

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 454 461

CG 031 002

AUTHOR DeStefano, Thomas J.; Petersen, Jerry; Skwerer, Lory; Bickel, Sarah

TITLE Key Stakeholder Perceptions of the Role and Functions of College Counseling Centers.

PUB DATE 2001-03-00

NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (Seattle, WA, March 17-21, 2001).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Counseling Objectives; *Counselor Role; Crisis Intervention; Emotional Problems; *Guidance Centers; *Higher Education; Mental Health; School Surveys

ABSTRACT

Counseling centers from 87 four-year colleges and universities completed the College Counseling Center Role and Function Survey (CCRF). This survey is designed to measure agreement and disagreement, and rank 14 functions of a university counseling center in order of importance. Participants were asked to identify their top five responsibilities. The provision of direct personal counseling and crisis intervention services to students was recognized as the most important function. The development of services for students from diverse cultures and racial backgrounds was also perceived as a primary function. Vocational counseling, counseling staff on student retention efforts, and training graduate students in counseling were perceived as having secondary importance. Differences were noted between large and small institutions and their perceived responsibilities. Several limitations of the study were noted including only 54% of the institutions contacted participated in the study. The study found that counseling for developmental and adjustment problems was perceived as more important than counseling for mental health problems. The significance of this is discussed in terms of the implications for counselor practice. (JDM)

Running head: Role and Function of College Counseling Centers

Key Stakeholder Perceptions of the Role and
Functions of College Counseling Centers

Thomas J. DeStefano

Jerry Petersen

Lory Skwerer

Sarah Bickel

Northern Arizona University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

T. DESTEFANO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Key Stakeholder Perceptions of the Role and Functions of College Counseling Centers.

University and college counseling centers have undergone many changes since they first emerged in the 1940's to provide vocational counseling to World War II veterans. Through the years their mission and services have been modified to better address the needs of students and the changing mission of colleges and universities. Once again it appears that college counseling centers are experiencing a period of re-evaluation. This current period of assessment is being driven by changing student populations, increases in the incidence and severity of psychological problems among students, expanding technologies, current health care reforms, and fiscal concerns of the higher education systems (Pace, Stamler, Yarris & June, 1996).

During periods of transitions it is important to gather data that reflect the perception of counseling center roles, functions, and current trends. This knowledge can be used to make more informed decisions concerning possible modifications in programming to better meet the changing demands. In addition knowing the beliefs of staff, directors, and administrators will provide information to graduate programs in counseling psychology and student affairs administration regarding trends and training needs of future student affairs administrators and counseling center professionals.

According to Bishop (1996) there is a need for more open communication between counseling staff and college administrators. Quite often perceptions regarding role and function of a counseling center vary between counseling center professionals, center directors, and chief student affairs officers. More often than not the key counseling center professionals and key stakeholders are not aware of these differences in perceptions. In this current period of transition it would be helpful for all the key individuals to be aware of the various perceptions regarding directions envisioned for college counseling centers – the primary focus of this present study.

Research Questions

The following are the primary research questions addressing the previously stated focus:

- What are the perceptions of counseling staff, center directors, and university administrators regarding the most important functions of university counseling centers as they currently exist and in the future?
- What are the perceptions of counseling staff, center directors, and university administrators regarding the least important functions of university counseling centers as they currently exist and in the future?
- What is the relationship of demographic variables of participant gender, institution size, years at institution and position with the fourteen identified functions counseling center functions both currently and in the future?
- What is the relationship of demographic variables, institution size, and institution type-- private, public, commuter, residential, and institutions offering graduate training with the fourteen identified functions counseling center functions both currently and in the future?
- Are there significant differences between the way counseling staff, interns, and directors perceive the importance of the fourteen identified counseling center functions, currently and in the future, compared to administrators?

