”*

*(Full report at
<http://newdev.www.ncpublicschools.org/studentsupport/counseling/>)*

Summary of “From the Frontline: What’s Really Going on with Testing Coordination”

Background In December 2003, four questions regarding the relationship between testing coordination and the role of school counselors were distributed through the North Carolina School Counselor listserv. The objective of the survey was to obtain a snapshot of the impact testing coordination has on the ability of school counselors to perform their job responsibilities. The following is a summary of the 143 responses received for the four questions.

Survey Question Summary

1. How much time is going into coordinating testing?

Most respondents indicated that 40%-60% of their time was spent on test coordination. During the test administration window, school counselors reported spending 80%-100% of their time coordinating testing. The respondents who reported that less than 40% of their time was spent in testing coordination shared the responsibility with one or two colleagues.

2. What comprehensive counseling services are you not able to implement due to the time going into testing coordination?

Respondents indicated not all components of a comprehensive counseling program were provided to their students. Unavailable services included, but were not limited to the following:

- individual and group counseling,
- classroom guidance,
- school-wide intervention programs and
- limited collaboration with parents/guardians and educators to assist students with educational and career planning.

In addition, respondents indicated that in schools where the school counselor was not the testing coordinator, more components of the comprehensive counseling program were provided. The school counselors in these schools were able to provide an uninterrupted comprehensive counseling program for students, educators, and parents. Some counselors were able to add or expand services such as the following:

- group counseling,
- supports for emotional and testing issues and
- programs for students not making satisfactory academic progress.

3. If the counselor is not the testing coordinator at your school, who is?

The respondents provided the following responses most frequently:

- assistant principal,
- instructional resource teacher,
- cross categorical resource teacher,
- curriculum coordinator and
- media specialist.

4. If your school has hired a testing coordinator, where did they get the funding?

The following are *possible* funding sources for testing coordination:

- Waivers for unavailable categories (open chart with restrictions) (PRC 006),
- Title I (PRC 50),
- Improving student accountability standards (072),
- Accountability grants for low performing schools (PRC 087),
- Transferability among specified Federal PRCs (PRC 721),
- Local funds and
- ADM allotment

Whether these budgets can actually be utilized for this purpose will have to be confirmed by individual LEA finance officers as it may vary from system to system.

IMPORTANT NOTE

A testing coordinator is not an approved instructional support position for PRC 007 (see detail below). These State funds can be used for these positions only if an ABC transfer request to move funds to another budget is submitted and approved by the State. The conversion is at the state average salary, plus benefits, for instructional support. If a person is performing both the guidance and testing coordinator duties, the position should be prorated between the PRC 007 budget and the other budget being used for testing coordination.

In the State allotment manual, under INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL - CERTIFIED, PROGRAM REPORT CODE: 007, it states:

"PURPOSE: Provides funding for salaries for certified instructional support personnel to implement locally designed initiatives which provide services to students who are at risk of school failure as well as the students' families. It is the intent of the General Assembly that the positions must be used first for counselors, then for social workers and other instructional support personnel, which have a direct instructional relationship to students or teachers to help reduce violence in the public schools. They shall not be used as administrators, coordinators, supervisors, or directors."

APPENDIX E

Summary of the NC School Counselor Association Government Relations Job Responsibility Survey Results September 2006

NCSCA Government Relations Job Responsibility Survey Results **September 2006**

Group	Total Responses	Currently spend 80% of time in direct services to students	Currently testing coordinator	Currently serving lunch duty	If lunch duty, began this academic year	Conduct more than 6 classroom guidance activities per week	Block reduces ability to provide 80% direct services to students
Elementary	194	68	135	19	8	141	50
Middle	132	39	75	22	8	12	23
High	134	38	44	32	16	3	48
Unspecified	20	6	13	7	4	2	3
Total	480	151	267	80	36	158	124
Percentage of responses		31%	56%	17%	45% of those who serve lunch duty	33%	26%

APPENDIX F
2007 Survey Results
for SL 2006-176 Section 2

School Counselor Survey I 2006-2007
total of 1529

1. Have you attended any of the following on the NC School Counselor Job Description or the ASCA National Model: Framework for School Counseling Programs?

Conference break out session	265	27%
DPI/NCSCA three-hour 1/2 day training	326	33%
DPI/NCSCA five-hour full day training	235	24%
ASCA on-line training	10	1%
Other, please specify	295	30%

2. What, if any, obstacles have prevented you from attending a NC School Counselor Job Description or a ASCA National Model training?

