

# Counseling Versus Noncounseling Duties: Examining The Past and Present in School Counseling

Jan Chandler  
Jacksonville State University

Joy Burnham  
The University of Alabama

Carol Dahir  
New York Institute of Technology

## Abstract

This study reexamined published research on school counseling in Alabama to consider the ongoing issues with role ambiguity in the field. In addition, baseline data were collected to determine and to report the status of school counseling (i.e., in regard to counseling versus noncounseling activities and duties) after the implementation of the revised 2003 Alabama Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance State Model for Alabama's Public Schools (State Plan) and the ASCA National Model ® (American School Counselor Association, 2003, 2005).

Currently, Alabama school counselors experience the same challenges as counselors across the nation (i.e., increased diversity, a growing English Second Language (ESL) population, poverty, school and community violence, terrorism threats, education reform, standards-based testing). Even though school counseling concerns and problems have an ebb and flow, one issue that has been persistent over time has been role ambiguity. Because of the ambiguous origins of school counseling, many assigned responsibilities began as tasks for the convenience of others (e.g., administrators). Since the beginning of school counseling, written established guidelines for appropriate responsibilities have lagged behind and, consequently, many inappropriate duties have become

entrenched as part of the school counselor's identity.

## *School Counseling Role Issues for Thirty Years in Alabama*

The issue of role ambiguity among Alabama school counselors has been raised by educators across Alabama through the decades (Anderson, 1983; Barron, 2002; Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Carrington, 1977; Cecil & Cecil, 1984; Cecil & Cobia, 1991; Cecil & Comas, 1985; Childress, Davis & Manning, 1986; Cooley, Johnson & McCullers, 1986; Jarrell, 1980, King, 2003; Manning, 1984; Mason, Dyal & Meadows, 1999; Parker, 1977). Overall, there is a consensus that Alabama school counselors have been assigned and have accepted inappropriate noncounseling duties for too long. Over 20 years ago, Cecil and Cecil (1984) pinpointed the problem as the "inability of school counselors to adopt a coherent role, free of unrelated quasi-administrative and clerical tasks" (p. 4). Unfortunately, Cecil and Cecil's words are still relevant today.

During the past three decades, at least 15 publications relating to the roles of school counselors have been conducted in Alabama (e.g., Anderson, 1983; Barron, 2002; Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Carrington, 1977; Cecil & Cecil, 1984; Cecil & Cobia, 1991; Cecil & Comas, 1985; Childress, Davis & Manning, 1986; Cooley, Johnson &

## 45 Counseling Versus Noncounseling

McCullers, 1986; Jarrell, 1980, Johnson, 1977; King, 2003; Manning, 1984; Mason, Dyal & Meadows, 1999; Parker, 1977). A few studies from each decade (i.e., 1970s to the twenty-first century) will be reexamined before considering the current status of school counseling in Alabama. It is the authors' view that we need to learn from past issues, trends, and problems related specifically to school counseling roles in Alabama in order to have change and success in the future. Some issues from thirty years ago have been resolved; yet, some linger, as will be clear in the following review.

*The 1970s.* Johnson (1977) examined the school counselor's role as perceived by counselors, principals, and counselor educators and discussed the controversy related to counselors' roles. Overall, findings suggested that counselors believed that they were more involved in administration than the principals contended and that the "ideal" counseling roles were not in full agreement with what principals assumed as "ideal." For example, school counselors hoped to decrease their scheduling and administrative duties, while principals had no reason to believe a decrease in such duties was needed.

In another study that considered roles, Parker (1977) surveyed 145 Alabama elementary school counselors. The study identified typical activities performed, perceptions of identified activities, and influences on the counselor's role. Counselors identified counseling, interpreting, and administering tests as appropriate functions. The inappropriate school counseling duties included such duties as substitute teaching, administering discipline, caring for ill students, and administrative work. In contrast to today's school counseling perspective, Parker found

that some counselors included facilitating teacher in-services and curriculum development as noncounseling duties in the study. Today, these duties are promoted by current counselor training guidelines as appropriate functions for school counselors. The example illustrates the impact of lingering influences on attitudes about appropriate and inappropriate duties (i.e., testing as appropriate; curriculum involvement as inappropriate).

