



A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION OF THE ROANOKE COUNTY  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING PROGRAM

by

Joanne R. Lehman

Committee Chairman: Martin Gerstein  
Counselor Education & Student Personnel

(ABSTRACT)

One of the earliest and most comprehensive elementary school guidance and counseling programs in the Commonwealth of Virginia is located in Roanoke County. An integral component of every elementary school guidance and counseling program is evaluation. The purpose of this study was to design and conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program in order to determine program effectiveness. Data was collected through questionnaires disseminated to samples comprised of 261 students, 34 teachers, 13 principals, and 280 parents of children in the program. Additional information was gathered from focus interviews conducted with counselors, teachers, and individual interviews with principals.

The findings indicate that the guidance program is effective in meeting stated objectives as well as student needs. It was also concluded that program effectiveness could be jeopardized in the future due to the growing number of students and responsibilities required of the counselors. In

addition, the data indicated that all populations exhibit a favorable attitude toward the program.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee—Dr. Martin Gerstein, Dr. David Hutchins, Dr. Bud Protinsky, Dr. Lou Talbutt, and Dr. Larry Weber—for the support and assistance each has provided, in their own special way, throughout my academic career at Virginia Tech.

A heartfelt thank you to \_\_\_\_\_ for allowing me the opportunity to develop and implement this study and observe, firsthand, supervision of the highest caliber. In addition, I would like to express my gratitude to the elementary school guidance counselors of Roanoke County Schools for their help during the various stages of the evaluation process.

I am especially grateful to many special friends for the encouragement exhibited throughout this project. Most notably I would like to thank \_\_\_\_\_, my mentor, colleague, and friend, for his understanding and insight.

To my father, \_\_\_\_\_ I give thanks for cultivating within me great respect for the written, as well as the spoken word. To my mother, \_\_\_\_\_ I am appreciative for the emphasis placed upon education and career long before it was in vogue for women to hold such beliefs.

Finally, I would like to thank the children with and/or \_\_\_\_\_ for whom I have had the opportunity to work during these past

15 years. For their spontaneity, warmth and wisdom, I am continually grateful.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	ix
CHAPTER	
I.    AN OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	4
Evaluation Questions . . . . .	4
Assumptions Underlying the Study . . . . .	6
Limitations and Significance of the Study. . .	7
Definitions of Terms . . . . .	7
Summary. . . . .	8
II.   REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	10
Introduction . . . . .	10
Elementary School Guidance and Counseling: An Historical Overview . . . . .	10
The Vocational Guidance Movement . . . . .	10
The Mental Health Movement . . . . .	12
The Child Guidance Movement. . . . .	12
The Testing Movement . . . . .	14
The Dean of Students Movement. . . . .	14
Federal Legislation. . . . .	15
Elementary School Guidance and Counseling . . . . .	16
The Evaluation of Guidance and Counseling. . .	20
Rationale for Evaluating Guidance and Counseling Programs. . . . .	20
The Status of Evaluation in Guidance and Counseling . . . . .	23
Guidance and Counseling Program Evaluation Models . . . . .	26
Baltimore County Schools . . . . .	26
Dallas Independent School District . . . .	28
Georgia State Department of Education. .	29
A Model for the Evaluation of Results- Based Guidance Programs. . . . .	30
Oregon State Department of Education . .	31
Elementary School Guidance and Counseling in Virginia . . . . .	32
Goals for Elementary School Guidance in Virginia . . . . .	32

State Funded Evaluation. . . . .	34
School District Initiated	
Evaluations . . . . .	36
Summary. . . . .	36
III. EVALUATION DESIGN. . . . .	39
Introduction . . . . .	39
Demographic Data . . . . .	39
Data Collection. . . . .	40
Elementary School Guidance Counselors. .	41
Students . . . . .	42
Elementary School Teachers . . . . .	43
Elementary School Principals . . . . .	43
Parents. . . . .	44
Data Analysis. . . . .	45
IV. RESULTS. . . . .	47
Summary of Questionnaire Results and	
Interview Data . . . . .	47
Data Analysis. . . . .	49
Evaluation Question One. . . . .	49
Questionnaire Data. . . . .	50
Students . . . . .	50
Teachers/Principals. . . . .	58
Interview Data. . . . .	73
Evaluation Question Two. . . . .	74
Questionnaire Data. . . . .	74
Student Response . . . . .	74
Teachers/Principals. . . . .	76
Interview Data. . . . .	77
Evaluation Question Three. . . . .	78
Questionnaire Data. . . . .	78
Students . . . . .	78
Teachers/Principals. . . . .	82
Parents. . . . .	88
Interview Data. . . . .	100
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	102
Summary. . . . .	102
Conclusions. . . . .	107
Evaluation Question One. . . . .	107
Questionnaire Data. . . . .	108
Interview Data. . . . .	110
Evaluation Question Two. . . . .	111
Questionnaire Data. . . . .	111
Interview Data. . . . .	113
Evaluation Question Three. . . . .	114
Questionnaire Data. . . . .	114

	Interview Data. . . . .	117
	Recommendations . . . . .	118
REFERENCES. . . . .		121
APPENDIX A:	Initial Correspondence With Roanoke County Schools . . . . .	127
APPENDIX B:	Counselor Focus Interview Forms. . . . .	133
APPENDIX C:	Student Data Collection: Procedures and Instruments . . . . .	137
APPENDIX D:	Teacher/Principal Data Collection: Procedures and Instruments . . . . .	149
APPENDIX E:	Parent Data Collection: Correspondence and Instruments . . . . .	161
APPENDIX F:	Letter to Guidance Supervisors . . . . .	165
VITA. . . . .		167

**LIST OF TABLES**

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Summary of Questionnaire Returns . . . . .	48
2	Responses of Primary Students (K-2) to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #1. . . . .	51
3	Responses of Intermediate Students (3-6) to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #1 . . . . .	54
4	Responses of Teachers to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #1. . . . .	59
5	Responses of Principals to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #1. . . . .	67
6	Responses of Primary Students (K-2) to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #2. . . . .	75
7	Responses of Primary Students (K-2) to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3. . . . .	79
8	Responses of Intermediate Students (3-6) to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3 . . . . .	80
9	Responses of Teachers to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3. . . . .	83
10	Responses of Principals to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3. . . . .	85
11	Responses of Parents to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3 (Random Sample of Parents) . . . . .	89
12	Responses of Parents to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3 (Selected Sample of Parents) . . . . .	95

CHAPTER I  
AN OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

When considering the role of the counselor in public school settings, the usual image brought to mind is that of the secondary counselor. Less familiar to the general public, though, is the role and function of the elementary school guidance counselor. Even though support has been expressed for this position for over 50 years, elementary guidance programs are just now beginning to increase significantly in America's public schools (Gibson & Mitchell, 1981).

On May 23, 1986, the Virginia State Board of Education presented a resolution recommending that elementary school guidance counseling programs be implemented in all of Virginia's public schools over a four-year period beginning in September, 1986. In addition to this four-year phase-in plan, the subcommittee recommended that each school division employ one counselor per 500 elementary school students by the 1989-1990 school year (Commonwealth of Virginia Board of Education, 1986). This recommendation was the result of a five-year study conducted by the Joint Subcommittee Studying the Feasibility of Requiring Guidance Counseling in the Public Elementary Schools.

On June 19, 1987, the Virginia State Board of Education modified the Standards for Accrediting Schools in Virginia,

insuring the provision of elementary school guidance programs in accordance with the aforementioned recommendations.

An integral component of every elementary school guidance and counseling program is evaluation. Therefore, the Virginia Department of Education requires evaluation as part of all elementary school guidance and counseling program development.

All data collected through evaluation should be analyzed in terms of stated goals and objectives of the program. These analyses serve as the basis for making necessary changes in the program. In turn, any program modifications made also must be evaluated (Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Education, 1981, p. 24).

One of the earliest and most comprehensive elementary school guidance and counseling programs in the Commonwealth is located in Roanoke County. The program was initiated during the 1973-1974 school year with seven counselors serving eight schools. By the 1986-1987 school year there were 15 counselors serving all 17 elementary schools in the county.

Since its inception, the Roanoke County Program has been evaluated by various means. Most recently data has been compiled at the discretion of individual counselors at their respective schools. This information has been obtained primarily through questionnaires disseminated among various populations participating in the program (i.e., parents, students, teachers). Most of the questions have addressed

parental perception of the program. Acceptance and support for the program have been consistently reflected.

In addition to counselor initiated evaluations, two more comprehensive studies have taken place since the program's inception: one during the first year (the 1973-1974 school year), and the other during the 1979-1980 school term.

The 1973-1974 study was designed to obtain program credibility for the purpose of continued and increased funding. This study included experimental measures and was implemented by Dr. William Van Hoose, from the University of Virginia, who served as a program consultant during the initial stages of the program's development. The purpose of this evaluation was to determine if program goals were being met. The results indicated that experimental groups exhibited significant improvement in assisting students in developing self-esteem, academic achievement, and personal and social adjustment when compared to the control groups.

The 1979-1980 study was done in response to concerns expressed by parents about content of the guidance program. It was designed by the Mental Health Committee of the school system's P.T.A. for the purpose of determining attitude. Data was collected from teachers using questionnaires disseminated throughout the school system and from a random sample of parents by means of a telephone survey. The results reflected support on the part of both of these populations in regard to program goals, objectives, content, and materials.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The aforementioned evaluations provided valuable data for the development of the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program. However, by the conclusion of the fourteenth year of the program's existence, there had not been an evaluation to determine the overall effectiveness of the program in all of the elementary schools. Further, there had not been an evaluation designed to include representation of all program participants (i.e., counselors, teachers, principals, students, and parents) simultaneously. As a result, the purpose of this study was to design and conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program in order to determine program effectiveness.

### **Evaluation Questions**

The following goals for this evaluation were developed as a result of the following: discussions with the Supervisor of Guidance and the elementary guidance counselors, analysis of the data provided by previous evaluations, and an extensive review of the program objectives and activities outlined in the Roanoke County Elementary Guidance & Counseling Activities & Techniques For Child Development Handbook (R.E.A.C.H. Manual). The goals for this evaluation were: (a) to

determine if the program objectives were being met; (b) to determine if student needs were being met appropriately; and (c) to determine the attitude of program participants toward the program.

The following Evaluation Questions were developed in order to address the goals for this study:

1. Are the program objectives stated in the R.E.A.C.H. Manual being met?
  - a) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a realistic self-concept?
  - b) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing self-direction?
  - c) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing group awareness?
  - d) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a capacity for interpersonal relationships?
  - e) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing communication skills?
  - f) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing decision-making skills?
  - g) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing coping behaviors?
  - h) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing skills for academic achievement?

- i) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a wholesome attitude for the world of work?
  - j) Is the program effective in facilitating a more effective learning environment?
2. What additional identified student needs can be met by the elementary school guidance program?
  3. Do participants exhibit a favorable attitude toward the program?

#### **Assumptions Underlying the Study**

The population for this study was comprised of counselors, teachers, principals, students, and parents participating in the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program during the 1986-1987 school year. It was assumed that the procedures used in sample selection and the return rate of said sample would be sufficient with regard to the evaluation process and outcome. In addition, it was assumed that the methods and instruments utilized would appropriately address the evaluation questions and that the responses to these questions would be reliable and valid indices of the participants' perceptions.

### **Limitations and Significance of the Study**

This study evaluated the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program. Generalizability to other programs within the Roanoke County Public School System and/or other elementary school guidance and counseling programs within the Commonwealth of Virginia or nationwide is not recommended. In addition, this evaluator acknowledges that the data collected from primary-aged students, by their respective guidance counselors, could have been influenced by the fact that five-year-old children possess the developmental characteristic of wanting to please adults.

The significance of this study was that data collection and analysis would assist in identifying any changes needed to assure optimal program effectiveness. In addition, procedures utilized in this study might be used in similar studies and criteria identified by which similar programs may be judged.

### **Definitions of Terms**

The following definitions of terms were used for this study:

1. **Coping Behaviors** - the ability to develop skills for adapting to various life situations and relationships.
2. **Developmental Guidance Program** - administered in the educational setting a program designed and implemented to

develop human potential, taking into consideration the various needs and abilities of individual students.

3. **Focus Interview** - a marketing research procedure used to gain information during the evaluation process. A group of approximately seven individuals gather for the purpose of discussing perceptions of the program or product being evaluated. A moderator interviews the group on specific topics and responses are recorded by a second individual.
4. **Guidance Curriculum** - student competencies, sequenced as structured activities for the purpose of facilitating emotional and social individual growth. This may be reflected in the form of classroom guidance activities (specific units being taught by counselors collaborating with classroom teachers), or group activities such as career days.
5. **Learning Climate** - an environment created for students that enhances their academic achievement.

### **Summary**

In 1986, the Commonwealth of Virginia mandated that elementary school guidance counselors be employed at a ratio of 1:500 in all school divisions by the 1989-1990 school year. Roanoke County has had an elementary school guidance and counseling program since 1973. An integral part of the state guidelines for elementary school program development is

evaluation. Since the inception of the Roanoke County program, most evaluation data has been collected through the discretion of individual counselors at their respective schools. There has never been a study of all populations involved in program implementation in each school. In addition, data has never been collected to identify the need for specific program improvements. As a result, this study helped design a comprehensive evaluation of the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program which assisted in determining program effectiveness.

A review of the literature is presented in Chapter Two. Chapter Three contains the evaluation design, including a description of the subjects, data collection procedures, and data analysis. The results of the study, based upon the analysis of the data, are reported in Chapter Four. A summary, along with conclusions and recommendations are discussed in Chapter Five.

**CHAPTER II**  
**REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

**Introduction**

A review of extant literature on the evaluation of elementary school guidance and counseling programs revealed the process has been underutilized. This chapter will address that issue from various perspectives.

An historical overview of the development of guidance and counseling programs in America will be provided as well as the rationale and current utilization of evaluation in guidance and counseling. In addition, evaluation models for guidance programs nationally will be presented in conjunction with the utilization of evaluation of elementary programs in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

**Elementary School Guidance and Counseling:  
An Historical Overview**

**The Vocational Guidance Movement**

Modern day school counseling programs have roots in vocational guidance as far back as the early 1900s. It was during this period in our nation's history when the onset of the industrial revolution presented a need for skilled workers

in urban America. In response to this situation, the vocational guidance movement was initiated and gained impetus.

A significant contributor to the field of vocational guidance was Frank Parsons. In order to train teachers as vocational counselors for the purpose of assisting students in making wise and appropriate vocational choices, Parsons founded the Boston Vocational Bureau in 1908 (Shertzer & Stone, 1981). Several months after his death, his book, Choosing a Vocation, was published in which a three-step approach for vocational guidance was presented. Briefly, these steps include: (a) a thorough analysis of client capabilities, interests, and temperament; (b) a thorough analysis of occupational requirements and opportunities; and (c) a matching of the first two (Brown & Srebalus, 1973 p. 6).

Jesse P. Davis has been credited with encouraging the development of guidance programs within school systems. In 1907, while principal of a Michigan High School, Davis utilized his previous experience as a high school class counselor to emphasize the importance of presenting vocational information in conjunction with the basic school curricula. Because of these efforts, in 1913 he received an appointment as Director of Vocational Guidance in Grand Rapids. Soon afterwards a comprehensive guidance system was established in that city's school system (Makinde, 1984).

Just as Parsons served as a pioneer in Boston and Davis in Grand Rapids, Eli Weaver was influential upon the

development of Vocational Guidance in the city of New York. Weaver emphasized the need for school-based guidance committees to assist students in making appropriate vocational choices.

In 1913, the National Vocational Guidance Association was organized due to the growing awareness and interest created by the contributions of the aforementioned. The first journal in the field, Vocational Guidance, appeared in 1915 (Shertzer & Stone, 1981).

#### The Mental Health Movement

The mental health movement served an integral role in the development of guidance in the early twentieth century. One of the most important individuals in this area was Clifford Beers. A former patient in a mental institution, Beers documented his mental breakdown and recovery in A Mind That Found Itself (1909). This publication assisted in arousing public sentiment and concern, which, in turn, helped to initiate reform in the field of mental health. As a result the increased awareness, the National Committee for Mental Health was founded in 1909 (Shertzer & Stone, 1981).