Method

Participants

Counseling center directors from 160 four-year colleges and universities were contacted to participate in this study. Directors were asked to complete the College Counseling Center Role and Function survey and request their counseling staff, Chief Student Affairs

Administrator, and one additional university administrator from their institution to also complete the survey. Eighty-seven institutions participated in this study for a return rate of 54%. There were 475 individual participants in this study. Of the individual participants 243 were counseling staff, 39 were graduate students or interns, 83 were center directors, 50 were chief student affairs officers, and 60 were other university administrators or student affairs professionals. See Table 1.

Measures

The Counseling Center Role and Functions survey (CCRF) was designed to measure participant agreement, disagreement, and ranked order preference of perceived importance regarding 14 functions of a university counseling center. The 14 functions were identified through the professional literature (Pace, Stammer, & Yarris, 1992; Stone and Archer, 1990) and in counseling center data bases collected by Dr. Robert Gallagher (1998) of the University of Pittsburgh and Dr. Thomas Magoon (1998) of the University of Maryland.

In the scoring of the CCRF, participants were to respond to both present and future counseling center functions by identifying the top five responsibilities by ranking one through five. Participants were requested to respond with an L for the four functions that they considered least important. In the individual scoring of these instruments not rated functions received a score of eight and L scores received a score of 12.5. It should be noted that a lower number reflected greater importance attached to the identified counseling center functions.

Data Analysis

Descriptive Analysis

Analyses included the calculation of means, standard deviations, and frequency distributions for each of the 14 counseling center functions. The relative ranking of the top five

endorsed items for the present and future where identified as where the four least important perceived functions for the present and future.

Measures of Associations and Differences

Two canonical correlations were conducted on the 14 counseling center functions by demographic variables. The first set compared the demographic variables of participant gender, institution size, years at institution and position with the fourteen identified functions. The second set compared the functions with the demographics variables, institution size, and institution type--private, public, commuter, residential, and institutions offering graduate training.

Finally, t-tests for independent samples were conducted to determine whether significant differences by position regarding the relative ranking of current and future functions

Results

Descriptive Analysis

Results of the relative ranking indicated the following functions were the highest endorsed items for the present:

- 1) Individual and group counseling for students with developmental and adjustment problems.
- 2) Individual and group counseling for students with psychological and mental health problems.
- 3) Provision of crisis intervention services to students.
- 4) Provision of outreach education and prevention.
- 5) Provision of appropriate counseling services and programs for students from diverse cultural and racial backgrounds.

Results of the relative ranking of the highest endorsed functions for the future where identical to the items ranked for the present. A spearman rank correlation (r_s) between the ranked college counselor roles ($r_s = .982, p < .05$) suggested that perceptions regarding current and

future roles did not change. These data are summarized including additional statistical analysis in table 2.

Concerning the least endorsed functions for the present, the following functions of counseling centers were identified as having only tertiary importance. For more detailed statistical analysis see Table 4.

1. Conduct student adjustment, learning, and psychological research.
2. Act as student advocates and disseminate information regarding student concerns.
3. Conduct student related psycho-educational and psychosocial assessments.
4. Provide intervention programs for mandated student clients referred by student life, academic affairs, athletics, residence life etc.

Concerning the least endorsed functions for the future the following functions were identified as having only tertiary importance. See Table 4.

- 1) Conduct student development and psychological research.
- 2) Conduct student related psycho-educational and psychosocial assessments.
- 3) Act as student advocates and disseminate information regarding student concerns and issues.
- 4) Conduct vocational counseling and maintain professional competence in vocational assessment

Measures of Associations and Differences

Two sets of canonical correlations (cr) were computed with the first of each set being "present" and the second being "future" status. The first set compared the demographic variables of subject gender, institution size, years at institution and position with the fourteen identified functions. The second set compared the functions with the demographics variables, institution size, and institution type--private, public, commuter, residential, and institutions offering graduate training. The canonical correlation results are reported in Tables 5 & 6.