*The 1980s.* Numerous researchers conducted studies and discussed role ambiguity in school counseling in Alabama in the 1980s. For example, Cecil and Cecil (1984) stated that noncounseling duties "... diffuse professional identity and to prevent the accumulation of relevant program outcomes data that could support the continuation and expansion of school guidance programs..." (p. 4), while Cecil and Comas (1985) noted the shortage of trained school counselors in Alabama. A year later, Childress, Davis, and Manning (1986) responded to results of a statewide survey of school superintendents by stating that the counselor's role should be defined as going beyond the analysis of test results and placement of students in courses.

Jarrell (1980) investigated perceptions of elementary school counselors, elementary principals, and counselor educators in Alabama concerning ideal and actual counseling, consulting, and coordinating functions of school counselors. Results indicated that the three groups differed, although, counselors and principals were closer in their views than either group was with counselor educators. Jarrell concluded that role functions varied among Alabama elementary schools as in other states and that elementary counselor training was not in step with actual demands of the position.

*The 1990s.* In 1991, Cecil and Cobia discussed a major school counseling issue in Alabama. They reviewed the shortage of trained school counselors in Alabama and posited that the limited number of school counselors (Cecil & Comas, 1985) resulted in a number of emergency certificates granted to personnel who were not properly trained in school counseling functions. The authors concluded that this practice perpetuated further role confusion.

In another study in the 1990s, Mason et al. (1999) considered what counseling functions were of most importance to secondary school counselors. The results showed that counselors believed that such services as “counseling, developmental/career guidance, evaluation and assessment, and program development” were most important, while “consulting and administrative duties” were of “least importance” to the school counselors (p. 8). This study made it clear that “secondary school counselors wanted a role grounded in counseling activities, rather than administrative tasks” (Mason et al., p. 8).

*The Twenty-First Century.* Within the early years of the 21st century, three Alabama studies were published on role issues and perceptions. Even though the studies were different, each highlighted concern and confusion related to roles and services of Alabama school counselors.

In a study of Alabama and Georgia school counselors, Burnham and Jackson (2000) reported typical daily activities that were subsequently compared with recommended activities from respected comprehensive school counseling programs. The results indicated that a majority of the counselors were overusing individual counseling, misusing small group counseling, guidance activities and consultation, and were

overburdened with noncounseling activities and test coordination. Approximately one-half of the respondents reported that between 13% and 40% of their time was dedicated to noncounseling duties, while 10% of counselors reported as much as 50% to 88% went to inappropriate activities.

Two years later, Barron (2002) surveyed 428 school counselors in Alabama about their awareness of the 1996 Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance State Model for Alabama’s Public Schools and the extent to which they had implemented the State Plan. Of the 259 counselors who responded, 72% indicated they were implementing the standards, although the range varied from 40% to 90%. For example, only 41% of counselors reported being evaluated on duties associated with the 1996 State Plan, indicating that their actual duties varied from the ideal. Less than one-half (44%) indicated that 100% of their day was spent on State Plan activities. Barriers to implementation were identified as time constraints due to noncounseling responsibilities (89%) and lack of administrative support (41%). Barron concluded that successful implementation required the elimination of noncounseling duties. Barron also recommended future research into the relationship of the Alabama Professional Education Personnel Evaluation (PEPE) Program for Counselors (Alabama State Department of Education, 2002) and state guidelines for school counseling programs as outlined in the State Plan. The counselor version of PEPE is the document used for the evaluation of performance of Alabama school counselors and does not include indicators related to noncounseling activities.