My schedule prevents me from leaving my school	284	25%
My school administrator will not approve for me to attend	28	2%
My school system will not approve for me to attend	9	1%
I was unaware of any trainings	218	19%
I have had no barriers to attending training	531	47%
Other, please specify	173	15%

3. Review the function area examples below, then indicate the approximate percentage of time you spent in each of the following school counseling service delivery areas during the 2006-2007 school year only. Although percentages vary by month, please average for the school year. Your total should not exceed 100%, so there should be few, if any, items marked >86%.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.						
	0-10%	11-25%	26-40%	41-55%	56-70%	71-85%
Guidance Curriculum	444 32%	438 32%	267 19%	127 9%	55 4%	11 1%
Student Planning	314 23%	496 36%	333 24%	123 9%	61 4%	13 1%
Preventive and Responsive Services	177 13%	405 30%	459 34%	190 14%	79 6%	18 1%
System Support of the Counseling Program	652 48%	483 35%	138 10%	49 4%	32 2%	4 0%
Accountability	728 53%	382 28%	130 9%	59 4%	38 3%	12 1%
Development & Management of the Counseling Program	762 56%	406 30%	113 8%	40 3%	27 2%	8 1%

Function Area Examples (these are examples only and do not include all activities which may fall into these areas) 1. Guidance Curriculum - Provides leadership and collaborates with other educators in the school-wide integration of the State Guidance Curriculum; conducts school-wide intervention programs such as conflict resolution; implements developmentally appropriate and prevention-oriented group activities to meet student needs and school goals; conducts classroom guidance. 2. Student Planning - Assists students, individually or in groups, with developing academic, career and personal/social skills, goals and plans; accurately and appropriately interprets and utilizes student data; collaborates with parents/guardians and educators to assist students with educational and career planning. 3. Preventive and Responsive Services - Provides individual and group counseling to students with identified concerns and needs; consults and collaborates effectively with parents/guardians, teachers, administrators and other educational/community resources regarding students with identified concerns and needs; implements an effective referral and follow-up process; accurately and appropriately uses assessment procedures for determining and structuring individual and group counseling services. 4. System Support of the School Counseling Program - Provides appropriate information to staff related to the comprehensive school counseling program; assists teachers, parents/guardians and other stakeholders in interpreting and understanding student data; participates in professional development activities to improve knowledge and skills; uses available technology resources to enhance the school counseling program. 5. Accountability - Collects and analyzes data to guide program direction and assists with appropriate interventions. 6. Development and Management of the School Counseling Program - Discusses the comprehensive school counseling program with the school administrator; develops and maintains a written plan for effective delivery of the school counseling program based on the School Counseling Standard Course of Study and current individual school data; communicates the goals of the comprehensive school counseling program to education stakeholders; maintains current and appropriate resources for education stakeholders.

4. Do you serve as testing facilitator/coordinator in any of the following capacities?

No	491	36%
School-wide	574	42%
Specific grade level	60	4%
Other, please specify (specific test, group, etc)	302	22%

5. If you serve as testing facilitator/coordinator, please indicate which months this duty most interferes with your capacity to deliver a comprehensive counseling program. Please DO NOT select more than three months.

N/A	261	24%
None	17	2%
July	6	1%
August	98	9%
September	159	14%
October	193	17%
November	105	9%
December	106	10%
January	155	14%
February	111	10%
March	308	28%
April	280	25%
May	754	68%
June	224	20%

6. Do any of the following non-counseling duties take up more than 5% of your time?

No	383	29%
Clerical Duties not related to counseling program (SIMS/NCWISE data entry, cumulative records, registering all students beyond assistance with course selection, etc.)	651	49%
Administrative Duties (disciplinary actions, administrative reports, etc.)	243	18%
Teaching Content Areas (teaching reading, math, science, social studies, etc.)	37	3%
Miscellaneous Duties/Other (Bus duty, cafeteria duty, club advisement, etc.)	402	30%
Other, please specify	261	19%

7. How have policies to protect teacher time impacted your schedule or capacity to deliver a comprehensive school counseling program?