Inspection of Table 5 indicated that within the first set, significant canonical correlations ($\alpha = .05$) occurred for present status. The first canonical correlation ($cr = .596$) suggested that demographically the larger schools (loading (l) = .986) reported perceiving comparatively more responsibilities with graduate training, (l = -.744) vocational counseling, (l = -.525) and being less responsible regarding student advocacy (l = .425) and faculty/staff consultation (l = .301). Concerning future role responsibilities, the significant canonical correlation ($cr = .542$) indicated that larger universities tended to perceive future, similar to present role responsibilities. Future status graduate training (l = -.751) and vocational counseling (l = -.401) were considered comparatively more important with lesser responsibilities attached to faculty/staff consultation (l = .394). It should be noted that the lower the score the more importance attached, hence the negative loadings.

A second significant canonical correlation ($cr = .310$) occurred. In the demographic set, respondents with greater years service (l = .972) indicated crisis intervention (l = -.390) and vocational counseling (l = -.347) became more important as a future status responsibility. Respondents viewed assessment (l = .423) and outreach prevention (l = .398) receiving lesser status responsibility.

The Set Two data, where institution sizes and types is compared with both present and future roles indicated three significant canonical correlations. The first canonical correlation ($cr = .593$) indicated that the larger (l = .989), public (l = .433), and commuter schools (l = .323) view present role responsibilities to be both graduate training and vocational counseling (l = -.780 and l = -.473,) being comparatively more important. Student advocacy ($r = .441$) was considered a lesser important role. Concerning future status the first canonical correlation ($cr =$

.548) indicated a similar pattern of response, a fact suggesting that the comparative role will not change from present status. See table 6.

The remaining significant canonical correlations for both present and future role statuses suggested parallel perceptions. For the second significant canonical correlation comparing both present and future status ($cr = .420$ and $.384$), data indicated that private ($\beta = .645$) and residential schools ($\beta = .404$) tended to view psychological counseling ($\beta = -.575$), outreach prevention ($\beta = -.367$), graduate training ($\beta = -.379$) and crisis intervention ($\beta = -.321$) being important. Vocational counseling, assessment and retention ($\beta = .660, .481, \text{ and } .526$) were comparatively considered of lesser importance. These schools viewed future status similarly.

The third significant present status canonical correlation ($cr = .300$) indicated public ($\beta = .427$) non-commuter ($\beta = -.491$) colleges attached comparative present status responsibilities to psychological counseling ($\beta = -.489$) but identified low comparative status to outreach prevention ($\beta = .408$), and retention ($\beta = .398$). A similar pattern ($cr = .314$) occurred concerning the schools perception of future status responsibilities.

Results of the t -tests for independent samples indicated significant differences in eight functions as perceived by key stakeholder groups. In comparing directors and chief student affairs administrators a significant difference on the perceived current importance of graduate training ($t = -1.95; p < 0.5$). Mean scores for directors were 8.61 compared to chief student affairs administrators of 9.76. These findings were similar to the comparison of all administrators to counseling staff, interns, and directors on the same function for both the present and future. Significant differences also were found when administrators as a group were compared to counseling staff, interns and directors regarding the importance of current and future retention efforts and intervention programs for mandated students. Significant differences

were found between the administrators and the counseling center group on the future importance of vocational counseling ($t=-2.25$ $p < .02$). The mean score for administrators was 10.14, and the counseling center group was 9.2. See table 7.

Discussion

Summary of the Findings

The provision of direct personal counseling and crisis intervention services to students was still recognized as the most important functions of a college-counseling center. The provision of counseling for developmental and adjustment problems was perceived as slightly more important than the provision of counseling for mental health problems. The provision of outreach prevention and education programs and the development of services for students from diverse cultural and racial backgrounds were perceived as primary functions of college counseling centers. Participants did not believe that there would be any difference in the relative importance of current counseling center function and center functions of the future.

Vocational counseling, counseling staff assistance in campus retention efforts, consultation to faculty and staff, and the training of graduate students in counseling were perceived as having secondary importance. Conducting student development and psychological research, acting as student advocates, conducting student psycho-educational and psychosocial assessments, and providing mandated counseling services to students were considered at present to be the least important center functions.

Analysis of the importance of these trends in the future indicated that the relative importance of providing mandated counseling services to students shifted from a least important activity in the present to a function of secondary importance in the future. The relative

importance of providing vocational counseling shifted from a function of secondary importance to one of least importance in the future.

