In redirecting educational efforts to respond to change, the counseling and guidance services are at the core. New roles for these areas must emerge as career education comes of age. The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (NACVE) sees a need for counseling and guidance to set new goals and objectives. NACVE's sixth report, "Counseling and Guidance: A Call for Change," is in great demand and apparently controversial. To explain the report, it is first necessary to understand the organization of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education and its relationship to the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. NACVE's sixth report was based on reports from the State Advisory Councils. Since the States demonstrated such interest, the National Council held public hearings to gather information from a wide spectrum of public representation. The report was written after completion of testimony and reexamination of the State Reports. The conclusion that guidance and counseling has not met the needs of the current rapidity of societal change is based on a thorough study, and the report should be viewed as a strong statement of support for guidance and counseling voiced by an organization outside the guidance field itself. (AG)
There is in our country today a growing concern for the preparation of youth to cope with rapid sociological and technological changes. Parents continue to express a concern and even fear that their children are not being taught the three R's as in "the days of yore."

Labor and industry strongly demand that teaching attitudes and work ethic become an integral part of every curriculum.

Youth in their desperate search for identity and survival damn the present school curricula as meaningless and irrelevant in a post industrial society.

We listen with respect and admiration as mystified educators call for a coalition of educational efforts in the new concept of career education, hoping that this union may be at least a partial answer to their woes.

We must accept the fact that change is inevitable. In their book, "The Courage to Change", the authors (Pucinski and Hirsch) boldly state that "courage to change may be the key to survival."

In the same book, Professor David V. Tiedman wrote, "Education is one particular field which has been sorely pressed to expand its capacity to change and whose response thus far has proved very disappointing."

Change is taking place more rapidly than we realize. Few of us will question this. The question, however, is not "is change inevitable"; rather the question is, "Are we willing to change in order that we may adequately dispel the responsibilities of our chosen profession?"
Toffler points this out vividly in *Future Shock* when he states:

"To help avert future shock, we must create a super-industrial education system. And to do this, we must search for our objectives and methods in the future, rather than the past."

If schools are to take responsibility for the career preparation of all students and be answerable to parents and pupils as well as employers, then educators must look at all segments of education as well as those in education who help direct students' lives.

At the core of this redirected educational efforts are counseling and guidance services. These services are important for all students, regardless of their future plans. As an integral part of a system resistant to change, counseling and guidance has found itself in a spider web of mysticism and confusion which tend to create frustration.

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education clearly understands the role which counseling and guidance must play in the development of youth and society, in and out of education. However, it is evident that new roles for counseling and guidance must emerge as career education comes of age. Those who offer counseling services must accept the need to change to meet the demands of the day.

As the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education examined needs in the educational system of our country, it became quite obvious that the very core of education (counseling
and guidance), must set new goals and objectives to meet the
demands of the times. New responsibilities are emerging for
counselors. Counselors must be prepared to meet these respon-
sibilities.

More than 85,000 copies of NACVE's 6th Report, "Counseling
and Guidance: A Call for Change." have been requested from
the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. This
is more than all previous NACVE Reports combined. Certainly,
it is safe to say that this has been the most "discussed" of
all NACVE Reports. In view of criticisms directed towards
this report by some members of the counseling and guidance
movement, the 6th Report, in addition to being the most
"discussed", may also qualify as the most "cussed"! In
any event, it seems safe to say that many people are aware
of its existence.

My purpose here today is to explain, not to defend, this
Report. In view of the nature of some criticisms that have
been directed toward it, the need for an explanation is obvious.
In my opinion, the content itself is in no need of defense. It
is clear and speaks for itself. NACVE Reports have prided
themselves on both saying what they mean and on meaning what
they say. The 6th Report is no different than other NACVE
Reports in this respect.

To understand fully the 6th Report and its implications,
it will be necessary to comment briefly on three related
matters. I must say something about the National Advisory
Council on Vocational Education as an organizational entity. It seems appropriate to discuss briefly the genesis of the 6th Report. Finally, a few brief comments would appear to be needed regarding the contents and implications of the Report itself.