Rigid and/or excessive classroom guidance schedule	292	35%
Cafeteria duty in excess of what other staff perform	130	16%
Having to teach content such as reading or math	20	2%
Other, please specify	459	55%

8. It is a highly recommended best practice, due to student safety and school liability, that when a school counselor is placed in a position of choosing between a scheduled classroom guidance session or responding to the needs of a student in crisis, that the crisis always takes precedence over the classroom guidance schedule. Are you allowed to follow this best practice at your school?

Yes	956	70%
No	67	5%
Sometimes	186	14%
I do not provide classroom guidance	153	11%
Total	1362	100%

9. If you answered "no" or "sometimes" to question 7, have you had a formal discussion with your school administrator regarding this recommended best practice?

Yes	180	51%
No	172	49%
Total	352	100%

10. Are you written into student Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) to provide in-depth counseling services such as weekly individual counseling?

Yes	446	34%
No	879	66%
Total	1325	100%

11. Please rank the following items in order of which most prevent you from implementing the NC School Counselor Job Description (1 being what most prevents implementation and 10 what least prevents implementation). NOTE: Because this is a ranking question, you must check a different number for each item and cannot check the same number more than once.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	N/A
Testing facilitation/coordination	386 28%	126 9%	78 6%	65 5%	60 4%	60 4%	45 3%	63 5%	52 4%	66 5%	53 4%	316 23%
Functioning as a school registrar	71 5%	131 10%	91 7%	86 6%	72 5%	58 4%	65 5%	56 4%	79 6%	73 5%	68 5%	520 38%
Non-Counseling duties other than testing or registrar	75 5%	157 11%	180 13%	141 10%	110 8%	95 7%	90 7%	93 7%	92 7%	96 7%	60 4%	181 13%
Rigid and/or excessive classroom guidance schedule	89 6%	69 5%	63 5%	79 6%	65 5%	59 4%	89 6%	104 8%	102 7%	121 9%	103 8%	427 31%
Counselor to student ratio	216 16%	158 12%	139 10%	132 10%	122 9%	104 8%	80 6%	89 6%	84 6%	66 5%	65 5%	115 8%
Have not had any training on the new job description	30 2%	53 4%	51 4%	41 3%	51 4%	68 5%	69 5%	80 6%	81 6%	95 7%	70 5%	681 50%
Need additional training on the new job description	14 1%	48 4%	84 6%	68 5%	87 6%	100 7%	113 8%	100 7%	87 6%	73 5%	65 5%	531 39%
Did not know there was a new job description	42 3%	21 2%	17 1%	24 2%	31 2%	25 2%	37 3%	42 3%	45 3%	72 5%	97 7%	917 67%
Lack of school administrator support	35 3%	82 6%	81 6%	96 7%	110 8%	97 7%	101 7%	92 7%	86 6%	115 8%	85 6%	390 28%
Lack of LEA central office support	47 3%	65 5%	88 6%	103 8%	118 9%	121 9%	89 6%	91 7%	94 7%	75 5%	85 6%	394 29%
Lack of administrator knowledge or understanding of the appropriate roles of school counselors	73 5%	94 7%	119 9%	113 8%	97 7%	126 9%	86 6%	74 5%	85 6%	66 5%	80 6%	357 26%

12. Have you ever left employment at a school due to an overwhelming amount of non-counseling duties?

Yes	231	17%
No	1123	83%
Total	1354	100%

13. Have you ever considered leaving employment of a school due to an overwhelming amount of non-counseling duties?

Yes	656	49%
No	672	51%
Total	1328	100%

14. Have you ever turned down employment of a school due to an overwhelming amount of non-counseling duties said to be included with the position?

Yes	236	18%
No	1105	82%
Total	1341	100%

15. How many years have you been a school counselor?

0-5 years	454	33%
6-10 years	284	21%
11-15 years	227	17%
16-20 years	166	12%
21-25 years	115	8%
more than 25 years	116	9%
Total	1362	100%

16. How many years have you been employed at your current school?

0-5 years	809	59%
-----------	-----	-----

6-10 years	283	21%
11-15 years	144	11%
16-20 years	85	6%
21-25 years	26	2%
more than 25 years	17	1%
Total	1364	100%

17. With what grade levels do you currently work?

Elementary	508	37%
Middle/Jr. High	322	24%
High/Secondary	418	31%
Elementary and Middle	25	2%
Middle and High/Secondary	52	4%
K-12	10	1%
Other, please specify	29	2%
Total	1364	100%

18. Please share additional comments that you feel are relevant to this school counselor survey, but were not captured in the questions included.