Results of the canonical correlation for present and future status indicated the following: Larger institutions perceive responsibilities for the training of graduate students in counseling, and the provision of vocational counseling to have higher importance than smaller institutions both in the present and future. Larger institutions perceived student advocacy as having little current importance as a function of their respective centers. In the future large institutions perceived student advocacy as taking on a secondary importance and faculty/staff consultation having only tertiary importance.

Concerning staff years in service, more senior staff found crisis intervention and vocational counseling to have an increased priority as a center function for the future than did less experienced staff. Senior staff also viewed assessment and outreach prevention as having less importance in the future.

When relationships between institution size and type of institution were analyzed for both present and future roles three significant correlations were found. Larger public and primarily commuter institutions viewed, also, graduate training and vocational counseling to be of greater importance and student advocacy as having the least importance for the present and future. In regards to the finding that larger institutions perceived graduate training to have higher importance, this “may stem” from the fact that larger institutions often offer graduate programs in counseling and experience a responsibility for providing practicum and internship opportunities for their students.

Private, primarily residential campuses, tend to perceive psychological counseling, outreach prevention, crisis intervention, and graduate training as more important functions and

found vocational counseling, assessment, and retention activities as having less importance compared to other institutions. Public residential campuses perceived higher importance to psychological counseling both in the present and future. These institutions perceived less value for the present and future for retention efforts and outreach activities.

Staff comparisons of the present and future functions by professional role indicated that there tends to be significant agreement regarding the relative ranking of counseling center functions. Perceived differences by staff function occurred in four areas. Those differences are as follows. Center directors, Counseling staff, and interns perceived providing training experiences for graduate students currently and in the future as having more importance than chief student affairs officers and other university administrators. A comparison of all administrators with all counseling personnel indicated that administrators perceived the counseling center's assistance in retention efforts and the center's role in providing mandated intervention services as having higher importance than counseling center personnel. Finally, counseling center personnel perceived vocational counseling as having more importance in the future compared to administrators.

Limitations of the Study

There are some limitations to this study that might challenge these findings. First, results of this study may be questioned due to the fact that only 54% of those institutions contacted to participate in this study, completed the surveys. Though 54% is a high rate of return for a survey of this type, it is possible that the professionals from non-participating institutions might differ in some ways from those who completed the survey. Second, because counseling center directors were responsible for recruiting participants and collecting the surveys, some participants may not have believed that they were assured confidentiality. It is possible that these participants either

over or under reported their importance of certain functions to coincide with their perceptions of their supervisor's beliefs.

Implications for Counseling Centers and Student Affairs

Results of this study have several important implications for campus based counseling services. The provision of Counseling for developmental and adjustment problems were perceived as slightly more important than the provision of counseling for mental health problems. However counseling of psychological problems takes on additional importance in large and primarily residential institutions. The provision of outreach prevention and education programs and the development of services for students from diverse cultural and racial backgrounds were perceived as primary functions of college counseling centers. There does not appear to be any perceived difference in the relative importance of current counseling center functions and those center functions of the future. Most stakeholders agree that the current counseling center priorities will continue to be top priorities in the future.

This information may be useful to the administrators who must make decisions regarding the focus of counseling center staff effort in the future. A collective prioritization of the most relevant functions of counseling centers provides benchmarking information for use by administrators and counseling staffs. The illumination of differences of perceptions between administrators and counseling staff invites exploration and discussion. The prioritization of functions could play a role as budgets tighten and as administrators seek to assess the impact of programs upon student success, possibly looking toward outsourcing options. Finally, this information is relevant for counselor training programs so that they may address the most central functions of future counseling centers with regard to the preparation of students.

Table 1
Demographic Variables including summary analysis by gender, years in position, institution size and institutional type.