In another study, King (2003) explored the perceptions of Alabama counselors and principals about various school counselor

## 47 Counseling Versus Noncounseling

activities. The results varied greatly. For example, 53% of counselors and 9% of principals reported that counselors were assigned noncounseling responsibilities. Further, 30% of counselors and 0% of principals reported the assignment of other duties not related to comprehensive school counseling implementation. According to King, significant differences between the opinions of counselors and administrators, led to role conflict for counselors.

King (2003) also discovered another point of contention. She noted that although noncounseling duties were not included in the formal evaluation document PEPE (Alabama State Department of Education, 2002); they were a large part of daily activities for Alabama counselors. Thus, the researcher recommended additional research to better understand the prevalence and significance of noncounseling activities and to investigate the possibility of a discrepancy between responsibilities assigned to school counselors and competencies on the PEPE.

### *Significant Changes in School Counseling*

Since the earlier studies in Alabama, the ASCA National Model ® (American School Counselor Association, 2003, 2005) and the Alabama State Plan (2003) have been published and implemented. These new documents represent a shift in focus from “service-centered for some students to program-centered for all students” (Alabama State Department of Education, 2003, p. 1) and offer a clear distinction between typical activities of school counselors that are professional and those that are not. For instance, professional duties include counseling activities for which counselors have been trained at the graduate level (e.g., consulting, collaboration, counseling), while activities that detract from the professional

status of school counselors are considered noncounseling (i.e., clerical, administrative in nature). To add, noncounseling duties are specifically discouraged in the ASCA National Model. Further, the Alabama State Plan identifies that 80 to 90% of the school counselors time (variances occur among the grade levels) should be direct contact with students through program components of guidance curriculum, individual student planning, and responsive services. The fourth component, system support, is designated for indirect guidance support activities such as consultation, professional development, program management, and fair-share duties, all of which should total no more than 10 to 20% of the counselor’s total time (Alabama State Department of Education, 2003; American School Counseling Association, 2005). In other words, “nonguidance responsibilities assigned to counselors should not be above and beyond those of other certified staff members, and should not interfere with the delivery of guidance services” (Alabama State Department of Education, 2003, p. 9). Thus, the State Plan clearly sets the tone that “nonguidance” (i.e., noncounseling) duties are to be a minor part of the counselor’s routine.

### *The Current Study*

Since the introduction of the revised State Plan (Alabama State Department of Education, 2003), no research has been conducted on the status of implementation. However, evidence of variation from previous state plans indicated that Alabama school counselors historically have not fully integrated new programs because of insufficient time resulting from assignment of noncounseling duties (Barron, 2002; Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Cecil & Comas, 1985; King, 2003). A significant volume of research supports the detrimental influence

of role ambiguity on the ability of school counselors to routinely incorporate precepts of accepted national program models.

The present study provides a baseline examination of common practices of school counseling programs in Alabama concerning counseling versus noncounseling activities. The data also provide information that can be instrumental in clarifying the present role of professional school counselors and what changes are necessary for better alignment with the ASCA National Model and the State Plan.

The three research questions were: (1) Will the percentages on the Expectations and Priorities section of the Assessment of School Counselor Needs for Professional Development (ASCNPD; Oliver, Burnham, & Dahir, 2004) vary across grade levels (elementary, middle, high, K-12)? ; (2) Are there significant differences between grade level assignments based on the ASCNPD scores for the Alabama section?; (3) Will counseling and noncounseling duties differ across grade levels (elementary, middle, high, K-12)? With the research questions in mind, this study aimed to investigate the status of counseling and provide a baseline of typical duties of Alabama school counselors after the introduction of the revised Alabama Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance State Model for Alabama's Public Schools (Alabama State Department of Education, 2003).