498 Responses

19. Please identify your school district/LEA. (This item is solely for the purposes of identifying what percentage of LEAs responded and which LEAs provided no responses)

A Charter School	3	0%
Alamance-Burlington Schools	29	2%
Alexander	6	0%
Alleghany	2	0%

Anson	3	0%
Ashe	6	0%
Asheboro City	5	0%
Asheville City	6	0%
Avery	4	0%
Beaufort	8	1%
Bertie	1	0%
Bladen	4	0%
Brunswick	13	1%
Buncombe	35	3%
Burke	5	0%
Cabarrus	19	1%
Caldwell	14	1%
Camden	1	0%
Carteret	9	1%
Caswell	1	0%
Catawba	12	1%
Chapel Hill-Carrboro	14	1%
Charlotte-Mecklenburg	62	5%
Chatham	7	1%
Cherokee	6	0%
Clay	0	0%
Cleveland	14	1%
Clinton City	0	0%
Columbus	6	0%
Craven	10	1%
Cumberland	52	4%
Currituck	7	1%
Dare	6	0%
Davidson	14	1%
Davie	7	1%
Duplin	2	0%
Durham	51	4%
Edenton/Chowan	3	0%

Edgecombe	1	0%
Elizabeth City/Pasquotank	12	1%
Elkin City	0	0%
Franklin	12	1%
Gaston	47	4%
Gates	1	0%
Graham	0	0%
Granville	6	0%
Greene	8	1%
Guilford	82	6%
Halifax	5	0%
Harnett	17	1%
Haywood	14	1%
Health and Human Services	1	0%
Henderson	2	0%
Hertford	5	0%
Hickory City	8	1%
Hoke	3	0%
Hyde	1	0%
Iredell-Statesville	24	2%
Jackson	4	0%
Johnston	16	1%
Jones	2	0%
Kannapolis City	2	0%
Lee	3	0%
Lenoir	17	1%
Lexington City	4	0%
Lincoln	13	1%
Macon	4	0%
Madison	3	0%
Martin	11	1%
McDowell	10	1%
Mitchell	2	0%
Montgomery	5	0%

Moore	20	1%
Mooresville City	3	0%
Mount Airy City	0	0%
Nash-Rocky Mount	25	2%
New Hanover	18	1%
Newton-Conover City	6	0%
Northampton	7	1%
Onslow	20	1%
Orange	9	1%
Pamlico	2	0%
Pender	12	1%
Perquimans	5	0%
Person	8	1%
Pitt	23	2%
Polk	0	0%
Randolph	18	1%
Richmond	18	1%
Roanoke Rapids City	4	0%
Robeson	18	1%
Rockingham	18	1%
Rowan-Salisbury	5	0%
Rutherford	16	1%
Sampson	11	1%
Scotland	13	1%
Stanly	22	2%
Stokes	19	1%
Surry	12	1%
Swain	0	0%
Thomasville City	3	0%
Transylvania	3	0%
Tyrrell	3	0%
Union	5	0%
Vance	2	0%
Wake	87	7%

Warren	3	0%
Washington	1	0%
Watauga	6	0%
Wayne	17	1%
Weldon	0	0%
Whiteville City	2	0%
Wilkes	2	0%
Wilson	8	1%
Winston-Salem/Forsyth	64	5%
Yadkin	2	0%
Yancey	4	0%
Other	2	0%
Total	1338	100%

School Counselor Survey II 2007-08

total of 927

1. As you begin the 2007-2008 school year, are you able to implement the NC School Counselor Job Description/ASCA National Model: Framework for School Counseling Programs at your school?

Yes	187	20%
Somewhat	427	46%
A little	192	21%
No	125	13%

2. What are your primary obstacles to implementing the NC School Counselor Job Description/ASCA National Model: Framework for School Counseling Programs (please select no more than three)?

I have had no obstacles to implementation	90	10%
Testing coordination	369	40%
Serving as a registrar	181	20%
Teaching or tutoring content areas	23	2%
Rigid classroom guidance schedule including, but not limited to, being in the master schedule with courses such as art, music, PE, etc.	139	15%
Extra duties assigned in order to protect teacher time	111	12%
Student Assistance/Support Management Team Coordination	279	30%
Providing ongoing IEP counseling	43	5%
Counselor to Student ratio	383	41%
Clerical Duties not related to counseling program (SIMS/NCWISE data entry, cumulative records, registering all students beyond assistance with course selection, etc.)	331	36%
Administrative Duties (disciplinary actions, administrative reports, etc.)	84	9%
Miscellaneous Duties/Other (Bus duty, cafeteria duty, club advisement, etc.)	241	26%
Have not had any training on the new job description/ASCA National Model	87	9%
Other, please specify	155	17%

3. Please share additional comments that you feel are relevant to this school counselor survey, but were not captured in the questions included.