Gender by Years in Position

Years	Male	Female	Total
0 - 3	73 35.4%	133 50%	206 43.6%
4 - 7	40 19.4%	65 24.4%	105 22.2%
8 - 11	32 15.5%	29 10.9%	61 12.9%
12 +	61 29.6%	39 14.7%	100 21.2%
Total	206 43.6%	266 56.4%	472 100%

Gender by Institution Size

Institution Size	Male	Female	Total
3,000 or less	46 22.4%	59 22.7%	105 22.6%
3,000 to 5,000	23 11.2%	30 11.5%	53 11.4%
5,000 to 10,000	42 20.5%	59 22.7%	101 21.7%
10,000 to 15,000	28 13.7%	25 9.6%	53 11.4%
15,000 to 25,000	42 20.5%	63 24.2%	105 22.6%
25,000 or more	24 11.7%	24 9.2%	48 10.3%
Total	205 44.1%	260 55.9%	465 100%

Participant Institution Type

Institution Type	Frequency	Percent
Private Institution	166	34.9%
Public Institution	288	60.5%
Primarily Commuter Campus	123	25.8%
A Significant Residential Population	281	59%
Graduate Programs in Counseling	255	53.6%

Table 2.
Top Functions/Statuses of College and University Counseling Centers

Current	
Function	Means and Standard Deviation
1. Provide individual and group counseling for students with developmental and adjustment problems	<u>M</u> =2.28 <u>SD</u> =1.82
2. Provide individual and group counseling for students with mental health problems	<u>M</u> =2.70 <u>SD</u> =2.91
3. Provision of crisis intervention services to students	<u>M</u> =4.26 <u>SD</u> =2.71
4. Provision of outreach prevention and education	<u>M</u> =5.30 <u>SD</u> =2.67
5. Provide counseling and special Programs for Students from Diverse Cultural and Racial Backgrounds	<u>M</u> =6.93 <u>SD</u> =2.83
Future	
Function	Means and Standard Deviation
1. Provide individual and group counseling for students with developmental and adjustment problems	<u>M</u> =2.66 <u>SD</u> =2.31
2. Provide individual and group counseling for students with mental health problems.	<u>M</u> =3.04 <u>SD</u> =3.19
3. Provision of crisis intervention services to students	<u>M</u> =4.55 <u>SD</u> =2.99
4. Provision of outreach prevention and education	<u>M</u> =5.19 <u>SD</u> =2.76
5. Provide counseling and special programs for students from diverse cultural and racial backgrounds	<u>M</u> =6.43 <u>SD</u> =2.97

Note lower scores indicate higher perceived importance

Table 3.
Secondary Functions/Statuses of College and University Counseling Centers

Current	
Function	Means and Standard Deviation
6. Provide training experience and professional supervision for graduate students in counseling	<u>M</u> =8.05 <u>SD</u> =3.51
7. Act as consultants to faculty, staff, and administration on student related issues like learning and teaching styles, personal concerns, developmental issues, etc.	<u>M</u> =8.32 <u>SD</u> =2.96
8. Provide appropriate counseling services for women and help to develop a more supportive campus environment for women	<u>M</u> =8.55 <u>SD</u> =2.21
9. Conduct vocational counseling and maintain professional competence in vocational assessment	<u>M</u> =9.00 <u>SD</u> =3.77
10. Assist campus student retention efforts through involvement in non-counseling programs such as student orientation programs and teaching "college success classes".	<u>M</u> =9.03 <u>SD</u> =3.08
Future	
Function	Means and Standard Deviation
6. Provide training experience and professional supervision for graduate students in counseling	<u>M</u> =7.99 <u>SD</u> =3.42
7. Act as consultants to faculty, staff, and administration on student related issues like learning and teaching styles, personal concerns, developmental issues, etc.	<u>M</u> =8.38 <u>SD</u> =2.92
8. Provide appropriate counseling services for women and help to develop a more supportive campus environment for women	<u>M</u> =8.51 <u>SD</u> =2.36
9. Assist campus student retention efforts through involvement in non-counseling programs such as student orientation programs and teaching "college success classes".	<u>M</u> =8.72 <u>SD</u> =3.19
10. Provide intervention programs for mandated clients referred by student life, academic affairs, athletics, residence life, etc.	<u>M</u> =9.29 <u>SD</u> =2.99