#### The Child Guidance Movement

"The child guidance movement was founded on the belief that since emotional disorders begin in childhood, treating problems of children is the best way to prevent mental illness

in the population" (Nichols, 1984, p. 18). The Healys, a husband and wife team of physicians, identified the various needs of children living in Chicago slums in the early 1900s. In addition to physical difficulties, the Healys became increasingly concerned with the psychological well-being of the children.

With the financial backing of a wealthy widow, they established the clinic that, years later, was taken over by the State of Illinois to become known as the Illinois Institute of Juvenile Research. By 1914 over 100 child guidance clinics had been established. (Makinde, 1984, p. 80)

A former student of Sigmund Freud, Alfred Adler, addressed the need children have for a family environment emphasizing support and encouragement. Adler organized the first child guidance clinics in Vienna during the early 1920s. Located in public schools and administered by psychologists, these facilities concentrated upon family education (Corsini, 1979). The concept was brought to the United States by a student of Adler, Rudolph Driekurs. The family members and their relationships with the child served as the focal point for this therapeutic model. A team comprised of social workers, psychiatrists, and psychologists participated in the process (Nichols, 1984).

### The Testing Movement

The testing movement also had significant impact upon the development of modern day guidance programs. Alfred Binet has long been considered a significant figure with regard to his contributions to this field. Through his work with retarded children he assisted in creating, with Theodore Simon, the first intelligence scale. With the onset of World War I, Binet worked together with Lewis Terman to develop the Army Alpha Test. This instrument was significant due to the fact it could be administered to large groups of individuals. Such an advantage had great impact on education in the area of standardized testing as we now know it.

### The Dean of Students Movement

In January of 1913, Ella Flagg Young, Superintendent of Chicago schools, made recommendations to the Board of Education initiating the dean of girls movement. It was based on the concept that female high school teachers should be employed to serve as counselors for female students in much the same way principals had been advising male students for years. In conjunction with their educational responsibilities, these teachers would assist in the organization of social activities and address personal concerns as the need arose. In return, they would be paid \$300, thus starting the "deans" movement in America.

By the 1920s, this concept had grown in America's secondary schools with representation for both male and female students alike, modeled after their counterparts in higher education. Gibson and Mitchell (1981) indicate that the purpose of these programs was remedial in nature dealing with students who expressed personal and or academic problems.

### Federal Legislation

As time progressed federal legislation began to play an increasingly important role in the development of guidance and counseling in the nation's schools. Services addressing the vocational rehabilitation needs of veterans were provided by The Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act (1920) and Public Law 47 in 1921.

The Roosevelt administration of 1936 began taking a serious look at the importance of public education which resulted in federal funds being allocated for vocational education and certain federal agencies getting involved in vocational needs.

For example, in 1940 the Department of Labor introduced its Vocational Outlook Service in which valuable trends and needs in the labor market were identified. Even before this, important work had been undertaken by the Department of Labor in the classification of jobs, represented eventually in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (1939).

At the end of World War II actual financial aid was given for the support of state and local guidance services through the George-Barden Act of 1946. (Brown & Srebalus, 1972, p. 13)

The successful Soviet launch of the Sputnik I Satellite in 1957 had great impact upon American public education. This resulted in the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. In addition to emphasis being put upon math and science curricula, there was an identified need for an increase in personnel to assist students in the career decision making process. Pine (1975) explains that Title V of this legislation provided monies to local educational agencies and higher education institutions for the purpose of establishing guidance programs and educating counselors, respectively. As a result, Pine (1975) describes the 1960s as "halcyon days" in which counselors benefitted from the support of school personnel, students, and parents alike.

#### Elementary School Guidance and Counseling

Faust (1968) delineates the development of elementary guidance into three periods as follows: (a) the traditionalist period (1908-1940s); (b) the neotraditionalist period (1950-1965); and (c) the developmentalist period (1965-to the present).

"In the traditionalist period, methods and techniques were borrowed almost exclusively from secondary school

guidance practice" (Gerstein & Lichtman, 1990, p. 1). According to Faust (1968), during this time programs emphasized the needs of "special children" and were "crisis-oriented" and "problem-centered" (p. 9). In addition, a "high degree of knowledgeableness in occupations, college programs, achievement, aptitude, interest, and readiness tests" (Faust, 1968, p. 9) was required of the elementary counselor.

It was during the traditionalist period that the works of William Burnham were published. Burnham's books, The Normal Mind (1924), Great Teachers and Mental Health (1926), and The Wholesome Personality (1932), explain his theories that deviated from the norm of the era in the following ways: (a) emphasized preventative measures be provided to students, rather than remedial; and (b) emphasized the need to work with elementary-aged students rather than secondary students (Faust, 1968). Mills (1971) maintains "His tenets included the necessity of a positive learning climate for the child, mental health services for the teacher, and guidance for all children" (p. 80).

Burnham's principles became apparent in the neotraditionalist model when the counselor's role became more preventative in nature. "It emphasized group counseling and learning climate in the classroom and consequently deemphasized traditional secondary school practices" (Gerstein & Lichtman, 1990, p. 1).

Prevention was the impetus for the developmentalist period. Rather than being crisis-centered, the needs of all children were addressed through individual and group work (Faust, 1968; Gerstein & Lichtman, 1990; Gysbers & Henderson, 1988). Gerstein and Lichtman (1990) cite Dinkmeyer (1966), as well as Shaw and Tuel (1966), for supporting the developmental perspective and developing a guidance model for all students, respectively.

Even though the concept and actual programs in the field existed as far back as the 1920s, growth for elementary school guidance and counseling programs was very slow.

While Elementary school counseling had apparently been on the verge of change nationally for a considerable period, the evidence of this showed only here and there in a few communities across the nation. In fact, misleading symptoms were frequently apparent. Only in the middle sixties, with congressional legislation which made it possible for schools to receive funds for employment of elementary school counselors, did the long-awaited final thrust give birth to the new counselor. Then late in the year 1964, the Congress of the United States signed the birth certificate of modern elementary school counseling: an amendment to the National Defense Education Act of 1959 [sic]. (Faust, 1968, p. 63)

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, we witnessed a clearer delineation of the developmentalist approach of

Faust. Guidance was defined in developmental-comprehensive-outcome terms, with substantial support coming from leadership efforts of a number of state departments of education that developed guidelines for implementing developmental concepts into the public school curriculum with goals, objectives, and activities. (Gerstein & Lichtman, 1990, p. 2)

This growth has been confirmed by many experts in the field. Myrick (1977) cites the research conducted by Van Hoose et al. (1968, 1970, 1972) indicating that by 1967, 48 states had approximately 3,837 counselors in elementary schools. In 1969, all 50 states had elementary school guidance counselors totalling approximately a little over 6,000. "By 1971 the total number of elementary school counselors had grown to 7,982, of which 67 percent were supported by state and local funding" (Myrick, 1977, p. 44). In a study completed by Myrick and Moni in 1976 it was approximated that there were 10,770 counselors in American elementary schools that year. Statistics collected in 1979 by the American Personnel and Guidance Association indicated a total of 13,713 elementary school counselors employed in the 50 United States.

As of this writing 12 states have passed mandates for elementary school guidance and counseling programs, while 12 additional states are currently considering such legislation (Glosoff & Koprowicz, 1990).

## The Evaluation of Guidance and Counseling

### Rationale for Evaluating Guidance and Counseling Programs

"Evaluation is the systematic process of judging the worth, desirability, effectiveness, or inadequacy of something according to definite criteria and purposes" (Sauber, 1973 p. 89). This process of determining merit or worth became an important factor in public education with the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. At that time, federal funding supported comprehensive evaluations for various programs designed to emphasize science, math, and foreign language education.

As previously noted, there was new emphasis placed upon the employment of guidance counselors due to their role in assisting in the appropriate placement of students in the aforementioned curricula. "In response to the post-Sputnik drive for national power and social justice, executive and legislative programs were established to stimulate recruitment, employment, and training in counseling and guidance" (Pine, 1975, p. 554). As government took an increasingly more important role in guidance and counseling, accountability gained significance in the field as well. Evaluation became a valuable tool in order to insure that monies, allocated for the purpose of developing guidance programs, were being well spent.

During the 1960s, the need for evaluation throughout education gained further momentum. The War on Poverty, begun under the Kennedy administration and carried out by the Johnson administration, emphasized creating educational opportunities for all American citizens. Federal funds were appropriated so the necessary academic programs could be initiated. Senator Robert Kennedy, along with some of his congressional colleagues, amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964 (ESEA) to include specific evaluation requirements.

As a result, Title I of that Act, which was aimed at providing compensatory education to disadvantaged children, specifically required each school district receiving funds under its terms to evaluate annually--using appropriate standardized test data--the extent to which its Title I projects had achieved their objectives.

(Madaus, Scriven, & Stufflebeam, 1983, p. 13)

Thus, the concept of accountability in the development and implementation of educational programs within the realm of public education was further emphasized.

Today the relationship between educational accountability and governmental influence has shifted from federal to state and local levels. This has been especially true in the area of counseling and guidance. More than ever before legislators need to be made aware of the positive influences guidance and counseling programs have upon the well-being of students.

"They have to set priorities, and first priorities usually go to activities that yield tangible results. Other programs are scrutinized to determine whether results warrant expenditures" (Pulvino & Sanborn, 1972, p. 16). "The increased relationships between evaluation, accountability and program support suggest a significant heightening of interest and activity in this aspect of the schools' counseling and guidance programs as a survival technique" (Gibbons, Mitchell & Higgins, 1983, p. 226). Ballast and Shoemaker (1980) concur with the aforementioned, indicating evaluation is a viable means for assisting legislators in prioritizing allocations for guidance and counseling programs.

Evaluation can also be a means of gaining public support by establishing credibility. Gibson, Mitchell, and Higgins (1983) maintain, "the increased relationships between evaluation, accountability and program support suggest a significant heightening of interest and activity in this aspect of the schools' guidance and counseling and guidance programs as a survival technique" (p. 226). In addition, Humes (1972) encourages the use of evaluation as an influential public catalyst for salvaging guidance and counseling programs.

Amidst the emphasis put upon evaluation for the purpose of gaining public support and funding, Daniels, Mines, and Gressard (1981), Pine (1975), as well as Wheeler and Loesch (1981) concur that another important utilization for

evaluation is to enhance program effectiveness. "The criteria for a particular program grow out of logical relationships between the program's ultimate goals and its immediately measurable changes" (Oetting & Haewke, 1974, p. 43). More specifically, Johnson and Johnson (1987) state, "By evaluating competency and goal attainment, the data can be used to determine the effectiveness of the processes as well as the adequacy of the resources" (p. 21).

In summarizing the rationale and need for evaluation in the field of counseling, Krumboltz (1974) states, "Counselors do good things for people--no doubt about that. But it is necessary to know exactly what good things counselors accomplish, the cost of each good deed, and how to do still better in the future" (p. 639).

#### The Status of Evaluation in Guidance and Counseling

Although evaluation has repeatedly been identified as an integral component in the development of guidance programs and an important variable in obtaining public support, it is often neglected. "A glance at counseling and human services programs in schools, colleges, and agencies reveals little evidence of meaningful evaluation taking place" (Burk & Peterson, 1975, p. 564).

The reasons counselors avoid the evaluation process vary. One explanation given is the pressure experienced by the individuals participating in the process. Baker (1977)

supports this stance explaining, "Many helping professionals seem to have a negative attitude toward accountability; i.e., one must demonstrate worth in order to keep the job" (p. 53).

Another rationale given for counselors not initiating evaluations is the lack of knowledge in the area. Many well-trained guidance counselors have no idea how to design and initiate an evaluation or are unaware of the benefits and utilization of the data obtained as part of the process. Because of this, Frith and Clark (1982), as well as Pietrofesa, Bernstein, Minor, and Stanford (1980) indicate that evaluation is often avoided due to misconceptions that the statistical analysis necessary is extensive and too difficult to manage. "Counselors therefore do not develop skills in program evaluation; that is, they do not receive instruction on how they might go about evaluating programs in the context of the difficulties and obstacles in the real world of counseling" (Burk and Peterson, 1975, p. 565).

May (1976), Wheeler and Loesch (1981), as well as Daniels, Mines, and Gressard (1981) attribute this lack of comfort and familiarity with evaluation to a lack of training in the area. In response to this concern, it has been recommended that counselor education programs address the issue appropriately. Burk and Peterson (1975), Daniels et al. (1981), and Shertzer and Stone (1981) recommend that more counselor training programs make evaluation design an integral part of the counselor preparation curricula. Baker (1977) and

Krumboltz (1974) support the stance that appropriate education in the area of evaluation would enhance the counselor's confidence in the process and serve as a positive influence in carrying out the necessary procedures. Thus, the counselor's familiarity and comfort with evaluation procedures would increase, resulting in more effective guidance and counseling programs.

The lack of guidance program evaluations taking place is also often attributed to time constraints on the part of counseling personnel. Burk and Peterson (1975) attribute this to the numerous and diversified responsibilities faced by counselors in the school setting. Because of the ever-increasing duties of school counselors, scheduling does not permit for the preparation needed to design and implement an evaluation.

Evaluation has proven to be a reliable and effective tool in the development, implementation, and funding of guidance and counseling programs. "The pressures and demands of accountability are strong driving forces behind this maturation process. Indeed, because of accountability pressures, program evaluation may become one of the most important activities in which counselors engage" (Wheeler & Loesch, 1981, p. 576).

## **Guidance and Counseling Program Evaluation Models**

Although evaluation has been identified as a valuable component of guidance program development implementation, a comprehensive review of extant literature revealed that it is seldom utilized. Presented below are examples of guidance and counseling evaluation designs resulting from a comprehensive review of extant literature addressing this topic.

The models selected have some common elements; all of the designs can be utilized in grades K through 12 and emphasize the need for evaluation in order to improve program effectiveness. Each provides input from the multiple populations participating in the program. In addition, each model, except one (the Georgia State Department) utilizes numerous methods for data collection.

### Baltimore County Schools

Baltimore County Public Schools, Guidance Program Management Model, K-12, has three major components: needs assessment, interim evaluation, and impact evaluation.

Needs assessment enables counselors to identify the discrepancy between what is and what should be. Implicit, therefore, in all needs assessment is a set of conditions reflective of an ideal state. These conditions are defined within the Baltimore County Guidance Accountability Model in relation to expected

student behaviors, knowledge, and attitudes specific to designated grade level. (Baltimore County Schools, 1984, p. 41)

Counseling personnel collect data for this component from questionnaires, interviews and student records and reports. Program planning takes place as a result of the information obtained. Program goals and objectives are redesigned and prioritized in order to appropriately serve the identified student needs.

"Interim evaluation - Two questions are addressed at this stage:

- Are the procedures for conducting the program in place and working?
- Is the planned program effecting the results anticipated?" (Baltimore County, 1984, p. 41)

"Interim evaluations are concerned with the question of whether or not desired changes are occurring" (Baltimore County Public Schools, 1984, p. 66). Data is collected by guidance counselors through the use of various forms of questioning (i.e., sociogram, checklists, interviews); observations of various school personnel, parents and students; and records addressing the areas of academic progress, attendance and health.

"Impact evaluation - essentially measures the overall impact of a program relative to program objectives and

identified student need" (Baltimore County Public Schools, 1984, p. 41).

Measuring the impact of the program enables counselors and other educators to determine the degree to which program objectives and the need of the students are met. Impact evaluation, summative in nature, measures growth and change. Outcomes of summative evaluation, predicted and unanticipated, may indicate directions and needed program modification. (Baltimore County Schools, 1984, p. 79)

Data for this portion of the model is collected by all individuals involved with the implementation of the program. A variety of sources are utilized in the collection process. These include student records, standardized test scores, and significant personal sources involved in the program (i.e., parents, school personnel, agency representatives).