## Method

### *Participants*

Public school counselors employed in the state of Alabama in the fall of the 2004-2005 academic school year were invited to participate in this study. There were 1,691 public school counselors employed by the

133 separate school districts during the 2004-05 school year, as verified by the ALSDE (D. Oliver, personal communication, November 9, 2004). Surveys were completed and returned by 1,244 counselors, for a 74% return rate. The participants who indicated level combinations were categorized together as *Other*. Totals by grade level were as follows: elementary level, 37% ( $n = 461$ ); middle level, 18% ( $n = 224$ ); secondary level, 25% ( $n = 312$ ); K-12, 6% ( $n = 74$ ); other 14% ( $n = 171$ ). Experience as designated by years was reported in Table 1. Of the participants, 1,026 had a master's degree in school counseling. Approximately 46% of the participants had been school counselors between 1-5 years, while 22% had 6-10 years experience, and 19% had 11-15 years as a school counselor. Approximately 9% of the participants had 16+ years of experience as a school counselor.

### *Procedure*

Surveys were mailed to all public school counseling coordinators in Alabama along with instructions to distribute the surveys to the school counselors in their school district. Permission to collect data using the survey was obtained from The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human subjects in research.

### *Instrument*

Stone and Dahir (2003) developed the 81-item Assessment of School Counselor Needs for Professional Development (ASCNPD, Oliver et al., 2004) and revised the survey in 2004. The ASCNPD offers information about school counseling activities and roles, the school setting, priorities of the school counselor, and working with students. The

## 49 Counseling Versus Noncounseling

survey was utilized in numerous cities in several states prior to use in Alabama (i.e., Florida, Tennessee, Rhode Island, and New York).

An additional section, Expectations and Priorities, was developed by Oliver et al. (2004) and added to the ASCNPD to obtain information specific to school counselors in the state of Alabama. Data from the Expectations and Priorities are reported in this study. Expectations and Priorities includes 12 items of specific interest to the Alabama Department of Education (ALSDE). The section consists of statements about activities or responsibilities that are common for school counselors in the state. Respondents choose one answer for each item from the following alternatives: (a) Not at all accurate, (b) A little accurate, (c) Somewhat accurate, (d) Very accurate, and (e) Not applicable.

### Results

Totals were calculated and reported for Somewhat accurate and Very accurate responses from the participants. Results indicated variances exist among grade levels. For example, elementary school counselors documented direct services and coordinated testing often. At the middle school level, counselors frequently met with system-level coordinators, documented direct services, attended conferences, and workshops. Typical activities for secondary school counselors included scheduling, implementation of four-year plans, record keeping, and master schedule development. Counselors in K-12 schools indicated high totals for almost all activities. Results are presented in Table 2.

### Discussion

The present study investigated the common practices of school counselors in Alabama in the first year of implementation of the new State Plan. Specifically, the study sought to identify differences in counseling and noncounseling duties among various groups of practicing school counselors in the state.

Participant responses identified wide variations of counseling duties among the grade levels examined. All grade levels reported high levels of responsibilities for coordination of statewide assessments, although the elementary and middle school levels were highest. Testing coordination has frequently been correlated with significant time commitments, which interferes with performance of more appropriate counseling responsibilities (Brown, D., Galassi, J.P. & Akos, P., 2004; Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Day & Sparacio, 1980; DeMato & Curcio, 2001; Johnson, 1993; Scarborough, 2002). Secondary school counselors reported higher levels of activities such as student scheduling and master schedule responsibilities, which corresponded with findings of more noncounseling duties at the secondary level (Anderson, 2002; Baker, 2001; Barron, 2002; Gysbers, 2001; Hardesty & Dillard, 1994; King, 2003). Noncounseling duties associated with testing programs obviously continue to prevail, as evidenced by the present study.