Note lower scores indicate higher perceived importance

Table 4
Tertiary Functions/Statures of College and University Counseling Centers

Current	
Function	Means and Standard Deviation
11. Provide intervention programs for mandated clients referred by student life, academic affairs, athletics, residence life, etc.	<u>M</u> =9.45 <u>SD</u> =2.91
12. Conduct student related psycho-educational and psychosocial assessments.	<u>M</u> =9.78 <u>SD</u> =2.89
13. Act as student advocates and disseminate information regarding student concerns and issues	<u>M</u> =9.97 <u>SD</u> =2.66
14. Conduct student development and psychological research.	<u>M</u> =11.09 <u>SD</u> =2.22
Future	
Function	Means and Standard Deviation
11. Conduct vocational counseling and maintain professional competence in vocational assessment.	<u>M</u> =9.46 <u>SD</u> =3.63
12. Act as student advocates and disseminate information regarding student concerns and issues.	<u>M</u> =9.76 <u>SD</u> =2.72
13. Conduct student related psycho-educational and psychosocial assessments	<u>M</u> =9.95 <u>SD</u> =2.85
14. Conduct student development and psychological research.	<u>M</u> =10.69 <u>SD</u> =2.61

Note lower scores indicate higher perceived importance

Table 5
 Canonical Correlations Comparing Demographics with current and Future Functions
 Set One

	First Variate	Loading	Loading	Loading
	Variable	Present	Future	Future
Demographics	Gender	.102	.092	.016
	Size	.986	.992	.007
	Years	.006	-.002	.972
	Position	.251	.214	-.227
	Percent Variance	.262	.259	.249
	Second Variate			
Status	Psychological	.046	.145	.135
	Counseling			
	Adjustment	.125	.179	-.202
	Counseling			
	Outreach Prevention	.203	.239	.398
Function	Research	-.048	-.178	.295
	Diversity	-.089	-.179	.066
	Counseling			
	Vocational	-.525	-.401	-.347
	Counseling			
	Assessment	.098	.084	.423
	Graduate Training	-.744	-.751	.254
	Student Advocate	.425	.296	-.180
	Women Counseling	.075	.126	.256
	Crisis Intervention	.241	.139	-.390
	Retention	.057	-.063	-.181
	Mandated	.237	.247	.172
	Intervention			
	Faculty/Staff	.301	.394	-.199
	Consultant			
Percent Variance	.092	.089	.073	
Canonical Correlation	.596	.542	.310	

Note: canonical correlations are significant (alpha > .05)

Table 6
 Canonical Correlations Comparing Demographics with current and Future Functions
 Set Two

	First Variate	Loading	Loading	Loading	Loading	Loading	Loading
	Variable	Present	Present	Present	Future	Future	Future
Demographic	Size	.989	-.101	-.011	.980	-.027	-.098
	Private	-.492	.645	.024	-.519	.444	-.030
	Public	.433	-.574	.427	.530	-.346	.479
	Commuter	.323	-.506	-.491	.357	-.529	-.443
	Residential	-.111	.404	-.178	-.053	.521	-.184
	Graduate	.529	.367	-.062	.491	.567	-.071
	Percent Variance	.300	.218	.076	.314	.198	.079
	Second Variate						
Status Function	Psychological Counseling	-.020	-.575	-.487	.076	-.671	-.618
	Adjustment Counseling	.136	.072	.144	.154	.005	-.052
	Outreach Prevention	.194	-.367	.408	.253	-.421	.459
	Research Diversity	-.046	-.136	-.063	-.205	.005	-.106
	Counseling Vocational	-.072	.180	-.193	-.172	.187	-.167
	Counseling Assessment	-.473	.660	-.174	-.410	.612	-.248
	Graduate Training	.122	.481	-.075	.092	.542	-.097
	Student Advocate	-.780	-.379	.223	-.757	-.413	.111
	Women Counseling	.441	.222	-.147	.307	.242	.031
	Crisis Intervention	.089	.060	-.066	.155	.115	-.168
	Retention Mandated	.207	-.321	-.100	.134	-.252	-.081
	Faculty/Staff Consultant	.097	.526	.398	-.045	.406	.299
	Percent Variance	.232	-.117	.267	.252	-.104	.321
	Canonical Correlation	.281	-.113	.122	.386	-.012	.031
		.092	.128	.059	.090	.129	.068
		.593	.420	.300	.548	.384	.314