#### Dallas Independent School District

Grobe, Myatt, and Wheeler (1978) reviewed the Model for Accountable Elementary Guidance (MAEG) by the Dallas Independent School District.

The planning model that the schools worked through provided the framework for a systematic approach to: (a) organizing a building level planning team, (b) collecting needs-assessment data for use as input information into following functions of the model, (c) making decisions

relative to the prioritization of needs and selection of solution strategies, (d) writing a formal plan for implementation of the selected strategies, and (e) involving continual evaluation of each step with feedback to previous steps. (Grobe, et.al., 1977, p. 258)

Georgia State Department of Education

As part of the Georgia Comprehensive Guidance Series, the Georgia State Department has put together a manual to assess the effectiveness of their state elementary, middle, and secondary school guidance and counseling program. The manual contains instruments for the purpose of determining program effectiveness and identifying student needs. The instruments presented provide the following:

1. Assessment procedures that gather information regarding the perception of students, parents, and others concerning the school's current guidance program.
2. Assessment procedures that gather perceptions of the school staff and personnel concerning typical guidance functions (activities) and critical school support factors.
3. Assessment procedures related to student needs and progress toward guidance curriculum outcomes that can be used in the priority setting process. (Gunderson & Moore, 1981, p. 1)

The information obtained from the Georgia format is provided by school personnel, students, and parents.

A Model For the Evaluation of  
Results-Based Guidance Programs

Johnson and Johnson (1987) have designed a model "to provide guidance program directors, supervisors, coordinators, counselors, and evaluators with a framework for gathering and reporting data" (p. 14). "The basic framework used to identify the program elements to be evaluated has been adapted from Kaufman's model of organizational elements (Kaufman & Thomas, 1980, p. 42)" (Johnson & Johnson, 1987, p. 3). These organizational elements are as follows: Inputs, Processes, Products, Outputs, and Outcomes. In adapting the Kaufman model, the authors go into great detail defining each element. In addition, they exemplify how each of the elements can be properly utilized in the evaluation of guidance programs. An example follows.

PROCESSES: are the ways in which resources or inputs are orchestrated to make sure that students achieve the desired competency. These are strategies, techniques, activities, methods, and how-tos, e.g., individual and group counseling, group guidance, parent conferences, consultation with teachers, cased conferences, newsletters, visitations, etc. (Johnson & Johnson, 1987, p. 10).

This model emphasizes the utilization of varied methods of data collection in conjunction with representation from numerous populations (i.e., administrators, students, parents, school staff, and personnel). This is to insure that the evaluation results are as meaningful as possible to the appropriate personnel.

Oregon State Department of Education

The Oregon State Department of Education (1979) specifies the following in regard to evaluation of their elementary school guidance and counseling program:

Program Evaluation:

Program evaluation consists of determining the degree to which the individual program meets the local goals. It is seen as a four-step process:

1. Specifying the long-range and more immediate goals;
2. Selecting or developing a means to measure the attainment of guidance goals;
3. Measuring the degree to which the goals have been met; and
4. Comparing student performance with some kind of baseline (such as pre/post testing), and comparing the target group with a control group.

A comprehensive evaluation of the program will include feedback from various groups in contact with the counselor including: staff, parents, and students.

**Counselor Evaluation:**

A counselor's performance must be evaluated separately from the program because others--teachers, administrators, and parents, for example--are also responsible for achieving guidance program goals. (p. 13 & 14)

**Elementary School Guidance and Counseling in Virginia****Goals for Elementary School Guidance in Virginia**

At the time of this study all 50 states employed elementary school guidance counselors and or had legislation pending to do so. As indicated in Chapter One, the Commonwealth of Virginia was one of those states. During the 1986-1987 school year, 50 of Virginia's 139 school districts had elementary school guidance programs. In accordance with the Standards for Accrediting Schools in Virginia, all school districts were required to employ one elementary school guidance counselor for every 500 students by the 1989-1990 school year.

**Program Guidelines For Elementary School Counselors In The Commonwealth Of Virginia state:**

The goal of elementary guidance and counseling is to aid children to master the academic, social, and personal developmental tasks of childhood essential for positive growth. This means that guidance is concerned with all

aspects of pupil development. Emphasis is also upon the early identification of children's problems and the provision of appropriate interventions to prevent these problems from becoming overwhelming. (Virginia Department of Education, 1981)

Optimal program effectiveness include the following four counselor functions: counseling, classroom guidance, consultation, and coordination. Aside from working with regular classroom students, these components are often reflected in the counselor's role when working with parents, special education students, and the facilitation of the school's testing program.

The role of the elementary school counselor is an important one. It is expected that the recent legislation in Virginia will continue to enhance the effectiveness of educational programming throughout the state. In order to accomplish this goal, it is important to emphasize that all individuals participating in the process of developing elementary school guidance programs have a working knowledge of the four major components involved in guidance program development: planning or organizing, needs assessment, program design, and evaluation. In doing so, the development and implementation of appropriate programs designed to address identified student needs will be assured.

### State Funded Evaluation

In February, 1984, a report was filed culminating a three-year study of elementary school guidance and counseling programs in the state of Virginia. The study was conducted by Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) in conjunction with the Virginia State Department of Education. At the time of the report's completion, Virginia had approximately 200 elementary school guidance counselors employed on either a part-time or full-time basis.

The study was initiated due to "considerable interest--in the legislature, in the SDE and many LEA's--in obtaining objective information as to: (a) the effectiveness of such programs, and (b) the ways in which various guidance programs are implemented" (Ryan, 1984a, p. 1).

In response to these concerns, populations were selected with the intent of assuring state representation from urban, suburban, and rural regions respectively. As a result, the following school divisions were selected for data collection: Richmond City, Williamsburg-James City County, and Augusta County.

The strategy involved constructing typologies of schools, counselors and programs and systematic collection of perceptual data from all major stakeholders in the guidance and counseling process--parents, students, teachers, principals, and counselors themselves. Stakeholder perceptions, drawn from questionnaires and

interviews, were arrayed against the various descriptors to determine (1) the level of acceptance of programs in general; and (2) the effects, if any, of various descriptive factors on program acceptance.

The descriptors selected were (1) school setting (urban, rural, suburban), (2) school size, (3) full-time or shared counselor, (4) counselor load, (5) percentages of time counselors were required to perform non-counseling duties, and (6) counselor typology (a composite index of #s 2-5 above). (Ryan, 1984b, p. 1)

The results of the study were as follows:

(1) Elementary guidance programs in these schools are being carried out as described by the administrators, counselors, and school division personnel.

(2) These programs are taken seriously, i.e., they are not devices for getting administrative assistance or for achieving other unstated goals.

(3) They are rated very highly, virtually "across the board", by parents, principals, and staff other than counselors themselves (counselors were not asked to rate their own effectiveness).

(4) Of the descriptors studied, two which have very high correlations with perceptions of success are counselor load (472-1 is a key "breakpoint") and counselors serving only one school. (Ryan, 1984a, p. 3)

### School District Initiated Evaluations

The 50 Virginia school districts which had elementary school guidance and counseling programs during the 1986-1987 school year were contacted through the mail to determine the number of programs which had participated in comprehensive evaluations on the local level. As indicated in Appendix F, division representatives were asked to complete and return the bottom portion of the letter only if a comprehensive study had taken place. However, the six school districts that responded indicated their programs had not been evaluated. As a result, it was determined at the time of this study, there was no documentation of a school district within Virginia having initiated a comprehensive evaluation of an elementary school guidance and counseling program.

### **Summary**

The field of guidance and counseling has developed throughout the twentieth century. One of the greatest changes has been in the area of elementary school guidance and counseling. William Burnham's belief in the importance of elementary-aged school children's "mental hygiene" has come of age, and left its impact upon the field. Although his writings first appeared during the twenties and thirties, elementary school guidance programming didn't begin to develop

until the sixties. This was primarily due to federal legislation at the time.

The evaluation of guidance programs has been identified as a necessity to assure optimal effectiveness. However, the procedure has not been utilized often due to the lack of time and/or skills on the part of the counselors. This situation has been confirmed with regard to the evaluation of guidance programs in Virginia's elementary schools. Even though 50 school districts in the Commonwealth had elementary school guidance and counseling programs during the 1986-1987 school year, aside from a state-supported evaluation of three school systems reported in 1984, documentation of a comprehensive evaluation of a well-established elementary school guidance program in the Commonwealth was not identified at the time of this study.

The purpose of this chapter was to present a review of the literature on the evaluation of elementary school guidance and counseling programs. An historical overview of the development of guidance and counseling programs in America was provided, as well the rationale and current utilization of evaluation in guidance and counseling. In addition, evaluation models for guidance programs nationally were presented in conjunction with the utilization of evaluation of elementary programs in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The evaluation design, including a description of the subjects, data collection procedures, and data analysis, is presented in Chapter Three.

**CHAPTER III**  
**EVALUATION DESIGN**

**Introduction**

During the initial stages of this study, the evaluator met with the Supervisor of Guidance for Roanoke County Public Schools on four different occasions and attended meetings held for the district's elementary school guidance counselors for the purpose of (a) obtaining demographic information, (b) becoming familiar with program objectives and activities, (c) analyzing data provided by earlier evaluations, and (d) developing goals for the study. Following are the results of these meetings.

**Demographic Data**

Roanoke County is considered an urban/suburban community. Located in the Roanoke Valley, it has a total population 76,500 in a 248 square-mile area.

During the 1986-1987 school year there was a total of 28 schools in Roanoke County: 17 elementary, 4 junior high, 4 senior high, 2 vocational-technical, and 1 special education center. The total operating budget for the 1986-1987 school year was \$50,712,118. The total number of students enrolled was 13,561. A little over half of these students (7,233) were

elementary level. Close to 2,000 individuals were employed by the school system, approximately 1,000 as teachers.

By the time this study commenced, there were 15 counselors serving 17 elementary schools: 11 schools had full-time counselors, and six schools had part-time counselors. Two of the part-time counselors were assigned two schools each. The remaining two of these six schools were served by individuals employed on a half-time basis for the system.

All of the counselors were female and had masters degrees. One had recently completed her doctorate. Each was certified in elementary school guidance by the Virginia Department of Education. Eight counselors had participated in the program from 10 to 13 years. Five counselors had four to nine years of experience with the program, while two counselors had their positions one to three years.

The total budget allocated for the salaries of the 15 people employed as elementary school counselors for the 1986-1987 school year was \$485,105.64.

### **Data Collection**

In order to answer the evaluation questions, the study was comprised of samples from the following populations participating in the program: guidance counselors, teachers,

principals, students, and parents of elementary school children.

Students and school personnel addressed all three evaluation questions. Because parents were not familiar with the specific terminology involved in the program (i.e., self-concept, coping behaviors, learning climate, etc.), they were asked only for information regarding attitude toward the program (Evaluation Question Three).

#### Elementary School Guidance Counselors

It was the intent of the evaluator to have all 15 elementary guidance counselors employed by Roanoke County at the time of the study attend an interview. However, due to maternity leave, one counselor did not to participate. The remaining 14 counselors were requested, through memoranda (Appendix B), to attend one of two focus interview sessions scheduled at the Board of Education Office. The interviews were organized to provide an opportunity for participants to generate ideas on the topics being addressed by the study. Questions were posed by the evaluator from a questionnaire (Appendix B), while a fellow graduate student took notes. At the end of the discussion, each participant completed a Counselor Information Sheet (Appendix B) to provide the evaluator with demographic data.

### Students

Fourteen schools were selected for student representation in the study. A primary class (K-2) or an intermediate class (3-6) was selected at each school through random sampling. Data was collected through the use of questionnaires administered by counselors and the classroom teachers. The completed instruments were collected and returned by the teachers in order to assure confidentiality (Appendix C). A total of 261 students (144 at the intermediate level and 117 at the primary level) participated in the study.

The students in primary grades (K-2) were asked to respond on their answer sheets by marking an X over the smiley face if they agreed with the statement read by their guidance counselor or an X over the sad face if they disagreed. The responses on these answer sheets were later coded onto optical scanning (opscan) forms (1 = smiley face; 2 = sad face) (Appendix C). The students in the intermediate grades (3-6) were held responsible for reading their questionnaires (Appendix C) and marking the appropriate answer on the opscan forms provided. The responses provided on their instrument were 1 for Agree; 2 for Disagree; and 3 for Don't Know (Don't Know = 0 for scoring purposes).

### Elementary School Teachers

Seventeen teachers (nine primary grade and eight intermediate grade) were randomly selected to participate in one of the interviews scheduled (Appendix D). A questionnaire was used by the evaluator to facilitate focus group interviews for the teacher sample (Appendix D).

The same questionnaire used during the interview was disseminated to a sample of 34 teachers representing Roanoke County's 17 elementary schools (Appendix D). As a result of random sampling, two teachers per school were selected in order to insure equal representation of primary and intermediate grade educators at each facility.

Responses provided for the statements on the teacher instrument were as follows: 1 representing Agree; 2 representing Tend to Agree; 3 representing Tend to Disagree; 4 representing Disagree; and 5 representing Don't Know (Don't Know = 0 for scoring purposes). The information on the returned questionnaires was coded onto opscan forms in order to facilitate the analysis.

### Elementary School Principals

At the time of the study, there were 16 principals serving 17 elementary schools. Five elementary schools had student populations of 1-200; four schools had 201-400 students; and eight schools had 401-600. In order to assure equal administrative representation according to school size,

one principal was randomly selected from each of the three aforementioned categories and asked to participate in an individual structured interview. The 13 remaining principals were sent a questionnaire (Appendix D) used in the interviews with the other three administrators. The principals' instrument was comprised of the same items found on the teachers questionnaire.

### Parents

From September of 1985 through March of 1987 a total of eight schools had informally collected data from parents regarding their elementary school guidance and counseling program. As a result, the remaining nine schools were selected to participate in this study.

Two groups of parents were included in the process. One sample of 200 was comprised of names randomly selected from the total parent populations at each of the nine schools. The smaller random sample of 80 consisted of parents from each of the nine schools who had participated in the elementary school guidance program during the 1986-1987 school year. This latter sample was referred to throughout the study as the "selected" sample.

The questionnaires sent to the parents were color coded. The larger sample was white, and the one mailed to the selected sample was yellow. The instrument and directions to return the completed forms to the Supervisor of Guidance were

mailed to both populations with a self-addressed stamped envelope (Appendix E).

### **Data Analysis**

The responses to questionnaire items were coded onto opscan forms and computed at the Learning Resource Center at Virginia Tech. The SAS Program was used to calculate frequency distributions and percentages of responses on questionnaire items for all samples. Data obtained from students were cross-tabulated and analyzed for school-specific, sex-specific and grade-specific differences.

Responses to the open-ended questions provided on the student, teacher, principal, and parent questionnaires were categorized according to the program goals established during the Van Hoose study of 1974 (as noted in Chapter I). They were as follows:

- 1) Self-Concept Concerns - assisting the students in developing self-esteem;
- 2) Academic Concerns - assisting the students in developing in academic achievement;
- 3) Relationship Concerns - assisting the students in developing peer and social relationships.

Information collected during the focus interviews and the structured interviews was used for clarifying and

substantiating quantitative data obtained from the questionnaires.

This chapter presented the evaluation design including a description of the subjects, data collection procedures, and data analysis. The results of the study, based upon the analysis of the data, are reported in Chapter Four.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Summary of Questionnaire Results and Interview Data

A total of 588 questionnaires were disseminated to sample populations of teachers, principals, students, and parents in Roanoke County Elementary Schools.

As indicated in Table 1, the student samples were comprised of 144 intermediate level (third, fourth and fifth grade) children and 117 primary level (kindergarten, first and second grade) children. In the intermediate-aged population, 97% of the children responded to one or more of the open-ended questions presented. The primary level students were not provided with any open-ended questions.

Responses obtained from students were cross-tabulated using school, sex, and grade as variables. Analysis of this data did not reflect any school-specific, sex-specific, or grade-specific differences.

Of the 34 questionnaires distributed to teachers a total of 27, or 79%, were returned. The response for principals was 77%. Ten, in their sample of 13, were returned. All questionnaires returned by teachers and principals had written responses to each open-ended question presented at the end of the instrument.