The K-12 level is not a topic of research as often as the traditional school levels of elementary, middle, and secondary. In the present study, 6% of participants indicated employment at the K-12 level. However, K-12 counselors reported high levels of involvement in noncounseling activities

such as registration of students, master schedule development, the highest levels of record maintenance, and excessive amounts of fair-share duties. On the other hand, K-12 counselors also indicated the highest amounts of involvement in counseling activities (i.e., guidance advisory committees and implementation of the State Plan). The study indicated that, within a range of 88% to 97%, all grade levels were implementing the “Minimum Requirements for School Counseling and Guidance Programs in Alabama as stated in the State Plan.” Nonetheless, discrepancies still exist because the minimum requirements in the State Plan assert “...that 100% of each counselor’s time is spent in providing guidance services through the four program delivery components: School Guidance Curriculum, Individual Student Planning, Responsive Services, and System Support” (Alabama State Department of Education, 2003, p. 21). Thus, many of the noncounseling duties, which counselors at all levels reported as common in this study, are designated as inappropriate by the ASCA National Model and the State Plan.

#### *Concerns and Recommendations for Action*

The present study revealed evidence of excessive noncounseling duties for current school counselors, similar to studies conducted over the past 30 years in Alabama. To add, the authors believe that such duties will continue to hinder or in some cases prevent implementation of the State Plan, if changes are not made. We offer our four overriding concerns and recommendations for implementing change.

The first concern relates to the internal discrepancies among members of the school counseling profession. Although 88.9% of the counselors in the present study reported

having implemented a comprehensive school counseling program based on the Alabama State Plan or the ASCA National Model, the respondents also reported high levels of involvement in noncounseling duties that are not included in either model, such as coordination of statewide testing programs (89.1%), record keeping (68.3%), and serving as building registrar (52.4%) (see Table 2). Confusion among school counseling professionals about counseling and noncounseling duties does little to promote the true nature of school counseling and actually perpetuates the traditional view of the counselor as a scheduler and testing coordinator. School counselors must be clear about appropriate and inappropriate functions before they can advocate for themselves and the profession. School counselors who know and understand comprehensive school counseling programs such as the ASCA National Model are cognizant of the differences between counseling and noncounseling duties.

The second concern relates to role issues with administrators and principals. King’s (2003) study, of Alabama counselors’ and principals’ opinions of counselor duties, indicated that principals did not recognize a difference between counseling and noncounseling activities. As a result, there has been a pattern for counselors to be automatically assigned clerical and administrative tasks such as scheduling, test coordination, substitute teacher, and so forth. We contend, as King (2003), the disparities “between counselors’ expectations and principals’ expectations for school counseling programs created role conflict for school counselors” (p. 7). Thus, school administrators must be educated about the benefits of effective counseling activities in contrast to the lack of benefit in wasted time delegated to ineffective clerical duties.

## 51 Counseling Versus Noncounseling

The third concern relates to the proliferation of standards-based testing programs. There are philosophical and practical differences to be considered before testing responsibilities are routinely assigned to counselors. School counselors are trained through graduate level courses in testing and measurement to interpret test results for placement purposes and to administer assessments that lead to greater personal awareness and self-understanding. Alabama school counselors find themselves short of time to spend with students, parents, and teachers on the critical need of explaining test results and how to use them (Thorn & Mulvenon, 2002). School counselors' time is wasted on the mundane clerical tasks of counting and physically manipulating test booklets (Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Thorn & Mulvenon, 2002) or testing responsibilities that completely overtake the counselor's daily schedule to the point that students' needs are neglected and other more appropriate responsibilities are ignored (Brown et al., 2004). Until principals, other administrators, counseling coordinators, and some counselors realize the implications of assigning noncounseling duties to counselors, no significant changes will be made.

The fourth concern relates to active support attesting to the importance of full implementation of comprehensive school counseling programs in Alabama schools based on the Alabama State Plan and the ASCA National Model. Evidence of written support from ALSDE exists in the publication of the State Plan. However, visible, proactive endorsement by the ALSDE is vital to full statewide implementation of the State Plan. We contend that the ALSDE's support is required for the following, if major changes are to take place. We recommend:

1. Professional development across the state in urban and rural areas would educate practicing school counselors, administrators, and local policy-makers about components and parameters of the State Plan, including benefits of comprehensive school counseling programs, appropriate and inappropriate duties for counselors, and the concept of fair-share duties.