The Nature of NACVE

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education was created by the Congress as part of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The Congress felt that it needed an independent, outside body to study, evaluate, and make recommendations to the Congress and to the general public regarding vocational education in all its aspects. There is no doubt but that this need originated, in part, because of dissatisfaction on the part of the Congress with official statements coming from USOE regarding the nature and status of vocational Education. This was not so much a criticism of vocational educators within USOE as it was recognition of the fact that, at times, persons who are not themselves deeply involved in a given field can view things from a different perspective--one that more nearly expresses the needs of the general public rather than the concerns of professionals within a given field.

Simultaneously with creation of the NACVE, provision was made for establishment of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education in the 50 states, each of which had, at the state level, an analogous set of responsibilities to those accorded the NACVE at the national level. At both the state and national
levels, the prime hallmark of the Advisory Councils on Vocational Education has been their independence in operation and responsibility from the bureaucracy of vocational education itself. Such independence, it was reasoned, would provide the Congress and the various state legislatures with a perspective that is simply unobtainable from the field itself. That this has not always been understood by the vocational education community is evident in many states and, at times, at the national level as well.

Under the law establishing these Advisory Councils, the NACVE Council Members are Presidentially appointed for three year terms. While NACVE Council Members are supposed to be broadly representative of the general public, they are, in fact, more than this in that, among the 21 NACVE Members, a considerable amount of expertise, as well as a general societal concern regarding vocational education, is present. Among current NACVE Members, one can find educators, businessmen, labor union representatives, students, parents, and persons representing the general public. Despite their wide diversity in background, NACVE Members share in common a fair amount of intelligence, a much larger storehouse of wisdom, an even larger concern for vocational education, and a tremendous interest in the broad and pervasive problems of education in a rapidly changing society. The NACVE's Executive Director, Dr. Calvin Dellefield (a Ph.D. in Counseling and Guidance, by the way), heads NACVE's Washington, D.C., headquarters operations.
A number of committees and subcommittees of NACVE are at work, at any given point in time, on a variety of current problems and topics. The Committee on Counseling and Guidance is one of those Committees and it was this Committee, which I chair, that was assigned responsibility for studying the counseling and guidance field. In its last meeting, the Council voted to make this Committee a standing one in its Committee structure. This is how strongly NACVE feels about counseling services!

NACVE Reports are distributed first to the USOE Commissioner of Education, then to the Congress, to the SACVE's, and then to the general public. They carry no weight other than the prestige of the NACVE. To date, this seems to have been sufficient, when coupled with the interests of the Congress which created NACVE, so that some attention is typically paid to the contents of the NACVE Reports. The 6th Report seems to be no exception to this general rule.

**Genesis of NACVE's 6th Report**

Unlike previous NACVE Reports, the 6th Report began with a considerable body of material resulting from more than 45 State Advisory Council reports, which emphasized the need for improving counseling and guidance services. It seemed to our NACVE Committee that, with this obvious expression of interest and concern on the part of the states, it was incumbent on us to delve deeply into both public opinion and the thoughts of professionals in the field. Accordingly, we established, for the first time in NACVE history, the concept of public hearings, leading to production of the 6th
Report. We sought the widest possible public representation at our hearings and were fortunate in securing full cooperation from almost every group invited to testify. Among public groups whose testimony we heard were:

-- Project Adelante (an organization of Spanish-speaking persons)
-- Bureau of Indian Affairs
-- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
-- National Urban League
-- National Congress of Parents and Teachers
-- National Alliance of Businessmen
-- Chamber of Commerce of the United States
-- National Association of Manufacturers
-- Two organizations concerned with problems of Vietnam Veterans

To the strong appeals and dramatic case examples presented by such organizations, our Committee added formal invited testimony from individuals representing the counseling and guidance profession, including spokesmen for this movement from:

-- American Personnel and Guidance Association
-- Guidance Division, American Vocational Association
-- Vocational Guidance Unit, BAVTE, USOE
-- Vocational Counseling Branch, Veterans Administration

Volunteer consultants to our committee from the ranks of professionals in the counseling and guidance movement included Dr. Norman Gysbers, University of Missouri, and Dr. Kenneth Hoyt, University of Maryland. One or both of these volunteer consultants was present at each of our Committee's hearings.