Table 1

Summary of Questionnaire Returns

Population	N	Respondents	% Respondents
Primary Students	117	117	100%
Intermediate Students	144	144	100%
Teachers	34	27	79%
Principals	13	10	77%
Selected Parent Sample	80	36	45%
Random Parent Sample	200	86	43%

The 80-subject parent sample, selected from the parents who had been involved with the program during the current school year, had a 45% response rate. The 200-subject random parent sample, had a 43% response rate. Ninety-five percent of the respondents addressed one or more of the open-ended questions presented on their instrument. Seventy-nine percent of this group responded to one or more of their open-ended questions.

In terms of interview attendance, 14 teachers and 14 of the 15 elementary counselors participated in their assigned sessions. All three principals selected to represent a small, medium, and large school were accessible and cooperated in providing data as well.

### **Data Analysis**

#### Evaluation Question One

Are the program objectives being met?

- a) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a realistic self-concept?
- b) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing group awareness?
- c) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a capacity for interpersonal relationships?
- d) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a capacity for interpersonal relationships?

- e) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing communication skills?
- f) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing decision-making skills?
- g) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing effective coping behaviors?
- h) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing skills for academic achievement?
- i) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a wholesome attitude toward the world of work?
- j) Is the program effective in facilitating a more effective learning environment?

### Questionnaire Data

Students. As shown in Table 2, the majority of 117 primary-aged students indicated that specific program objectives were being met. This was represented by their responses to Items 1 through 13 on the questionnaire. The lowest number of responses (81%), was given for Item 5, indicating the counselor had assisted them in working in groups with other children. The greatest number of respondents, 98%, maintained they had learned to feel better about themselves (Item 4) as a result of the guidance program.

Although the responses of the 144 intermediate students (Table 3) suggested program objectives were being met, the favorable response pattern for this sample was lower when

Table 2

Responses of Primary Students (K-2) to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #1

Questionnaire Item	N=117 Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice			$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Agree/%	(2) Disagree/%	(3) Omitted/%	
My guidance counselor:				
1) has helped me to realize that I am special.	109/93%	7/6%	1/1%	1.06
2) has helped me to see that everyone is different.	110/94%	7/6%	0/0	1.06
3) has helped me to learn more about myself.	111/95%	6/5%	0/0	1.05
4) has helped me to learn to feel better about myself.	115/98%	2/2%	0/0	1.02

Table 2 continued

N=117				
Frequency and Percentage				
of Responses for Each Choice				
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Disagree/%	(3) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
My guidance counselor:				
5) has helped me to learn how to work and play in groups with other children.	95/81%	21/18%	1/1%	1.18
6) has helped me to learn how to make friends.	111/95%	6/5%	0/0	1.05
7) has helped me to learn how to get along with members of my family.	103/88%	14/12%	0/0	1.12
8) has helped me to learn that to have different feelings is alright.	108/92%	9/8%	0/0	1.08

Table 2 continued

Questionnaire Item	N=117 Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice			$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Agree/%	(2) Disagree/%	(3) Omitted/%	
My guidance counselor:				
9) has helped me to learn what to do when I feel mad.	104/89%	13/11%	0/0	1.11
10) has helped me to learn what to do when I feel sad.	105/90%	12/10%	0/0	1.10
11) has helped me to learn how to do my best in my school work.	109/93%	8/7%	0/0	1.07
12) has helped to make school a better place for me.	106/91%	11/9%	0/0	1.09
13) has taught me about different kinds of jobs.	96/82%	21/18%	0/0	1.18

Table 3

Responses of Intermediate Students (3-6) to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #1

Questionnaire Item	N=144 Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice				$\bar{X}$
	(1) Agree/%	(2) Disagree/%	(3) Don't Know/%	(4) Omitted/%	
My guidance counselor:					
1) has helped me to realize that I am special.	125/87%	3/2%	13/9%	4/2%	1.02
2) has helped me to see that everyone is different.	129/90%	7/5%	2/1%	6/4%	1.05
3) has helped me to learn more about myself.	92/64%	21/15%	19/13%	12/8%	1.19
4) has helped me to learn to feel better about myself.	109/76%	13/9%	11/8%	11/7%	1.11

Table 3 continued

N=144					
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice					
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Disagree/%	(3) Don't Know/%	(4) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
<b>My guidance counselor:</b>					
5) has helped me to learn how to work and play in groups with other children.	95/66%	23/16%	19/13%	7/5%	1.19
6) has helped me to learn how to make friends.	99/69%	26/18%	13/9%	6/4%	1.21
7) has helped me to learn how to get along with members of my family.	83/58%	31/22%	22/15%	8/5%	1.27
8) has helped me to learn how to share my thoughts and ideas with other people.	101/70%	17/12%	18/13%	8/5%	1.14

Table 3 continued

N=144					
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice					
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Disagree/%	(3) Don't Know/%	(4) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
<b>My guidance counselor:</b>					
9) has helped me to learn how to be a good listener when someone else is talking.	121/84%	10/7%	7/5%	6/4%	1.08
10) has helped me to learn how to make decisions.	104/72%	17/12%	16/11%	7/5%	1.14
11) has helped me to learn how to deal with things when they don't go my way.	88/61%	25/17%	25/17%	6/4%	1.22
12) has helped me to learn that to have different feelings is alright.	122/85%	6/4%	12/8%	4/3%	1.05

Table 3 continued

N=144 Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice					
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Disagree/%	(3) Don't Know/%	(4) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
<b>My guidance counselor:</b>					
13) has helped me to learn what to do when I feel different emotions.	84/58%	29/20%	27/19%	4/3%	1.26
14) has helped me to learn how to do my best in my school work.	109/76%	16/11%	15/10%	4/3%	1.13
15) has helped to make school a better place for me.	90/63%	24/17%	26/18%	4/3%	1.21
16) has taught me about jobs and different careers.	105/73%	23/16%	13/9%	3/2%	1.18

compared to that of the younger students. However, this could be attributed in part to the fact that the intermediate-aged students had a third response option, "Don't Know," whereas the primary aged students did not.

Items 7 and 13 addressing familial relationships and different emotions experienced by the older students reflected the lowest support of 58%. Items 11 and 15 which dealt with coping skills and the educational environment also exhibited low support of 61% and 63% respectively. The issue of being able to recognize individual differences (Item 2) exhibited the greatest support for this population (90%).

Teachers/Principals. Teachers maintained that program objectives were being met with 74% to 97% of the sample answering "Agree" or "Tend to Agree" on items addressing this issue. The mean response for all statements ranged from 1.32 for Item 3, dealing with self and group awareness, through 1.79 for Item 8, determining whether the guidance program assisted in academic development, (1 = Agree, 2 = Tend to Agree, 3 = Tend to Disagree and 4 = Disagree). This data can be found in Table 4.

As shown in Table 5, the principals' sample exhibited support with regard to Evaluation Question One as well. The administrators consistently responded more frequently to "Agree" than did the teachers with mean responses ranging from 1.10 for Item 1, dealing with self-concept, through 1.60 for Item 10 addressing learning climate.

Table 4

Responses of Teachers to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #1

Questionnaire Item	Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice						$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	
N=27							
The guidance program:							
1) helps the students to develop a realistic <u>self-concept</u> .	18/67%	7/26%	1/4%	0/0	1/4%	0/0	1.35
2) helps the students to develop realistic <u>self-direction</u> .	12/44%	12/44%	1/4%	1/4%	1/4%	0/0	1.65

Table 4 continued

Questionnaire Item	N=27						$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	
3) assists the students in the development of <u>self and group awareness.</u>	17/63%	8/30%	0/0	0/0	2/7%	0/0	1.32
4) assists the students in developing the capacity for <u>effective interpersonal relationships.</u>	12/44%	11/41%	3/11%	0/0	1/4%	0/0	1.65

Table 4 continued

Questionnaire Item	Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice					$\bar{x}$ Response	
	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%		(6) Omitted /%
5) assists the students in developing <u>effective</u> <u>communication</u> <u>skills</u> .	13/48%	12/44%	0/0	0/0	2/7%	0/0	1.48
6) assists the students in developing <u>effective</u> <u>decision-making</u> <u>skills</u> .	15/56%	9/33%	2/7%	0/0	0/0	1/4%	1.50

Table 4 continued

N=27							
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice							
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	$\bar{x}$ Response
7) assists the students in developing <u>effective coping behaviors.</u>	15/56%	9/33%	2/7%	1/4%	0/0	0/0	1.59
8) aids the students in <u>academic development.</u>	10/37%	10/37%	3/11%	1/4%	3/11%	0/0	1.79

Table 4 continued

N=27

Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice

Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	$\bar{x}$ Response
9) assists the students in developing <u>wholesome attitudes toward the world of work.</u>	12/44%	8/30%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.40
10) facilitates in the development of a <u>more effective learning climate.</u>	15/56%	6/22%	3/11%	1/4%	2/7%	0/0	1.60

Table 4 continued

		N=27					
		Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice					
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	$\bar{x}$ Response
11) The guidance counselor provides inservice training for teachers.	13/48%	8/30%	3/11%	2/7%	0/0	1/4%	1.77
12) The guidance counselor cooperates with you in meeting the needs of students.	25/93%	1/4%	1/4%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.11

Table 4 continued

N=27							
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice							
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	$\bar{x}$ Response
18) The guidance counselor is effective in identifying and utilizing outside re-sources for the children and their families.	20/74%	5/19%	0/0	0/0	2/7%	0/0	1.20
20) The philosophy of your counselor is in harmony with the needs of students in your school.	21/78%	4/15%	2/7%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.30

Table 4 continued

N=27							
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice							
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	$\bar{x}$ Response
21) The guidance program aids in achieving the major objectives of the school.	20/74%	6/22%	0/0	0/0	1/4%	0/0	1.23

Table 5  
Responses of Principals to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #1

Questionnaire Item	Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice						$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	
The guidance program:							
1) helps the students to develop a realistic <u>self-concept</u> .	9/90%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.10
2) helps the students to develop realistic <u>self-direction</u>	6/60%	3/30%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.50

N=10

Table 5 continued

Questionnaire Item	Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice						$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	
3) assists the students in the development of <u>self and group awareness.</u>	8/80%	2/20%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.20
4) assists the students in developing the capacity for <u>effective interpersonal relationships.</u>	8/80%	1/10%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.30
5) assists the students in developing <u>effective communication skills.</u>	6/60%	3/30%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.50

Table 5 continued

Questionnaire Item	Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice					$\bar{x}$ Response	
	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%		(6) Omitted /%
6) assists the students in developing effective <u>decision-making skills.</u>	6/60%	3/30%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.50
7) assists the students in developing <u>effective coping behaviors.</u>	8/80%	1/10%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.30
8) aids the students in <u>academic development.</u>	5/50%	5/50%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.50

Table 5 continued

N=10							
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice							
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	$\bar{x}$ Response
9) assists the students in developing wholesome attitudes toward the <u>world of work.</u>	8/80%	2/20%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.20
10) The guidance program facilitates in the development of a <u>more effective learning climate.</u>	5/50%	4/40%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.60
11) The guidance counselor provides in-service training for teachers.	6/60%	3/30%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.50

Table 5 continued

Questionnaire Item	N=10 Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice						$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	
12) The guidance counselor cooperates with you in meeting the needs of students.	7/70%	3/30%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.30
18) The guidance counselor is effective in identifying and utilizing outside services for the children and their families.	6/60%	4/40%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.40

Table 5 continued

		N=10					
		Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice					
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	$\bar{x}$ Response
20) The philosophy of your counselor is in harmony with the needs of students in your school.	8/80%	1/10%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.30
21) The guidance program aids in achieving the major objectives of the school.	9/90%	0/0	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.20

### Interview Data

The counselors, teachers, and principals interviewed substantiated the aforementioned data maintaining the program objectives were being met. The data depicted the elementary school counselor as a dependable and worthwhile resource in the areas of consultation and referral. This was especially evident when assisting with specific difficulties in classroom management and individual student problems.

The one discrepancy to arise regarding the program objectives dealt with whether or not the program was effective in assisting the students in developing a wholesome attitude toward the world of work. The majority of all interview participants indicated that the teachers were primarily responsible for career information, while the counselor served as a resource in this area. The counselor interview data reflected that the degree of their involvement with career information was a school-specific situation dependent upon the curricula priorities established by the principal, the grade level of the students, and the expertise exhibited by the teacher.

### Evaluation Question Two

What additional student needs can be met by the program?

#### Questionnaire Data

Student Response. Items 15, 17 and 18 on the Primary Student Questionnaire addressed the issue of specific needs being met according to the utilization and accessibility of small group and individual counseling. As shown in Table 6 only 33% (39) of the students had spoken to the counselor alone, while 46% of the students had worked in a small group with their counselor, and 93% maintained that their counselor would take the time to see them if the need arose.

Open-ended Question 3 in Section C of the Intermediate Student Questionnaire (Appendix C) and Question 3 in Section B of the Teacher/Principal Instrument (Appendix D) addressed this evaluation question through the use of an open-ended response format.

Eighty-two percent of the 109 students who responded to Question 3 in Section C maintained they did not have any concerns not being met by the guidance program. The remaining 20 answers were divided into the following two categories: relationship concerns and academic concerns.

In the category of relationship concerns the primary area addressed by 13 students was that of peer relationships. This was reflected in a desire for making and keeping friends as well as a general need for establishing a sense of belonging

Table 6

Responses of Primary Students (K-2) to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #2

Questionnaire Item	N=117 Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice			$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	
15) Have you ever worked in a small group with your guidance counselor?	54/46%	63/54%	0/0	1.54
17) Have you ever spoken to the counselor alone?	39/33%	78/67%	0/0	1.67
18) Will your counselor have time to see you if you let her know you would like to discuss a problem?	109/93%	5/4%	3/3%	1.04

and acceptance with peers. Second in importance for this category was the area of student/school personnel relationships. These relationships were characterized by an expressed dislike for a specific teacher, based upon the fact that the student perceived the teacher as being "mean," "hard," and/or "not liking" them. In addition, there was an expressed need to work on family relationships with regard to improving rapport and/or communication with siblings.

The academic concerns dealt primarily with preparation for junior high school. Having to adjust to a new and larger facility, new friends, different teachers, and the responsibility of having a locker were the most expressed worries by the student sample (seven respondents). Second in this category were some concerns regarding success in specific subject areas (six respondents).

Teachers/Principals. According to responses made for open-ended Questions 5, 6 and 7 in Section B of the Teacher and Principal Questionnaires (Appendix D), all teacher and principal responses maintained that students' needs were being met; however, there was concern regarding the degree in which future program effectiveness could eventually be jeopardized. This was attributed primarily to time constraints placed upon the counselor as a result of numerous students and responsibilities. Both samples expressed a need for a full-time counselor at their respective schools and/or some type of assistance at schools where a counselor was enrolled

full time. The teachers indicated additional personnel could be utilized in small group work, individual counseling, and classroom guidance activities as their perceived areas of need, while the principals prioritized more time with students and parent groups as areas needing more counselor attention.

### Interview Data

Interviews conducted with teachers, principals, and counselors supported the aforementioned data with regard to student needs. The counselors validated their colleagues' responses by expressing concerns about the numerous responsibilities their job required of them. This was reflected in the number of students, as well as various time-consuming documentation procedures required of them. In addition, the counselors expressed a concern for parents to have a better understanding of the counselor's role and responsibilities in the school setting. They also specified the following topics as priorities with regard to further continuing education sessions: death and dying, the needs and concerns of latch key children, suicide in elementary-age students, and AIDS information.

### Evaluation Question Three

Do participants exhibit a favorable attitude toward the program?

#### Questionnaire Data

Students. The primary students exhibited support for the guidance program in their schools. As indicated on Table 7, the majority of these students responded positively to all items addressing Evaluation Question Three. Favorable attitudes were consistently expressed with regard to classroom guidance activities, trust in counselor confidentiality, and the effect of having a guidance counselor in their school.