2. Funding must be made available for clerical assistance and testing and special education coordination so that counselors will not continue to be misused in such capacities. Other professionals (e.g., ESL teachers, Speech and Language Impaired teachers, and assistant principals), trained at the graduate level, are not burdened with inappropriate responsibilities as school counselors tend to be.

3. Continuing education for practicing counselors on topics such as overcoming obstacles to implementation of the State Plan and ways to use professional advocacy are necessary. Accountability and use of data are other topics for practicing counselors that could lead to increased support for school counseling programs. Fortunately, counselors at all grade levels who participated in the present study reported high levels of attendance to professional conferences and workshops, indicating that school counselors are open to continuing education and thus amenable to progressive ideas and changes that are needed to implement the State Plan.

4. Opportunities for dialogue between school principals and counselors must be provided to encourage the exchange of ideas and suggestions for implementation of the State Plan.

5. Higher standards for certification should be established and maintained resulting in employment of well-trained school counselors who are knowledgeable about comprehensive school counseling



programs and the ASCA National Model and, subsequently, able to implement the State Plan.

6. Further studies investigating barriers to full implementation of the 2003 State Plan should be initiated and supported by the ALSDE. Subsequent reports of the findings should be published for the general public and provided to all state and local policy makers, administrators, counseling coordinators, and practicing school counselors.

7. Promotion and support for follow-up surveys of practicing school counselors across the state to compare with results of this baseline study are necessary. Use of the ASCNPD with the additional Alabama Expectations and Priorities section (Oliver et al., 2004) of the survey instrument would provide comparative data to investigate improvements after professional development has been mandated and completed for counselors and administrators. Clarification of items and addition of others (i.e., regarding special education committees such as Building Based Student Support Team (BBSST) would provide additional pertinent information.

8. Encouragement of counselor education programs in Alabama to update pre-service training objectives to reflect current accreditation standards and to align with current counselor education reform movements such as the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) (Education Trust, 1997; Paisley & Hayes, 2003). Familiarity with the State Plan and the ASCA National Model is essential for students and counselor educators alike.

9. Many of the recommendations such as professional workshops, continuing education, and future research could best be accomplished in coordination with counselor educators from universities in the state. Counselor educators who are familiar with

the ASCA National Model and the State Plan could provide the training for workshops supported by the ALSDE. Students enrolled in graduate programs could provide assistance for research studies (Paisley & Hayes (2003). Paisley and Hayes provided a description of such partnerships with community educators for TSCI.

10. Principals are key players in the determination of the school counselor's role within the school. Principals make the final decision about task assignments and evaluate the counselor's performance, as well. Yet, principals receive minimal training in the use of the evaluation tool for counselors, PEPE (King, 2003). Mandatory professional in-services about the State Plan and proper implementation may improve principals' awareness of appropriate and inappropriate duties for counselors.

11. Endorsement and support from the ALSDE would empower district and county school counseling coordinators to advocate for reductions in inappropriate noncounseling responsibilities for counselors in local school systems.

## Conclusion

With the ASCA National Standards (Dahir, 2000) and the ASCA National Model (2003, 2005), school counseling leaders have provided written guidelines for the profession, complete with theoretical underpinnings documented by research. The subsequent development of the Alabama State Plan, based on the ASCA National Model, can be instrumental in defining the future of school counseling in the state. The extent to which the ASCA Model is fully implemented will be a determining factor in whether professional school counseling has a voice in current and future educational initiatives, both at the state and national level. No doubt, more work is yet to be done in Alabama. Unfortunately, Cecil and

## 53 Counseling Versus Noncounseling

Cecil's (1984) statements still ring true and challenge us today.