331 Responses

Director of Student Support Services Survey 06-07

Response Status: Completes

1. Have you attended a new school counselor job description/ASCA National Model training?			
Yes	63	89%	
No	8	11%	
2. Have you taken steps to ensure that your school counselors jobs responsibilities are aligned to the new job description?			
Yes	55	77%	
No	8	11%	
Please specify			
3. Have you taken steps to ensure that the new school counselor hires are prepared to fulfill the requirements of the new job description?	30	42%	
Yes	49	73%	
No	18	27%	
Total			
	67	100%	
4. Does your district have a plan to ensure school counselors are able to implement their job functions under the new job description?			
Yes	29	42%	
No	30	43%	
Please specify			
5. Have you offered professional development to school counselors regarding the new job description?	26	38%	
Yes	49	73%	
No	13	19%	
Please specify			
6. Have you offered professional development to administrators regarding the new job description?	15	22%	
Yes	33	50%	
No	18	27%	
Please specify			
	15	23%	
Total			
	66	100%	
7. What plans are in place to follow-up with your school counselors in 2007-08 to determine the level of implementation of the new job description?			
59 Responses			
8. Please indicate the total number of elementary school counselors in your LEA.			
63 Responses			
9. Please indicate the total number of elementary school counselors used as testing coordinators in your district in 2006-07.			
0-5	34	55%	

6-10	13	21%
11-15	3	5%
16-20	6	10%
21-25	1	2%
All	5	8%
Total	62	100%
10. Please indicate the total number of middle school counselors in your LEA.		

64 Responses

11. Please indicate the total number of middle school counselors used as testing coordinators in your district in 2006-07.		
0-5	42	68%
6-10	10	16%
11-15	2	3%
16-20	2	3%
21-25	1	2%
All	5	8%
Total	62	100%
12. Please indicate the total number of high school counselors in your LEA.		

64 Responses

13. Please indicate the total number of high school counselors used as testing coordinators in your district in 2006-07.		
0-5	52	81%
6-10	6	9%
11-15	5	8%
16-20	0	0%
21-25	0	0%
All	1	2%
Total	64	100%
14. Please indicate the barriers to implementing the new School Counselor Job Description.		

62 Responses

15. Please indicate the appraisal instrument that was used to evaluate School Counselors during the 2006-07 school year.

57 Responses

16. Please share additional comments that you feel are relevant to this survey, but were not captured in the questions included.

36 Responses

LEA Directors/Coordinators of School Counseling Survey 07-08

Response Status: Completes

1. As you begin the 2007-2008 school year, are your LEA school counselors able to implement the NC School Counselor Job Description/ASCA National Model: Framework for School Counseling Programs in your schools?

Yes	10	28%
Several	6	17%
A few	13	36%
No	7	19%
Other, please specify	0	0%

2. What are your school counselors' primary obstacles to implementing the NC School Counselor Job Description/ASCA National Model: Framework for School Counseling Programs?

They have had no obstacles to implementation	1	3%
Testing coordination	10	28%
Serving as a registrar	2	6%
Teaching or tutoring content areas	0	0%
Rigid classroom guidance schedule including, but not limited to, being in the master schedule with courses such as art, music, PE, etc.	3	8%
Extra duties assigned in order to protect teacher time	2	6%
Student Assistance/Support Management Team Coordination	1	3%
Providing ongoing IEP counseling	0	0%
Counselor to Student ratio	6	17%
Clerical Duties not related to counseling program (SIMS/NCWISE data entry, cumulative records, registering all students beyond assistance with course selection, etc.)	3	8%
Administrative Duties (disciplinary actions, administrative reports, etc.)	0	0%
Miscellaneous Duties/Other (Bus duty, cafeteria duty, club advisement, etc.)	3	8%
Have not had any training on the new job description/ASCA National Model	2	6%
Other, please specify	3	8%
Total	36	100%

3. Please share additional comments that you feel are relevant to this survey, but were not captured in the questions included.

36 Responses