The majority of the 144 intermediate-aged students concurred with their primary counterparts, exhibiting a positive attitude for the program. Response to Item 17 on Table 8 shows 130 of the respondents enjoyed the guidance activities. One hundred students responding to Item 19 said that they had worked in a small group with their counselor. Ninety-eight students indicated that they had enjoyed working in the small group (Item 19), while 60 students maintained that working in small groups had helped them (Item 20), and eighty-four students responded "yes" to Item 21 when asked if they would like to work in a small group again. In addition, 132 students indicated that they thought a school counselor could help them, while 130 respondents felt a school counselor was good to have in the school.

Table 7

Responses of Primary Students (K-2) to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3

Questionnaire Item	N=117 Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice			$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	
14) Have you enjoyed the classroom guidance activities you've done with your counselor?	111/95%	5/4%	1/1%	1.04
16) Would you like to work in a small group with your counselor?	97/83%	18/15%	2/2%	1.16
19) Can you trust your school counselor to keep a secret if you request it?	102/87%	13/11%	2/2%	1.11
20) Do you think a school counselor is good to have in the school?	114/97%	1/1%	2/2%	1.01

Table 8

Responses of Intermediate Students (3-6) to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3

N=144  
Frequency and Percentage  
of Responses for Each Choice

Questionnaire Item	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
17) Have you enjoyed the classroom guidance activities you've done with your counselor?	130/90%	13/9%	1/1%	1.09
*18) Have you ever worked in a small group with your school counselor?	100/69%	42/29%	2/2%	1.30
19) Did you enjoy working in the small group?	98/68%	4/3%	42/29%	1.04
20) Did working in the small group help you with a certain problem?	60/42%	37/26%	47/32%	1.38

\*Respondents answering No to question #18 were asked to skip questions 19, 20, and 21. Respondents answering Yes to question #18 were asked to skip question 22.

Table 8 continued

N=144				
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice				
Questionnaire Item	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
21) Would you like to work in a small group again?	84/58%	15/10%	45/31%	1.15
22) Would you like to work in a small group?	42/29%	15/10%	87/60%	1.26
27) Do you think the school counselor can help you?	132/92%	9/6%	3/2%	1.06
28) Do you think a counselor is good to have in the school?	130/90%	7/5%	7/5%	1.05

Two open-ended questions in Section C on the intermediate level questionnaire (Appendix C) asked the students to express their likes and dislikes for the program. Ninety-seven percent of the sample responded to the question addressing likes, and seventy-five percent answered the question dealing with dislikes. The responses in the "like" category dealt primarily with the counselor, the guidance activities, and the fact that the guidance program helped the children feel good about themselves. Eighty-four of the responses in the "dislike" category were "none". Twenty of the respondents addressed a desire to have more time with the guidance counselor. Four students in the sample expressed boredom for the program and/or dislike for the counselor.

Teachers/Principals. With regard to teachers and principals, the majority in both samples indicated a positive attitude toward the elementary guidance and counseling program. As exhibited on Table 9, the teachers expressed a positive attitude toward the elementary school guidance program. Their responses for this topic ranged from 78% to 93% marking "Agree" or "Tend to Agree". The highest number indicated the guidance counselor was fulfilling her role as well (Item 19) and the school was benefitting from the guidance program (Item 22).

When addressing Evaluation Question Three, 90% to 100% of the principals responded "Agree" or "Tend to Agree" to all items addressing their attitude toward the program (Table 10).

Table 9

Responses of Teachers to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3

N=27						
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice						
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree /%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /% $\bar{x}$ Response
13) The students have a good understanding and awareness of the guidance counselor's role in individual counseling.	15/56%	9/33%	2/7%	0/0	0/0	1/4% 1.50
14) The students have benefited from individual counseling.	17/63%	4/15%	1/4%	0/0	0/0	5/18% 1.27
15) The students have a good understanding and awareness of the guidance counselor's role in classroom guidance.	18/67%	6/22%	3/11%	0/0	0/0	0/0 1.44

Table 9 continued

N=27							
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice							
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree /%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /%	$\bar{x}$ Response
16) The students have benefited from classroom guidance.	18/67%	5/19%	2/7%	0/0	0/0	2/7%	1.36
17) The students have benefited from small group work with the guidance counselor.	19/70%	3/11%	2/7%	0/0	0/0	3/12%	1.40
19) The counselor is effective in fulfilling her role.	21/78%	4/15%	2/7%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.30
22) Your school benefits from having a guidance program.	24/89%	1/4%	2/7%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.19

Table 10

Responses of Principals to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3

N=10						
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice						
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree /%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /% $\bar{x}$ Response
13) The students have a good understanding and awareness of the guidance counselor's role in individual counseling.	4/40%	5/50%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0 1.70
14) The students have benefited from individual counseling.	8/80%	1/10%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0 1.30
15) The students have a good understanding and awareness of the guidance counselor's role in classroom guidance.	7/70%	3/30%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0 1.30

Table 10 continued

N=10							
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice							
Questionnaire Item	(1) Agree/%	(2) Tend to Agree/%	(3) Tend to Disagree/%	(4) Disagree/%	(5) Don't Know/%	(6) Omitted /% Response	
						$\bar{x}$	
16) The students have benefited from classroom guidance.	9/90%	0/0	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.20
17) The students have benefited from small group work with the guidance counselor.	9/90%	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.10
19) The counselor is effective in fulfilling her role.	7/70%	3/30%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.30
22) Your school benefits from having a guidance counselor.	9/90%	0/0	1/10%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1.20

Responses to the open-ended questions in Section B on the teacher/principal instrument (Appendix D) expressed support for the program as well. One hundred percent of both samples responded to Questions One and Two on their respective instruments. Eighty-one percent of the teachers and 80 percent of the administrators maintained that their guidance counselor was the greatest "strength" of the program. The remaining individuals attributed the content of the program (i.e., specific guidance activities and counseling services) as the primary strength.

In terms of weaknesses, teachers and principals concurred there was not enough time for the students to be with counselors, too much paper work for counselors, and a need for additional assistance for the counselors in order to keep the optimal level of program effectiveness.

Although the teachers and principals consistently indicated parent needs were being provided for, there was a desire expressed on the part of all administrators for more parent-oriented activities to be initiated by the counselors. The general consensus was that programs were lacking in this area due to time constraints placed upon the counselors. These constraints were attributed to the large number of students the counselor was responsible for, as well as the numerous and varied needs presented by the students.

Both samples maintained that their professional needs were being met by the program (Question 5).

Parents. As indicated on Table 11, the general random sample of parents exhibited a favorable attitude toward the program. Out of 86 respondents, 78% maintained they would contact the counselor regarding concern for their child's development (Item 3). In addition, 85% would speak with the counselor on issues dealing with behavior (Item 6) and 72% (Item 10) for academic difficulties.

The lowest number of responses for the parent sample dealt with their (the parents) participation in the guidance program. Less than 50% had attended a parent-oriented activity or had contacted the counselor for assistance (Items 16 & 18).

Sixty-nine of the 73 who indicated they knew there was a program in their child's school responded to open-ended Question 21 in Section B of the questionnaire (Appendix E) addressing program strengths. Thirty-three of these respondents said that although they were aware there was a program, they had not utilized and/or weren't aware of the specific components of the program. The remaining responses (36) reflected that the parents were glad that there was a counselor accessible. Specific areas cited in which the counselor had successfully worked with their children were: death in the family, impending divorce, custody situations, and peer relationships. In these situations support, insight, and encouragement were provided through individual and/or group work initiated by the counselor.

Table 11

Responses of Parents to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3  
(Random Sample of Parents)

Questionnaire Item	N=86 Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice			$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	
*1) Did you know that there is a guidance and counseling program in your child's elementary school?	73/85%	13/15%	0/0	1.15
2) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>development</u> , would you contact the teacher for assistance?	83/97%	3/3%	0/0	1.03
3) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>development</u> , would you contact the counselor for assistance?	67/78%	19/22%	0/0	1.22

\*Respondents answering No to question #1 were asked to skip questions #14 through #20. Respondents answering Yes to question #1 were asked to answer questions #14 through #20.

Table 11 continued

Questionnaire Item	N=86 Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice			$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	
4) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>development</u> , would you contact the principal for assistance?	53/62%	31/36%	2/2%	1.37
5) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>behavior</u> , would you contact the teacher for assistance?	82/95%	3/3%	1/1%	1.04
6) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>behavior</u> , would you contact the counselor for assistance?	73/85%	13/15%	0/0	1.15
7) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>behavior</u> , would you contact the principal for assistance?	60/70%	26/30%	0/0	1.30

Table 11 continued

N=86				
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice				
Questionnaire Item	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
8) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>progress in school</u> , would you contact the teacher for assistance?	86/100%	0/0	0/0	1.00
9) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>progress in school</u> , would you contact the principal for assistance?	55/64%	31/36%	0/0	1.36
10) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>progress in school</u> , would you contact the counselor for assistance?	62/72%	24/28%	0/0	1.28
11) Would you ever suggest to your child that he/she see the counselor to discuss concerns or difficulties?	77/90%	8/9%	1/1%	1.09

Table 11 continued

N=86				
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice				
Questionnaire Item	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
12) Do you think an elementary school guidance and counseling program is of value to children?	78/91%	6/7%	2/2%	1.07
13) Do you think an elementary school guidance and counseling program is of value to parents?	76/88%	6/7%	4/5%	1.07
14) Has your child utilized any of the guidance and counseling services in his/her school?	39/45%	32/37%	15/17%	1.45
15) Did it help them?	36/42%	5/6%	45/52%	1.12

Table 11 continued

N=86				
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice				
Questionnaire Item	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
16) Have you attended a parent oriented activity conducted by the counselor (i.e., parent discussion, parent education meeting, parent orientation)?	39/34%	42/49%	15/17%	1.59
17) Did it help you?	24/28%	4/5%	58/67%	1.14
18) Have you ever contacted the counselor for assistance?	31/36%	35/41%	20/23%	1.53
19) Did it help you?	25/29%	5/6%	56/65%	1.17
20) Would you seek assistance from the guidance counselor again if the need arose?	37/43%	4/5%	45/52%	1.10

Sixty-one individuals answered the open-ended question asking to identify program weaknesses (Question 22). Forty-three indicated there weren't any. Three people said there was difficulty at times with follow-through of services. The remaining respondents (15) cited the need for more information as the primary weakness. This latter issue was reinforced by 30 of the 40 responses to (open-ended) Question 23 indicating the same need.

As exhibited on Table 12, 81% to 92% of the parents in the selected sample indicated they would contact their child's counselor for assistance in the areas of child development, behavior, and academic progress. Just as in the larger sample, the majority of parents who had participated in the program had found the services valuable and would do so again.

Only three respondents from the selected sample did not answer open-ended Question 21 asking for identifiable strengths of the program. In this population the primary response dealt with the attributes of the counselor. Twenty-eight of the 33 responses complimented the counselors for being able to identify and provide for the needs of the children, teachers, and parents, while exemplifying great care and expertise in doing so. This seemed to be especially true when the counselor dealt with individual student concerns, parent or teacher referrals, and liaison duties with various community services.

Table 12

Responses of Parents to Questionnaire Items Addressing Evaluation Question #3  
(Selected Sample of Parents)

Questionnaire Item	N=36 Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice			$\bar{x}$ Response
	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	
*1) Did you know that there is a guidance and counseling program in your child's elementary school?	36/100%	0/0	0/0	1.00
2) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>development</u> , would you contact the <u>teacher</u> for assistance?	34/94%	2/6%	0/0	1.06
3) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>development</u> , would you contact the <u>counselor</u> for assistance?	33/92%	3/8%	0/0	1.08

\*Respondents answering No to question #1 were asked to skip questions #14 through #20. Respondents answering Yes to question #1 were asked to answer questions #14 through #20.

Table 12 continued

N=36				
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice				
Questionnaire Item	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
4) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>development</u> , would you contact the principal for assistance?	21/58%	14/39%	1/3%	1.40
5) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>behavior</u> , would you contact the teacher for assistance?	34/94%	1/3%	1/3%	1.03
6) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>behavior</u> , would you contact the counselor for assistance?	32/89%	3/8%	1/3%	1.09
7) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>behavior</u> , would you contact the principal for assistance?	25/69%	10/28%	1/3%	1.29

Table 12 continued

N=36				
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice				
Questionnaire Item	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
8) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>progress in school</u> , would you contact the teacher for assistance?	34/94%	0/0	2/6%	1.00
9) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>progress in school</u> , would you contact the principal for assistance?	21/58%	15/42%	0/0	1.42
10) If you had some concerns about your child's <u>progress in school</u> , would you contact the counselor for assistance?	29/81%	7/19%	0/0	1.19
11) Would you ever suggest to your child that he/she see the counselor to discuss concerns or difficulties?	33/92%	3/8%	0/0	1.08

Table 12 continued

N=36				
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice				
Questionnaire Item	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
12) Do you think an elementary school guidance and counseling program is of value to children?	33/92%	1/3%	2/6%	1.03
13) Do you think an elementary school guidance and counseling program is of value to parents?	34/94%	1/3%	1/3%	1.03
14) Has your child utilized any of the guidance and counseling services in his/her school?	34/94%	1/3%	1/3%	1.03
15) Did it help them?	30/83%	3/8%	3/8%	1.09

Table 12 continued

N=36				
Frequency and Percentage of Responses for Each Choice				
Questionnaire Item	(1) Yes/%	(2) No/%	(3) Omitted/%	$\bar{x}$ Response
16) Have you attended a parent oriented activity conducted by the counselor (i.e., parent discussion, parent education meeting, parent orientation)?	27/75%	8/22%	1/3%	1.23
17) Did it help you?	27/75%	1/3%	8/22%	1.04
18) Have you ever contacted the counselor for assistance?	30/83%	5/14%	1/3%	1.14
19) Did it help you?	28/78%	0/0%	8/22%	1.00
20) Would you seek assistance from the guidance counselor again if the need arose?	32/89%	0/0	4/11%	1.00

With regard to identified weaknesses exhibited by the program (open-ended Question 22), 20 in this sample responded. Twelve individuals said there weren't any weaknesses. Two individuals indicated there were instances when they requested a counselor's service, were assured they would receive assistance, but did not. The remaining six expressed concern for the negative effect the many and varied counselor responsibilities could eventually have on program effectiveness. Four of these recommended the hiring of additional counselors for their schools.

Responses to Question 23 concurred with the larger sample's request for more information regarding the program. All 20 responses for this item indicated that in order to utilize the program effectively more information regarding the design and specific components of the program was needed.

### Interview Data

Teacher, principal, and counselor interview data supported the questionnaire findings with regard to attitude towards the program. The counselors and teachers maintained that one of the greatest assets of the program was the Guidance Supervisor. His individual and program support, organizational and administrative skills, as well as positive public relations were cited as primary reasons for the program's success.

One area of concern expressed by the counselors was the mandate requiring 60% of the counselor's time to be spent in counseling and the 40% in guidance activities. Under current conditions many counselors felt it would be difficult to meet this criteria. In addition, counselors indicated the large number of students having to be served could eventually hamper program effectiveness.

The results of the study, based upon the analysis of the data, were reported in this chapter. A summary, conclusions, and recommendations are presented in Chapter Five.

**CHAPTER V**  
**SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Summary**

In May, 1986, the Virginia State Board of Education presented a resolution recommending that elementary school guidance and counseling programs be implemented in all of Virginia's public schools over a four-year period beginning in September, 1986, with full implementation by the 1989-1990 school year. In addition, it was recommended that one counselor be employed to serve every 500 elementary students in school districts throughout the Commonwealth. In June, 1987, the Virginia State Board of Education modified the Standards For Accrediting Schools In Virginia in accordance with the aforementioned recommendations.

One of the oldest and most comprehensive elementary school guidance and counseling programs in the Commonwealth is located in Roanoke County. The program was initiated during the 1973-1974 school year with seven counselors serving eight schools. By the 1986-1987 there were 15 counselors serving all 17 elementary schools in the county.