If Alabama school counselors are to be successful in their efforts to extend counseling into all schools... They must produce convincing evidence of program accountability, so that it becomes clear to all who influence decisions about counselors—parents, school administrators, politicians, and taxpayers—that school counselors have a definite function in the school and that the services they provide are worth whatever investment they require. (pp. 4-5)◆

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the school counselors and coordinators whose contributions made this study a reality. This study was partially funded by a grant from the College of Education, The University of Alabama.

### AUTHOR NOTE

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to: Jan Chandler, Ph.D., Jacksonville State University, Department of Educational Resources, 700 Pelham Road North, Jacksonville, Alabama 36265. Email: chandlerj@jsu.edu

### REFERENCES

Alabama State Department of Education (1996). *The revised comprehensive counseling & guidance state model for Alabama's public schools*, Bulletin 1996, No. 27. Montgomery, AL: Author.

Alabama State Department of Education (2003). *Comprehensive counseling and guidance state model for Alabama's public schools*, Bulletin 2003, No. 89, Montgomery, AL: Author.

Alabama State Department of Education (2002). *Professional Education Personnel Evaluation Program of Alabama, Counselor Evaluation Manual*. Montgomery, AL: Author.

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

American School Counselor Association (2005). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed)*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Anderson, R. (1983). Elementary guidance: A not-so-new idea whose time has come. *Alabama Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 10(1), 41-42.

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

Baker, S.B. (2001). Reflections on forty years in the school counseling profession: Is the glass half full or half empty? *Professional School Counseling*, 5(2), 75-83.

Barron, D.W. (2002). An examination of school counselors' awareness and implementation of the statewide comprehensive guidance and counseling program model in Alabama. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, 2002). (UMI No. 3075110)

Brown, D., Galassi, J.P., & Akos, P. (2004). School counselors' perceptions of the impact of high-stakes testing. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(1), 31-39.

Burnham, J.J., & Jackson, C.M. (2000). School counselor roles: Discrepancies between actual practice and existing models. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(1), 41-49.

Carrington, A.B. (1977). A rocky road for elementary school counselors in Alabama. *Alabama Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 4(1), 61-66.

Cecil, J.H., & Cecil, C.E. (1984). Excellence: Opportunity and challenge for Alabama's School Counselors. *Alabama Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 10(2), 3-9.

Cecil, J.H., & Cobia, D.C. (1991). Elementary school counseling and guidance in Alabama: Opportunity and challenge. *Alabama Association for Counseling and Development Journal*, 17(1), 23-28.

Cecil, J.H., & Comas, R.E. (1985). School counselors: An endangered species. *Alabama Association for Counseling and Development Journal*, 12(1), 51-55.

Childress, J., Davis, J., & Manning, F. (1986). The Alabama school counselor association: Past, present, and future. *Alabama Association for Counseling and Development Journal*, 12(2), 59-69.

Cooley, F.R., Johnson, M.L., & McCullers, G.H. (1986). ALACD: A legacy of service. *Alabama ACD Journal*, 12(2), 5-24.

Dahir, C.A. (2000). The national standards for school counseling programs: A partnership in preparing students for the new

millennium. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 84(616), 68-77.

Day, R.W., & Sparacio, R.T. (1980). Impediments to the role and function of school counselors. *The School Counselor*, 27, 270-275.

DeMato, D.S., & Curcio, C.C. (2004). Job satisfaction of elementary school counselors: A new look. *Professional School Counseling*, 7(4), 236-245.

Education Trust (1997). *Working definition of school counseling*. Washington, DC: Author.

Gysbers, N.C. (2005). Closing the implementation gap. *School Counselor*, 43(2), 37-41

Hardesty, P.H., & Dillard, J.M. (1994). The role of elementary school counselors compared with their middle and secondary school counterparts. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, 29(2), 83-92.