Note: canonical correlations are significant (alpha >. 05)

Role and Function of College Counseling

Table 7
Directors Compared to Chief Student Personnel Officers
Current Graduate Training

Variable	No of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Probability
Director	84	8.61	3.44	-1.95	.05
Chief	50	9.76	3.09		

Staff, Interns & Directors Compared to All Administrators
Current Graduate Training

Variable	No. of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Probability
Staff, Interns & Directors	366	7.71	3.49	-4.00	.000
Administrators	109	9.22	3.3		

Current Retention Efforts

Variable	No. of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Probability
Staff, Interns & Directors	366	9.2	3.03	2.44	.015
Administrators	109	8.39	3.17		

Current Intervention Programs for Mandated Students

Variable	No. of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Probability
Staff, Interns & Directors	366	9.76	2.84	4.25 *	.000
Administrators	109	8.43	2.87		

Future Vocational Counseling

Variable	No. of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Probability
Staff, Interns & Directors	366	9.2	3.6	-2.25	.02
Administrators	109	10.14	3.51		

Future Graduate Training

Variable	No. Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Probability
Staff, Interns & Directors	366	7.6	3.40	-4.32	.000
Administrators	109	9.22	3.20		

Future Retention Efforts

Variable	No. of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Probability
Staff, Interns & Directors	366	8.87	3.22	1.99 *	.048
Administrators	109	8.2	3.06		

Future Intervention Programs For Mandated Students

Variable	No. of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Probability
Staff, Interns & Directors	366	9.52	2.94	3.07 *	.002
Administrators	109	8.52	3.00		

Note*: corrected for heterogeneity of Variances

References

- Bishop, J., (1996), Trends in College and University Counseling Centers: Back to the Future? Commission VII, Counseling and Psychological Services Newsletter American College Personnel Association. 23(2) pg. 1-2
- Gallagher, R.P. (1998). Counseling Survey and Directory Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Counseling Center.
- Magoon, T. (1998). College and University Counseling Center Data Bank College Park: University of Maryland Counseling Center.
- Pace, D., Stamler, V., & Yarris, E. (1992) A Challenge to the Challenges: Counseling Centers of the 1990s. The Counseling Psychologist, 20. 183-188
- Pace, D., Stamler, V., Yarris, E & June, L. (1996), Rounding Out the Cube: Evolution to a global Model for Counseling Centers. Journal of Counseling and Development 74 321-325.
- Stone, G.L., & Archer, J. (1990), College and University Counseling Centers in the 1990s: Challenges and Limits. The Counseling Psychologist, 18(4), 539-607.



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>KEY STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF COLLEGE COUNSELING CENTERS</i>	
Author(s): <i>THOMAS J. DESTEFANO, JERRY PETERSEN, LORY SKWERER + SARAH BICKEL</i>	
Corporate Source: <i>NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY</i>	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

<p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; text-align: center;"> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> </div> <p>1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Level 1 ↑</p>	<p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; text-align: center;"> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> </div> <p>2A</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Level 2A ↑</p>	<p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; text-align: center;"> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> </div> <p>2B</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Level 2B ↑</p>
---	---	---

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: <i>Thomas J. Destefano</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>THOMAS J. DESTEFANO</i>
Organization/Address: <i>Box 5774 FLAGSTAFF, AZ 86001</i>	Telephone: <i>520-523-6302</i>
	FAX: <i>520 523-1429</i>
	E-Mail Address:
	Date:

NASPA 2001

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: ERIC Counseling and Student Services University of North Carolina at Greensboro 201 Ferguson Building, PO Box 26171 Greensboro, NC 27402-6171
--

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200

Toll Free: 800-799-3742

FAX: 301-552-4700

e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>