An integral component of every elementary school guidance and counseling program is evaluation. The Virginia Department of Education requires evaluation as a component of elementary school guidance and counseling programs.

Since its inception, the Roanoke County program has been evaluated by various means. Most recently data have been compiled at the discretion of individual counselors at their respective schools. Information for evaluation purposes was obtained primarily through questionnaires disseminated among various populations participating in the program (i.e., parents, students, teachers).

Two district-wide studies have taken place since the program's inception as well. The first of the studies, during the 1973-1974 school year, was designed to determine program credibility in order to obtain continued and increased funding. The results indicated that the program assisted students in developing self-esteem, academic achievement, and personal and social adjustment, when compared to the control groups. The second district wide study was during the 1979-1980 school term and was in response to a contingent of parents concerned about program content. It was designed by the Mental Health Committee of the County Council P.T.A. for the purpose of determining teacher and parental attitudes toward the program. The results reflected support on the part of both of these populations in regard to program goals, objectives, content, and materials.

These previous evaluations provided valuable data for the development of Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program. However, by the conclusion of the fourteenth year of the program's existence there had never

been an evaluation to determine program effectiveness throughout the school district, nor had there been an evaluation including all program participants (i.e., counselors, teachers, principals, students, and parents) simultaneously. In response to this situation, the purpose of this study was to design and conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program in order to determine program effectiveness.

The goals for this study were developed as a result of discussions with the Supervisor of Guidance and the elementary guidance counselors, analysis of the data provided by all previous program evaluations, and an extensive review of the program objectives and activities outlined in the Roanoke County Elementary Guidance & Counseling Activities & Techniques For Child Development Handbook (R.E.A.C.H. Manual).

They were as follows:

- 1) To determine if the program objectives were being met;
- 2) To determine if student needs were being met appropriately; and
- 3) To determine the attitude of program participants toward the program.

The following Evaluation Questions were developed in order to address the goals of this study.

- 1) Are the program objectives stated in the R.E.A.C.H. Manual being met?

- a) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a realistic self-concept?
  - b) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing self-direction?
  - c) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing group awareness?
  - d) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a capacity for interpersonal relationships?
  - e) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing communication skills?
  - f) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing decision-making skills?
  - g) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing coping behaviors?
  - h) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing skills for academic achievement?
  - i) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a wholesome attitude for the world of work?
  - j) Is the program effective in facilitating a more effective learning environment?
- 2) What additional identified student needs can be met by the elementary school guidance program?
  - 3) Do participants exhibit a favorable attitude toward the program?

In order to answer the evaluation questions, a total of 588 questionnaires were disseminated to sample populations of teachers, principals, students, and parents in Roanoke County Elementary Schools. Fourteen elementary guidance counselors as well as 17 elementary teachers participated in focus interviews. In addition, three principals were selected for individual interviews.

Students and school personnel addressed all three evaluation questions. Because parents were not familiar with the specific terminology involved in the program (i.e., self-concept, coping behaviors, learning climate, etc.) they were asked only for information regarding attitude toward the program (Evaluation Question Three).

Two hundred sixty-one questionnaires were administered to elementary school students by their counselors. The student sample was comprised of 144 intermediate level (third, fourth and fifth grade) children and 117 primary level (kindergarten, first and second grade) children. In the intermediate-aged population, 97% of the children responded to one or more of the open-ended questions presented at the end of their instrument. The primary level students were not provided with any open-ended questions.

Of the 34 questionnaires distributed to teachers a total of 27, or 79%, were returned. The response rate for principals was 77%. Ten, in their sample of 13, were returned. All questionnaires returned by teachers and

principals had written responses to each open-ended question presented at the end of the instrument.

The 200-subject parent sample had a 43% response rate. Ninety-five percent of the respondents addressed one or more of the open-ended questions presented. The 80-subject parent sample, selected from the parents who had been involved with the program during the current school year, had a 45% response rate. Seventy-nine percent of this group responded to one or more of their open-ended questions.

## Conclusions

### Evaluation Question One

Are the program objectives stated in the R.E.A.C.H. Manual being met?

- a) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a realistic self-concept?
- b) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing self-direction?
- c) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing group awareness?
- d) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a capacity for interpersonal relationships?
- e) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing communication skills?

- f) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing decision-making skills?
- g) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing coping behaviors?
- h) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing skills for academic achievement?
- i) Is the program effective in assisting the students in developing a wholesome attitude for the world of work?
- j) Is the program effective in facilitating a more effective learning environment?

#### Questionnaire Data

From the findings in this study, the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program was judged to be effective.

The majority of 117 primary-aged students indicated that specific program objectives were being met. The lowest number of responses, (81%), was given for the item indicating the counselor had assisted them in working in groups with other children. The greatest number of respondents, (98%), maintained they had learned to feel better about themselves as a result of the guidance program.

Although the responses of the 144 intermediate students suggested program objectives were being met, the favorable response pattern for this sample was lower when compared to

that of the younger students. However, this can be attributed in part to the fact that the intermediate-aged students had a third response option, "Don't Know," whereas the primary-aged students did not. Items that addressed familial relationships and different emotions experienced by the students reflected the lowest support of 58%. Questions that dealt with coping skills and the educational environment also exhibited low support of 61% and 63% respectively. The issue of being able to recognize individual differences exhibited the greatest support for this population (90%).

Teachers maintained that program objectives were being met with 74% to 97% of the sample answering "Agree" or "Tend to Agree" on items addressing this issue. The mean response for all statements ranged from 1.32 for Item 3, dealing with self and group awareness, through 1.79 for Item 8, determining whether the guidance program assisted in academic development.

The principals' sample exhibited support with regard to Evaluation Question One as well with 90%-100% responding "Agree" or "Tend to Agree". The administrators consistently responded more frequently to "Agree" than did the teachers with mean responses ranging from 1.10 for Item 1, dealing with self-concept, through 1.60 for Item 10, addressing learning climate.

### Interview Data

The counselors, teachers, and principals interviewed substantiated the aforementioned data indicating that the program objectives were being met. The data depicted the elementary school counselor as a dependable and worthwhile resource in the areas of consultation and referral. This was especially evident when assisting with specific difficulties in classroom management and individual student problems.

The one discrepancy to arise was regarding the issue of whether or not the program was effective in assisting the students in developing a wholesome attitude toward the world of work. This was reflected by all interview participants indicating that teachers were primarily responsible for career information, while the counselor served as a resource in this area. Furthermore, the counselor interview data reflected that the degree of their involvement with career information was a school-specific situation dependent upon the curricula, priorities established by the principal, the grade level of the students, and the expertise exhibited by the teacher.

From the aforementioned results one can conclude that the guidance program objectives were being met. More specifically, the primary student response pattern indicated counselors had been extremely effective in assisting in the development of a realistic self-concept, while the intermediate-aged students benefitted greatly in developing

group awareness in learning to recognize individual differences.

Teachers and administrators emphasized the positive effects the program had upon developing self and group awareness. In addition, teachers, principals and counselors indicated through interview data that teachers were primarily responsible for career information, while the counselor's role as resource person in this area was dependent upon the priorities established by the building administrator.

#### Evaluation Question Two

What additional identified student needs can be met by the elementary school guidance and counseling program?

#### Questionnaire Data

Data collected from primary students addressed the issue of specific needs being met according to the utilization and accessibility of small group and individual counseling. Only 33% of the students had spoken to the counselor alone, while 46% of the students had worked in a small group, and 93% maintained that their counselor would take the time to see them if the need arose.

Open-ended questions answered by a small number of the 144 intermediate students (20) reflected concerns with regard to relationships and academics.

With regard to relationship concerns, the primary area addressed by students was that of peer relationships. This was reflected in a desire for making and keeping friends, as well as a general need for establishing a sense of belonging and acceptance with peers. Second in importance in this category were student/school personnel relationships. These relationships were characterized by an expressed dislike for a specific teacher based upon the fact that the student perceived the teacher as being "mean", "hard," and/or "not liking" them. In addition, a few student respondents expressed a desire to work on family relationships, usually reflected in a need to improve rapport and/or communication with siblings.

The academic concerns dealt primarily with preparation for junior high school. Having to adjust to a new and larger facility, new friends, different teachers, and the responsibility of having a locker were the most expressed worries by the student sample.

Second in this category were some concerns regarding success in specific subject areas (i.e., math, spelling, reading).

All teacher and principal responses maintained students' needs were being met, yet there was concern regarding the degree in which future program effectiveness could be jeopardized. This was attributed primarily to counselor time constraints resulting from the number of students the

counselor was responsible for. Both of these sample populations expressed a need for a full-time counselor at their respective schools and/or some type of assistance at schools where a counselor was enrolled full time. With assistance from additional personnel the teachers specifically prioritized the need for small group work, individual counseling, and classroom guidance activities, while principals noted more time with student and parent groups as areas needing more counselor attention. Teachers prioritized student needs while principals placed public relations first.

#### Interview Data

Interviews conducted with teachers, principals, and counselors corroborated that student needs were being met. The counselors validated their colleagues' responses by expressing concerns about the numerous responsibilities their job requires of them. This was reflected in the number of students needed to be dealt with as well as the various time-consuming documentation procedures required of them. In addition, the counselors expressed a need for parents to have a better understanding of their responsibilities in the school setting. They also specified the following topics as priorities with regard to further continuing education sessions: death and dying, the needs and concerns of latch key children, suicide in elementary-age students, and AIDS information.

Taking into consideration the data collected for the second evaluation question, it was determined that the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program is successful in meeting student needs. However, it was concluded that program effectiveness could be jeopardized in the future due to the growing number of responsibilities and documentation procedures required of the counselors.

### Evaluation Question Three

Do participants exhibit a favorable attitude toward the program?

#### Questionnaire Data

The primary students exhibited support for the guidance program in their schools. Favorable attitudes were consistently expressed with regard to classroom guidance activities, trust in counselor confidentiality and the positive effects of having a guidance counselor in their school.

The majority of the intermediate-aged students concurred with their primary counterparts exhibiting a positive attitude for the guidance and counseling activities they had participated in.

With regard to teachers and principals, the majority in both samples indicated a positive attitude toward the elementary guidance and counseling program. Approximately 80

percent of the teachers and administrators maintained that the greatest "strength" of the program was their guidance counselor. The remaining individuals attributed the content of the program (i.e., specific guidance activities and counseling services) as the primary strength.

In terms of weaknesses, teachers and principals concurred there was not enough time for the students to be with counselors, too much paper work for counselors, and a need for additional assistance for the counselors in order to keep the optimal level of program effectiveness.

Although both of these samples consistently expressed that parents' needs were being provided for, administrators maintained that frequently the number of parent-oriented activities were limited due to time constraints placed upon the counselors. Again, administrators prioritized parent needs.

The general random sample of parents exhibited a favorable attitude toward the program. The lowest number of responses for this population dealt with parental participation in the guidance program. Less than 50% of this population had attended a parent-oriented activity or had contacted the counselor for assistance. Thus, the principals' concerns were validated. However, the majority who had worked with the counselor indicated they had benefitted from their experience.

Thirty-three respondents (17%) said that although they were aware there was a program, they had not utilized and/or weren't aware of the specific components of the program. The remaining responses reflected the fact that parents were glad there was a counselor accessible for their children.

The majority of parents indicated there weren't any weaknesses in the program. Most of the remaining respondents cited the need for more information as the primary program weakness. One could then conclude that if more parents were informed about the program, program utilization would increase.

The majority of parents in the selected sample indicated they would contact their child's counselor for assistance in the areas of child development, behavior, and academic progress. Just as in the larger sample, the majority of parents who had participated in the program had found the services valuable and would utilize the program again.

Many parents complimented the counselors for being able to identify and provide for the needs of the children, teachers, and parents, while exemplifying great care and expertise in doing so. This seemed to be especially true when the counselor dealt with individual student concerns, parent or teacher referrals, and liaison duties with various community services.

### Interview Data

Teacher, principal, and counselor interview data supported the questionnaire findings with regard to attitude towards the program. The counselors and teachers maintained that one of the greatest assets of the program was the Guidance Supervisor. His support, organizational and administrative skills, as well as positive public relations were cited as primary reasons for the program's success.

One area of concern expressed by the counselors was the mandate requiring 60% of the counselor's time to be spent in counseling and 40% in guidance activities. Under current conditions many counselors felt it would be difficult to meet these criteria, since the time allotments for guidance and counseling components were dictated by the needs of the student populations they were serving. In addition, the counselors indicated that pressures were mounting in an attempt to effectively implement their individual programs due to the increased and varied number of responsibilities and student problems with which they were presented.

The findings of this study indicate that students, teachers, principals, counselors, and parents exhibit a favorable attitude toward the program. However, again it was concluded that program effectiveness could be jeopardized in the future due to the growing number of responsibilities and documentation procedures required of the counselors. In addition, it was determined that parents need to be made aware

of the various components comprising an elementary guidance program.

### **Recommendations**

The information presented in this study indicated that the program objectives were being met and no specific additional student needs could be identified. Even though program participant attitudes were favorable, there were certain areas of concern that needed to be addressed. The following recommendations are based upon these data:

1. The results indicate the program objective "To assist students in developing a wholesome attitude toward the world of work" is primarily the responsibility of the classroom teacher. The present statement is misleading and implies that career-oriented activities are an integral part of the guidance program and a major responsibility of the counselor. It is therefore recommended that the district restate the objective emphasizing the teacher's role, and in so doing, implement the current mandate recommending the infusion of career education into the elementary curriculum. As a result, a future researcher may address the counselor's role as resource to the regular classroom teacher. The needs of educators with regard to the development of

appropriate and effective career guidance activities could then be identified.

2. In response to the limited amount of time counselors have for individual student sessions, managerial styles of the counselors need to be investigated and restructured accordingly in order to assure optimal student contact as well as fulfillment of the 60/40 mandate.
3. A further recommendation is that additional staff be employed in order to assure continued program effectiveness. The data revealed an expressed concern by the participants regarding the number of tasks and students each counselor is responsible for. The degree to which program effectiveness could eventually be jeopardized by these factors has consistently been expressed throughout this study. Fulfillment of the mandate stipulating that one elementary school guidance counselor be employed per 500 students in each school district could effectively address this issue. Considering the unique and varied characteristics of the elementary population, as well as the numerous responsibilities of counselors dealing with this age level, this situation should be monitored closely in order to determine if personnel exceeding the number recommended by the mandate is warranted.
4. It is also recommended that public relations with parents be improved. Greater attempts need to be made on the

part of counseling personnel to publicize the responsibilities of the elementary school guidance counselor, as well as the various program components. Pamphlets describing the program, newsletters, utilization of Parent Guidance Committees at each school, parent training groups, and guest speakers are all viable means of accomplishing this task. As a result, parental involvement can expect to increase significantly.

5. Staff development must be strengthened for counseling personnel. This evaluator recommends that a provision be made for workshops on current issues prioritized by the counselors (i.e., AIDS, suicide, death and dying, and latch key children).
6. More consideration should be given to peer and family relationship skills as well as academic concerns of intermediate-aged students. In addition, orientation procedures for rising middle/junior high school students need to be strengthened.
7. It would be advantageous for the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program to participate in a comprehensive evaluation every four to five years. In addition, the procedures outlined in this study could be used as models for similar programs nationwide.

## REFERENCES

- Aubrey, R. F. (1982). Program planning and evaluation: Road map of the 80s. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 17, 52-60.
- Baker, S. B. (1977). An argument for constructive accountability. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 56, 53-55.
- Ballast, D. L., & Schmueller. (1980). Coactive guidance: A blueprint for the future. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- Baltimore County Public Schools. (1984). Guidance Program Management Model, K-12. Author.
- Brown, D., & Srebalus, D. J. (1972). Contemporary guidance concepts and practices: An introduction. Dubuque: Brown.
- Burk, H. D., & Peterson, G. W. (1975). Needed: More evaluation, not research. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 53, 563-569.
- Commonwealth of Virginia Board of Education. (1986). Resolution expressing the intent of the board of education regarding elementary school guidance programs. Richmond, Virginia.
- Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Education. (1983). A guide for planning and developing guidance and counseling programs in Virginia's public schools. Richmond: Department of Education.

- Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Education. (1981). Program guidelines for elementary school counselors in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Richmond: Department of Education.
- Corsini, R. J. (1979). Current psychotherapies. (2nd. ed.). Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishing.
- Daniels, M. H., Mines, R., & Gressard, C. (1981). A Meta-Model for evaluating counseling programs. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 59, 578-582.
- Faust, V. (1968). History of elementary school counseling: Overview and critique. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Frith, G. H., & Clark, R. (1982). Evaluating elementary counseling programs: 10 Common myths. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 16, 49-51.
- Glosoff, H. L., & Koprowicz, C. L. (1990). Children achieving potential: An introduction to elementary school counseling and state-level policies. Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures and the American Association for Counseling and Development.
- Gerstein, M., & Lichtman, M. (1990). The best for our kids: Exemplary elementary guidance & counseling programs. Alexandria: American School Counselor Association.
- Gibson, R. L., & Mitchell, M. H. (1981). Introduction to guidance. New York: Macmillan.

- Gibson, R. L., Mitchell, M. H., & Higgins, R. E. (1983). Development and management of counseling programs and guidance services. New York: Macmillan.
- Grobe, R. P., Myatt, K., & Wheeler, S. B. (1978). A systematic planning model for an elementary school guidance program. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 12, 257-265.
- Gunderson, M. S., & Moore, E. J. (1981). Guidance program assessment procedures for elementary and secondary schools: Georgia comprehensive guidance series. Atlanta: Georgia State Department of Education.
- Gysber, N.C., & Henderson, P. (1988). Developing and managing your school guidance program. Alexandria: American Association for School Counselors.
- Humes, C. W. (1972). Accountability: A boon to guidance. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51, 21-26.
- Johnson, S. K., & Johnson, C. D. (1987). A model for the evaluation of results-based guidance programs. Howard County, Maryland: Consortium on Models of Guidance Program Evaluation.
- Krumboltz, J. D. (1974). An accountability model for counselors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 52, 639-646.
- Madaus, G. F., Scriven, M., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (Eds.). (1983). Evaluation models: Viewpoints on education and human services evaluation. Boston: Kuwer-Nijhoff.
- Makinde, O. (1984). Fundamentals of guidance and counseling. London: Mac Millan.

- May R. D. (1976). Pennsylvania elementary guidance evaluation instrument. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 10, 188-194.
- Mills, G. D. (1971). Elementary school guidance and counseling introduction through essays and commentaries. New York: Random House.
- Moore, E. J., & Miller, Y. C. (1977). Guidance program assessment; elementary school: Comprehensive career guidance projects. Atlanta: Georgia State Department of Education.
- Mortensen, D. G., & Schmuller, A. M. Guidance in today's schools (3rd. ed.). New York: John Willey & Sons.
- Myrick, R. D. (1977). The practice of counseling in the elementary school. In The status of guidance and counseling in the nation's schools: A series of issue papers (pp. 40-58). Washington D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association.
- Myrick, R. D., & Moni, L. (1976). A status of elementary school counseling. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 10, 159-165.
- Nichols, M. P. (1984). Family therapy concepts and methods. New York: Gardner Press.
- Oetting, E. R., & Hawkes, F. J. (1974). Training professionals for evaluative research. Personnel and Guidance, 52, 435-438.

- Oregon State Department of Education. (1979). Elementary school guidance and counseling: Suggested guidelines for school districts. Salem: Oregon State Department of Education.
- Pietrofesa, J. J., Bernstein, B., Minor, J., & Stanford, S. (1980). Evaluation of guidance services. In Pietrofesa, J. J., et al., Guidance: An introduction (pp. 461-494). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Pine, G. J. (1975). Evaluating school counseling programs: Retrospect and prospect. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 8(3), 136-143.
- Pine, G. J. (1975). Quo vadis, school counseling? Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 554-557.
- Pulvino, C. J., & Sanborn, M. (1972). Feedback and Accountability. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51, 15-20.
- Roanoke County Guidance Department. (1986). REACH: Roanoke County elementary school guidance and counseling activities and techniques for child development handbook. Salem, Virginia: Roanoke County Schools.
- Ryan, T. P. (1984). Executive summary of the evaluation of elementary school guidance programs in three Virginia school divisions. Richmond: Appalachia Educational Laboratory for The Virginia Department of Education.

- Ryan, T. P. (1984). Final report on evaluation of elementary guidance programs in three Virginia school divisions. Richmond: Appalachia Educational Laboratory for the Virginia Department of Education.
- Sauber, S. R. (1973). Preventative educational intervention for mental health. Cambridge: Ballinger.
- Shertzer, S. C., & Stone (1981). Fundamentals of guidance. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Wheeler, P. T., & Loesch, L. (1981). Program evaluation and counseling: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 59, 573-577.

**APPENDIX A**

**Initial Correspondence With Roanoke County Schools**



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**

526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

Information for Personnel Engaged in Graduate  
Research/Thesis/Dissertations

The following understandings would be in effect for your study.

1. You must have principal's approval.
2. You must have teacher's approval.
3. The names of students, teachers and school would not be identified in the study.
4. The collection of data procedures would not require personnel in the Roanoke County Public School System to detract from regular duties.
5. The study would be in compliance with the provisions of the policy governing the student's official record passed by the Roanoke County School Board on July 24, 1980.
6. The Roanoke County Public School System would be furnished a copy of the completed study.
7. The study would not infringe upon the instructional time of the students.

In addition to the above, the teacher(s) would not be expected to change teaching methodology, procedures, materials, etc., to accommodate the study.

August, 1986



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**  
526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

Procedures for Releasing Test Data to Personnel  
Engaged in Graduate Research/Thesis/Dissertations

The confidentiality of Roanoke County students' assessment data must be maintained at all times. Therefore, persons engaged in research studies requesting personal data of Roanoke County students must agree to meeting the following criteria:

I. Obtaining permission from students or parents

Virtually no way exists to protect confidentiality from the researcher, even though codes are supplied. Therefore, it will be necessary that written permission be secured from each parent (in case of a minor), or each individual student if 18 years old or older. This written permission must be supplied to the Supervisor of Testing prior to seeking release of data.

II. Coding of student data

A. The researcher must supply the Supervisor of Testing (if standardized test data is required) with a list of student names and their assigned code numbers.

B. In addition, the researcher must supply the Supervisor of Testing with the data collection forms to be used with only student codes listed.

III. Studies with large sample sizes

Studies involving sample sizes of more than 50 students and/or requiring test scores from more than two subject areas will require the services of a clerk or aide. The Supervisor of Testing will secure the services of such a person to collect the desired data. The fee for the clerk/aide will be paid by the researcher directly to the clerk/aide.

August, 1986

February 27, 1987

Dr.Theodore Viars  
Associate Superintendent  
Roanoke County Public Schools  
526 College Avenue  
Salem, Va, 24153

Dear Dr. Viars:

I am currently a doctoral student at Virginia Tech in Counselor Education and Student Personnel. The emphasis of my program has been in Pupil Services work within the realm of public education. This area of interest, in conjunction with the fact that I hold a masters degree in Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, has greatly influenced my decision to choose Elementary School Guidance and Counseling as my doctoral dissertation topic. As a result, I am requesting your permission to design and implement a comprehensive evaluation for Roanoke County Public Schools Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program.

I have already discussed this matter with Director of Guidance and Testing for your school system.

In addition, while meeting with Mr. Kelly on Wednesday, February 25, 1987, I read and discussed the two attached documents;

Information for Personnel Engaged in Graduate Research /Thesis /Dissertations and Procedures for Releasing Test Data to Personnel Engaged in Graduate Research /Thesis /Dissertation.

Having familiarized myself with this information, I am willing to abide by the policies and procedures required by your school system.

Enclosed you will find an outline of my Dissertation Prospectus. As indicated, the purpose of the study is to determine the effectiveness of your Elementary Guidance and Counseling Program. In so doing I would like to gather data from various populations accessible to Roanoke County Public Schools, using both quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection and analyses.

I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to pursue this study.

Any further information will gladly be provided upon request.

Sincerely Yours,

Joanne R. Lehman

cc. Dr. Martin Gerstein

Mr. Gary Kelly



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**  
526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

March 5, 1987

Dear Ms. Lehman:

You have permission to do research in the Roanoke County Schools as outlined in your letter of February 27, 1987. It is understood that you will be in compliance with all rules and regulations of the Roanoke County School System which relate to doing research in the school division. Mr. Kelly will be your contact person.

Please consult with him about your data gathering procedure and other matters in general related to your research.

If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Theodore J. Viars  
Associate Superintendent

bgh

c: Mr. Gary Kelly, Supervisor of Guidance

**APPENDIX B**  
**Counselor Focus Interview Forms**



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**  
526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

MEMORANDUM

TO: Elementary Guidance Counselors

FROM: Gary Kelly, Supervisor of Guidance and Curriculum  
Coordination

Joanne Lehman, Evaluation Coordinator *JL*

RE: Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program  
Evaluation: Counselor Focus Group Interviews

As mentioned during your April meeting, part of the evaluation process for the Roanoke County Elementary Guidance and Counseling Program will entail a counselor group interview. We would like to get your input, recommendations and opinion regarding the effectiveness of the program.

Below please find the schedule for these interviews.

**During the Monthly Meeting On:**

**Monday, May 11, 1987**

(Names omitted per policy of Roanoke County Schools)

**Monday, June 8, 1987**

(Names omitted per policy of Roanoke County Schools)

Looking forward to seeing you then.

**Questions For Counselor Focus Group Interview**

- 1) A. Do you think the objectives for the Elementary Guidance and Counseling Program are being met?  
(Each objective will be specified by the evaluator and addressed by the participants.)  
B. Why/Why not?
- 2) A. Are there student needs not being met by the program?  
B. What are they?
- 3) What are the strengths of the current program?
- 4) What are the weaknesses of the current program?
- 5) A. Is there a need for continuing education in order to address a specific concern or topic?  
B. If so, what?
- 6) Are there any specific areas of interest or concerns you would like to share at this time?

**Counselor Information Sheet**

- 1) **Number of Years in Current Position:**
- 2) **Previous Work Experience Since Graduating From College:**
  - A. **In Education:**
  - B. **Other:**
- 3) **Highest Educational Degree(s) Held for Current Position:**
- 4) **Graduate Units Beyond Highest Degree (i.e., M.A. +9) / Dates:**
- 5) **Continuing Education and Inservice Credits / Dates:**
- 6) **Certification and Licensure Credentials:**
  - A. **Public School:**
  - B. **Clinical:**
- 7) **Memberships to Professional Organizations:**

**APPENDIX C**

**Student Data Collection: Procedures and Instruments**



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**

526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

MEMORANDUM

TO: Designated Teachers

FROM: Gary Kelly, Supervisor of Guidance and Curriculum  
Coordination *GK*

Joanne Lehman, Evaluation Coordinator *JL*

RE: Evaluation of the Elementary Guidance and  
Counseling Program: Student Questionnaire

DATE: May 12, 1986

Your class has been selected to participate in the evaluation of the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program. This will entail your students completing a questionnaire regarding the effectiveness of the program.

Enclosed you will find parental permission slips. The parents have been informed to return the bottom portion of the letter to their child's guidance counselor by Monday, May 18, 1987, only if they do not want their child to participate in the evaluation.

Your assistance in this matter is greatly appreciated.

cc: School Counselor



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**

526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
 SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

May 12, 1987

Dear Parent:

Roanoke County is currently evaluating its elementary school guidance and counseling program. As part of this procedure, certain elementary school classes have been selected to respond to a questionnaire addressing the effectiveness of the program. Your child's class has been chosen as one of these groups. As a result, a questionnaire will be presented to your child by his/her school guidance counselor sometime during the latter part of May. The content of this survey will deal with the students' perceptions of the school's guidance program and the extent to which the children's guidance and counseling needs are being met.

If you do not wish for your child to participate in the evaluation process, by responding to the aforementioned questionnaire, please fill in and return the bottom portion of this letter to his/her guidance counselor.

If you have any further questions regarding this situation, please feel free to contact us at 387-6416 between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Gary Kelly  
 Supervisor of Guidance and  
 Curriculum, Coordination

Jeanne Lehman  
 Evaluation Coordinator

-----  
 I, \_\_\_\_\_ do not wish for  
 my son/daughter \_\_\_\_\_ to  
 participate in the Roanoke County Elementary Guidance and  
 Counseling Program Evaluation.  
 Parent's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ (Date) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Student's School \_\_\_\_\_



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**

526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
 SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

MEMORANDUM

TO: Designated Teachers and Counselors

FROM: Gary Kelly, Supervisor of Guidance and Curriculum  
 Coordination  
 Joanne Lehman, Evaluation Coordinator

RE: Evaluation of the Elementary Guidance and  
 Counseling Program: Student Questionnaire  
 Information

DATE: May 18, 1987

Below please find detailed instructions for the completion of the student component of the Elementary Guidance and Counseling Program Evaluation. If there are any questions regarding this procedure, please free to call us at 367-6416.

**Directions:**

1) Teachers and counselors at each school will meet to determine a mutually agreed upon time for administering the questionnaire.

2) Counselors will familiarize themselves with the questionnaire directions sometime prior to administering the instrument.

3) Counselors will administer the questionnaire.

4) After the students have completed the questionnaire, teachers will collect the instrument and answer sheet and mail everything, through the "Pony" in the addressed envelope provided. (All questionnaires and answer sheets need to be returned by Tuesday, June 2, 1987.)

The end of the school year is invariably a very hectic time; all the more reason we truly appreciate your cooperation in this matter. Thanks so much!



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**  
526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

**STUDENT DIRECTIONS: PRIMARY GRADES**

**To Be Read By The Counselor:**

We're trying to find out how helpful it is for you to have a guidance counselor in your school.

In order to do this I will read some statements and questions to you. Please mark your answer on the Smiley Face answer sheet that has been provided.

Before you begin, please put a big "B" on top of your Answer Sheet if you are a boy, and a "G" if you are a girl.

\*\*\* (The Counselor Now Reads The Instructions On Top Of Page 1 And Illustrates Using Item #1 On The Instrument.) \*\*\*

Since we have not asked you to put your names on anything there is no way for us to know how each of you answered individually, so please tell us how you honestly feel.

There are no right or wrong answers.

Please ask me any questions you may have, even while you are completing this activity.

Are there any questions now?

Is everybody ready to begin?

Let's Begin.

**COUNSELORS PLEASE NOTE:**

Please wait for every student to respond to each item before you begin to read the next one.

**STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE: PRIMARY LEVEL GRADES (K-2)****(To Be Read To The Students By The Guidance Counselor)****(A Smiley Face Answer Sheet Has Been Provided)****Section A:**

I am going to read some statements to you. If you agree with what I say please put an X over the happy face. If you disagree with what I say please put an X over the sad face.

- 1) My Guidance Counselor has helped me to realize that I am special.
- 2) My guidance counselor has helped me to see that everyone is different.
- 3) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn more about myself.
- 4) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn to feel better about myself.
- 5) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how to work and play in groups with other children.
- 6) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how to make friends.
- 7) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how to get along with members of my family.
- 8) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn that to have different feelings is alright.
- 9) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn what to do when I feel mad.
- 10) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn what to do when I feel sad.

- 11) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how to do my best in my school work.
- 12) My guidance counselor has helped to make school a better place for me.
- 13) My guidance counselor has taught me about different kinds of jobs.

**Section B:**

I am going to read some questions to you. If your answer to the question is yes, please put an X over the happy face. If your answer to the question is no, please put an X over the sad face.

- 14) Have you enjoyed the classroom guidance activities you've done with your counselor?
- 15) Have you ever worked in a small group with your counselor?
- 16) Would you like to work in a small group with your counselor?
- 17) Have you ever spoken to the counselor alone?
- 18) Will your counselor have time to see you if you let her know you would like to discuss a problem?
- 19) Can you trust your school counselor to keep a secret if you request it?
- 20) Do you think a school counselor is good to have in the school?





OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**

526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

**STUDENT DIRECTIONS: INTERMEDIATE GRADES**

**To Be Read By The Counselor:**

We're trying to find out how helpful it is for you to have a guidance counselor in your school. We would also like to see if you have anything special you would like your guidance counselor to help you with.

In order to do this please read the following statements and questions and mark your answer on the answer sheet that has been provided.

**\*\*\* (The Counselor Now Reads The Instructions On Top Of Page 1 And Illustrates Using Item #1 On The Instrument.) \*\*\***

Before you begin, on your answer sheet under the heading "Group", please fill in circle #1 if you are a boy and circle # 2 if you are a girl.

Since we have not asked you to put your names on anything there is no way for us to know how each of you answered individually. So please feel free to tell us how you honestly feel.

There are no right or wrong answers.

This is not a timed exercise so take as long as you need and answer carefully.

After you have finished please go back and make sure you have put your answers in the correct place on the answer sheet.

Please ask me any questions you may have, even while you are completing this activity.

Are there any questions at this time? Please begin.

**STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE: INTERMEDIATE LEVEL****Section A:**

Please use the scale below when responding to the following statements. Be sure to use the answer sheet that has been provided.

- 1) Agree
- 2) Disagree
- 3) Don't Know

- 1) My guidance counselor has helped me to realize that I am special.
- 2) My guidance counselor has helped me to see that everyone is different.
- 3) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn more about myself.
- 4) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn to feel better about myself.
- 5) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how to work and play in groups with other children.
- 6) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how to make friends.
- 7) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how get along with members of my family.
- 8) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how to share my thoughts and ideas with other people.
- 9) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how to be a good listener when someone else is talking.
- 10) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how to make decisions.
- 11) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how to deal with things when they don't go my way.
- 12) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn that to have different feelings is alright.

- 13) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn what to do when I feel different emotions.
- 14) My guidance counselor has helped me to learn how to do my best in my school work.
- 15) My guidance counselor has helped to make school a better place for me.
- 16) My guidance counselor has taught me about jobs and different careers.

**Section B:**

Please use the scale below when responding to the following questions. Be sure to use the answer sheet that has been provided.

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

- 17) Have you enjoyed the classroom guidance activities you've done with your counselor?
- 18) Have you ever worked in a small group with your school counselor?

\*\*\* (If you answered no to #18, please SKIP #19, #20, and #21 and ANSWER #22-#28) \*\*\*

\*\*\* (If you answered yes to #18, please ANSWER #19-#27, but SKIP #22 ) \*\*\*

- 19) Did you enjoy working in the small group?
- 20) Did working in the small group help you with a certain problem?
- 21) Would you like to work in a small group again?
- 22) Would you like to work in a small group?
- 23) Have you ever spoken to the counselor alone?
- 24) Would you like to make an appointment to speak to the counselor alone?

- 25) Will your counselor have time to see you if you let her know you would like to discuss a problem?
- 26) Can you trust your counselor to keep a secret?
- 27) Do you think the school counselor can help you?
- 28) Do you think a counselor is good to have in the school?

**Section C:**

1) What do you like about your guidance program?

---

---

---

2) What do you not like about your guidance program?

---

---

---

3) Please write down any needs or concerns you may have that you would like your guidance counselor to help you with.

---

---

---

**THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR ALL YOUR HELP! HAVE A NICE DAY!**

**APPENDIX D**

**Teacher/Principal Data Collection:**

**Procedures and Instruments**



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**

526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

MEMORANDUM

TO: Counselors

FROM: Gary Kelly, Supervisor of Guidance and Curriculum  
Coordination  
Joanne Lehman, Evaluation Coordinator *JL*

RE: Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program  
Evaluation: Teacher Focus Group Interview Schedule

As mentioned during your May meeting, as part of the evaluation process for your guidance program, Tuesday, May 26, 1987 and Thursday, May 28, 1987 have been scheduled for teacher focus group interviews. Below is the schedule for these interviews. If a teacher in your school has been selected to participate, please make the necessary arrangements for class coverage.

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

**Tuesday, May 26, 1987 1:30 p.m.**

(Names omitted per policy of Roanoke County Schools)

**Thursday, May 28, 1987 1:30 p.m.**

(Names omitted per policy of Roanoke County Schools)



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**

526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

MEMORANDUM

TO: Selected Teachers

FROM: Gary Kelly, Supervisor of Guidance  
and Curriculum Coordination *GW*  
Joanne Lehman, Evaluation Coordinator *JL*

RE: Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program  
Evaluation: Teacher Group Interview

DATE: May 15, 1987

The Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program is currently being evaluated to determine the effectiveness of the program and the extent to which the needs of the children are being met. You have been selected to assist in this process by participating in a group discussion regarding the program. This meeting will take place on Tuesday, May 26, 1987 in the Roanoke County Board of Education Building at 1:30 P.M. Arrangements have been made for your school's guidance counselor to cover your class for that afternoon.

If for any reason you can not attend this session, please notify us by May 21, 1987 by calling 387-6416.

The end of a school year is invariably a very hectic time; all the more reason we truly appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

We look forward to seeing you on the May 26th!

cc: School Guidance Counselor



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**

526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

MEMORANDUM

TO: Selected Teachers

FROM: Gary Kelly, Supervisor of Guidance  
and Curriculum Coordination *AK*  
Joanne Lehman, Evaluation Coordinator *JK*

RE: Elementary Guidance and Counseling Program  
Evaluation: Teacher Group Interview

DATE: May 15, 1987

The Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program is currently being evaluated to determine the effectiveness of the program and the extent to which the needs of the children are being met. You have been selected to assist in this process by participating in a group discussion regarding the program. This meeting will take place on Thursday, May 28, 1987 in the county's School Board Building at 1:30 P.M. Arrangements have been made for your school's guidance counselor to cover your class for that afternoon.

If for any reason you can not attend this session, please notify us by May 21, 1987 by calling 387-6416.

The end of a school year is invariably a very hectic time; all the more reason we truly appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

We look forward to seeing you on the May 28th!

cc: School Guidance Counselor

## Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Evaluation

Teacher Questionnaire:

### SECTION A:

The following is a list of goals for the elementary guidance program. Indicate the degree to which you feel each goal is being met by the guidance service in your school. Please use the scale below as a key to your responses and enter your replies in the spaces provided.

- 1) Agree
- 2) Tend To Agree
- 3) Tend To Disagree
- 4) Disagree
- 5) Don't Know

- \_\_\_ 1) The guidance program helps the students to develop a realistic self-concept.
- \_\_\_ 2) The guidance program helps the students to develop realistic self-direction.
- \_\_\_ 3) The guidance program assists the students in the development of self and group awareness.
- \_\_\_ 4) The guidance program assists the students in developing the capacity for effective interpersonal relationships.
- \_\_\_ 5) The guidance program assists the students in developing effective communication skills.
- \_\_\_ 6) The guidance program assists the students in developing effective decision-making skills.
- \_\_\_ 7) The guidance program assists the students in developing effective coping behaviors.
- \_\_\_ 8) The guidance program aids the students in academic development.
- \_\_\_ 9) The guidance program assists the students in developing wholesome attitudes toward the world of work.
- \_\_\_ 10) The guidance program facilitates in the development of a more effective learning climate.

Teacher Questionnaire  
Page 2

- 11) The guidance counselor provides inservice training for teachers.
- 12) The guidance counselor cooperates with you in meeting the needs of students.
- 13) The students have a good understanding and awareness of the guidance counselor's role in individual counseling.
- 14) The students have benefited from individual counseling.
- 15) The students have a good understanding and awareness of the guidance counselor's role in classroom guidance.
- 16) The students have benefited from classroom guidance.
- 17) The students have benefited from small group work with the guidance counselor.
- 18) The guidance counselor is effective in identifying and utilizing outside resources for the children and their families.
- 19) The counselor is effective in fulfilling her role.
- 20) The philosophy of your counselor is in harmony with the needs of students in your school.
- 21) The guidance program aids in achieving the major objectives of the school.
- 22) Your school benefits from having a guidance program.

Teacher Questionnaire  
Page 3

SECTION B

1) What do you think are the strengths of the guidance program in your school?

---

---

---

2) What do you think are the weaknesses of the guidance program in your school?

---

---

---

3) In what ways do you feel the guidance program could more effectively meet the needs of your students?

---

---

---

4) In what ways do you feel the guidance program could more effectively meet the needs of your students' parents?

---

---

---

5) In what ways do you feel the guidance program could more effectively meet your needs as a teacher?

---

---

---



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**  
526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Designated Teachers and Principals

FROM: Gary L. Kelly, Supervisor of Guidance and Curriculum Coordination *G.L.K.*  
Joanne Lehman, Evaluation Coordinator *J.L.*

DATE: May 25, 1987

SUBJECT: Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Evaluation Questionnaire

The Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program is currently being evaluated to determine the effectiveness of the program and the extent to which the needs of the children are being met. As part of this process we would greatly appreciate your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaire addressing your perceptions of the program.

Please use the envelope provided and the Pony to return your completed questionnaire by June 5, 1987. You are assured of complete confidentiality. If you have any questions, feel free to call us at 387-6416.

The end of the school year is inevitably a very hectic time; all the more reason we truly appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

SW

Enclosures

## Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Evaluation

Principal Questionnaire:

## SECTION A:

The following is a list of goals for the elementary guidance program. Indicate the degree to which you feel each goal is being met by the guidance service in your school. Please use the scale below as a key to your responses and enter your replies in the spaces provided.

- 1) Agree
- 2) Tend To Agree
- 3) Tend To Disagree
- 4) Disagree
- 5) Don't Know

- \_\_\_ 1) The guidance program helps the students to develop a realistic self-concept.
- \_\_\_ 2) The guidance program helps the students to develop realistic self-direction.
- \_\_\_ 3) The guidance program assists the students in the development of self and group awareness.
- \_\_\_ 4) The guidance program assists the students in developing the capacity for effective interpersonal relationships.
- \_\_\_ 5) The guidance program assists the students in developing effective communication skills.
- \_\_\_ 6) The guidance program assists the students in developing effective decision-making skills.
- \_\_\_ 7) The guidance program assists the students in developing effective coping behaviors.
- \_\_\_ 8) The guidance program aids the students in academic development.
- \_\_\_ 9) The guidance program assists the students in developing wholesome attitudes toward the world of work.
- \_\_\_ 10) The guidance program facilitates in the development of a more effective learning climate.

Principal Questionnaire  
Page 2

- 11) The guidance counselor provides inservice training for teachers.
- 12) The guidance counselor cooperates with you in meeting the needs of students.
- 13) The students have a good understanding and awareness of the guidance counselor's role in individual counseling.
- 14) The students have benefited from individual counseling.
- 15) The students have a good understanding and awareness of the guidance counselor's role in classroom guidance.
- 16) The students have benefited from classroom guidance.
- 17) The students have benefited from small group work with the guidance counselor.
- 18) The guidance counselor is effective in identifying and utilizing outside resources for the children and their families.
- 19) The counselor is effective in fulfilling her role.
- 20) The philosophy of your counselor is in harmony with the needs of students in your school.
- 21) The guidance program aids in achieving the major objectives of the school.
- 22) Your school benefits from having a guidance program.

Principal Questionnaire  
Page 3

SECTION B

1) What do you think are the strengths of the guidance program in your school?

---

---

---

2) What do you think are the weaknesses of the guidance program in your school?

---

---

---

3) In what ways do you feel the guidance program could more effectively meet the needs of your students?

---

---

---

4) In what ways do you feel the guidance program could more effectively meet the needs of your students' parents?

---

---

---

5) In what ways do you feel the guidance program could more effectively meet your needs as a principal?

---

---

---



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**

526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

MEMORANDUM

TO: Selected Principals

FROM: Gary Kelly, Supervisor of Guidance and Curriculum  
Coordination *GJK*  
Joanne Lehman, Evaluation Coordinator *JL*

RE: Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program  
Evaluation: Principal Interviews

DATE: May 18, 1987

As mentioned during your April meeting, the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program is currently being evaluated to determine the effectiveness of the program and the extent to which the needs of the children are being met. As part of this process we would greatly appreciate your participation in an interview addressing your perceptions of the program. In order to establish a time convenient for you, you will be called this week to schedule a meeting.

The end of a school year is inevitably a very hectic time. All the more reason we truly appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

**APPENDIX E**

**Parent Data Collection: Correspondence and Instruments**



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**

526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

June 8, 1987

Dear Parent:

We are currently evaluating the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program to determine the effectiveness of the program and the extent to which the needs of the students are being met. As part of this process we would like to find out how parents view the program. You have been selected as part of the sample to assist us in this task. In order to do this, we ask that you complete and return the enclosed questionnaire in the envelope provided by June 19, 1987.

If you have any questions regarding this issue, please feel free to contact us at 387-6416.

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

Gary L. Kelly, Supervisor  
Guidance and Curriculum Coordination

Joanne Lehman, Evaluation Coordinator

SW

Enclosures

## ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING EVALUATION

## Parent Questionnaire

## Section A

1. Did you know that there is a guidance and counseling program in your child's elementary school? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
2. If you had some concerns about your child's development, would you contact the teacher for assistance? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
3. If you had some concerns about your child's development, would you contact the counselor for assistance? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
4. If you had some concerns about your child's development, would you contact the principal for assistance? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
5. If you had some concerns about your child's behavior, would you contact the teacher for assistance? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
6. If you had some concerns about your child's behavior, would you contact the counselor for assistance? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
7. If you had some concerns about your child's behavior, would you contact the principal for assistance? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
8. If you had some concerns about your child's progress in school, would you contact the teacher for assistance? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
9. If you had some concerns about your child's progress in school, would you contact the principal for assistance? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
10. If you had some concerns about your child's progress in school, would you contact the counselor for assistance? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
11. Would you ever suggest to your child that he/she see the counselor to discuss concerns or difficulties? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
12. Do you think an elementary school guidance and counseling program is of value to children? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
13. Do you think an elementary school guidance and counseling program is of value to parents? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no

If you answered "No" to question #1, please SKIP questions #14 through #20 below and proceed to Section B. If you answered "Yes" to question #1, please answer questions #14 through #20 below and proceed to Section B.

14. Has your child utilized any of the guidance and counseling services in his/her school? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
15. Did it help them? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no

- 16. Have you attended a parent oriented activity conducted by the counselor (i.e., parent discussion, parent education meeting, parent orientation)?  
\_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
- 17. Did it help you? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
- 18. Have you ever contacted the counselor for assistance? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
- 19. Did it help you? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no
- 20. Would you seek assistance from the guidance counselor again if the need arose? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no

**Section B**

If you answered "No" to question #1, please SKIP questions #21 and #22 below and ANSWER question #23. If you answered "Yes" to question #1, please answer questions #21, #22 and #23 below.

- 21. Please list what you have found to be the strengths of the elementary guidance and counseling program in your child's school.

---

---

---

- 22. Please list what you have found to be the weaknesses of the elementary guidance and counseling program in your child's school.

---

---

---

- 23. What would you like to know about the guidance and counseling program in your child's school?

---

---

---

---

**APPENDIX F**

**Letter to Guidance Supervisors**



OFFICE OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT  
**ROANOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS**  
 526 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE  
 SALEM, VIRGINIA 24153

April 8, 1988

Dear Guidance Supervisor:

Recently, a comprehensive evaluation was completed of the Roanoke County Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Program. The purpose of this study was to determine program effectiveness and to identify additional student needs.

In order to have the most current data regarding the evaluation of elementary school guidance and counseling programs in the Commonwealth, please complete and return the bottom portion of this letter by April 22, 1988. No response will indicate that an evaluation of your elementary school guidance and counseling program has never taken place.

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gary L. Kelly, Supervisor  
 Guidance and Curriculum Coordination

-----  
 Please complete and return to Mr. Gary Kelly by Friday, April 22.

The elementary school guidance and counseling program for our school system has been evaluated. Enclosed is information pertaining to the evaluation.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Position \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

**The two page vita has been  
removed from the scanned  
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been  
removed from the scanned  
document. Page 2 of 2**