Jarrell, R.E. (1980). *An analysis of the role of the Alabama elementary school counselor as perceived by elementary school counselors, principals, and counselor educators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

Johnson, F. (1977). The counselor's role as perceived by counselors, school administrators, and counselor educators. *Alabama Personnel and Guidance Association Journal*, 4, 35-42.

Johnson, L. (1993). School counseling: Standards versus practice. *New York State Journal for Counseling and Development*, 8, 55-69.

## 55 Counseling Versus Noncounseling

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

Manning, F.T. (1984). A report on the history of elementary school counseling in Alabama. *Alabama Association for Counseling and Development Journal*, 10(2), 29-37.

Mason, C., Dyal, A., & Meadows, R. (1999). Secondary school counselors' views concerning counseling functions and their perceptions of importance within the school. *Alabama Counseling Association Journal*, 25, 3-11.

Oliver, D., Burnham, J.J., & Dahir, C.A. (2004). Expectations and priorities, *Assessment of SchoolCounselor Needs for Professional Development (ASCNPD)*. Unpublished survey.

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

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

Scarborough, J.L. (2002). *Between practice and preference: Factors related to discrepancies in how school counselors spend their time*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville. (UMI No. 3056857)

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

Thorn, A.R., & Mulvenon, S.W. (2002). High-stakes testing: An examination of elementary counselors' views and their academic preparation to meet this challenge. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 35,195-206.

Table 1

*Years of Professional Experience Reported by Level*

Grade Level	Years of Experience						Total
	1-5 Years	6-10 Years	11-15 Years	16-20 Years	21-25 Years	26+ Years	
Elementary	197	112	116	17	3	2	447
Middle	98	51	39	14	5	12	219
Secondary	155	60	40	20	14	8	297
K-12	35	13	15	3	4	2	72
Other	89	32	26	8	4	5	164
Total	574	268	236	62	30	29	1199

## 57 Counseling Versus Noncounseling

Table 2

Totals for Expectations and Priorities--SOMEWHAT AND VERY ACCURATE RESPONSES

Expectations and Priorities					
Please indicate the extent to which these statements of expectations and tasks accurately reflect your program					
	Elementary	Middle/J HS	K-12	High School	Total Population
1. I am involved in the coordination of statewide assessments (Stanford-10, AHSGE, DIBELS, ADAW, etc).	90.9%	90.2%	87.8%	84.9%	89.1%
2. I am involved in record keeping, including transferring records, posting grades, etc.	51.2%	77.6%	89.2%	78.2%	68.3%
3. I am involved in the development of the master schedule.	24.7%	49.1%	71.7%	61.3%	46.3%
4. I am involved in the scheduling and placement of students.	39.7%	73.2%	85.1%	93.9%	66.4%
5. I serve as the building registrar for new entrants and transferred and withdrawn students.	34.7%	61.2%	78.4%	57.7%	52.4%
6. I implement the Minimum Requirements for School Counseling and Guidance Programs in Alabama as stated in the State Plan.	91.1%	92.0%	97.3%	88.1%	92%
7. I have established a School Counseling and Guidance Advisory Committee.	80.7%	77.7%	82.4%	76.0%	80.1%
8. I/we have implemented a comprehensive individual school guidance plan that is aligned with the Alabama State Plan or the ASCA National Model.	84.8%	88.4%	91.9%	89.1%	88.9%

	Elementary	Middle/J HS	K-12	High School	Total Population
9. I will attend school counseling conferences and/or workshops during this school year.	92.6%	.2%	90.6%	91.3%	92.8%
10. I/we meet regularly with our system-level counselor coordinator.	84.0%	87.5%	78.4%	81.7%	85%
11. I keep records that document time spent or activities performed, which would enable me to determine the percentage of time, spent providing direct services to students.	89.5%	89.2%	78.3%	79.8%	86.4%
12. I perform fair-share duties above and beyond what is expected of other certified staff at my school.	73.1%	69.7%	77.1%	66.0%	71.5%