Following receipt of all such testimony and again examining all state reports on counseling and guidance, the Committee wrote a first draft of our Report. This draft was distributed to all members of our Committee who were asked to re-examine it in the privacy of their homes, and suggestions for revisions sought.
At the "final" writing session of our Committee, two additional consultants (Mr. Steve Stocks, a high school principal and NACVE member, and Mr. Clarence Johnson, County Coordinator of Guidance, Orange County, California) were brought in and invited to make suggestions.

Additional suggestions and modifications were made by members of the Council. This draft was then given to the Writing Committee of the Council for more modifications. The final version was then presented to the full NACVE, discussed at some length, and finally adopted by unanimous vote of the entire NACVE.

This historical background is presented here in order to make "perfectly clear" several very important points. First, NACVE's 6th Report is one based on a very wide base of testimony. It was certainly not something our Committee fabricated out of thin air. Second, our Committee gave the fullest possible consideration to representatives of the counseling and guidance movement in assembling ideas, data, and suggestions for this Report. The Report itself represents a mix of the best thinking and deepest concerns we could elicit from all who testified before our Committee. It is not intended, in any way, to simply represent another "article" in the literature of the counseling and guidance field. Finally, it should be clear that the final version of the Report represents the thinking and input of a large number of people and organizations. It is not the product of any single individual.
Content and Implications of NACVE's 6th Report

The content of NACVE's 6th Report can be reduced, in terms of major concepts, to these generalized statements:

1. The current rapidity of societal change makes the need for counseling and guidance, on the part of both youth and adults, become greater each year.

2. Recent years have seen a rather significant increase in counseling and guidance services aimed at meeting these increasing needs for service.

3. In spite of an increase in counseling and guidance services, the needs for counseling and guidance have not been well met. This, in part, is a function of the fact that the need for counseling and guidance is growing at a faster rate than are provisions for providing this needed service.

4. Many organizations, agencies, and societal forces have combined to keep the counseling and guidance profession from fully meeting the growing need for their services.

5. A number of possible directional changes are specifically worth considering as approaches to better meeting the growing needs for counseling and guidance services in the United States.

6. The NACVE, while recognizing the imperfections of the counseling and guidance movement, affirms its faith in this movement and its continuing support for counseling and guidance as the best means we know of providing assistance to individuals while protecting individual freedom of choice.

It seems odd to me that some members of the counseling and guidance profession have chosen to describe the Report as a
damning and negative document. It is my firm belief that, on the contrary, this Report represents one of the strongest statements of support for the counseling and guidance movement ever voiced by an organization outside the guidance field itself. I would challenge any of you to examine the contents of this Report carefully and conclude otherwise.

Speaking clinically, it appears to me that the prime objections some professionals in the counseling and guidance movement have voiced concern themselves with the seventeen specific recommended changes contained in the body of the Report. These changes, as explained earlier, grew out of testimony from a wide variety of organizations representing various segments of the general public. It is thus not surprising or difficult to understand why some of them differ, to a considerable degree, from those that would have resulted had only representatives of the counseling and guidance movement been consulted. The only surprising thing to me is why this seems to be so difficult for certain people within the counseling and guidance movement to understand.

Remember, the NACVE was, by law, established to represent the general public. Were any NACVE Report to speak only for one part of society, it would not be fulfilling its legally prescribed function. While NACVE is generally charged with evaluating and suggesting changes in the broad field of vocational education, it is inevitable that, in doing so, not all persons, even within the field of vocational education, are going to be happy with some of NACVE's recommendations.
For NACVE to be concerned about this to the extent that its reports become altered and/or "watered down" versions of the public's concerns would be tantamount to neglect of its lawful duties. The NACVE has never tried to win a popularity contest--and let us hope that it never does. On the contrary, NACVE has always tried to say what it truly believes to be right.

It seems both improper and unwise for me to comment on each of the 17 "calls for change" contained in NACVE's 6th Report. You can read and study each for yourself. On the other hand, I feel a strong obligation to urge you to really study and to really think about both the nature and the implications of each of these "calls for change." If, after having done so, there are some you wish to oppose, you should certainly exert every effort to do so. The important point to recognize is the necessity for some kind of substantive changes, within the counseling and guidance movement, as part of American society. By issuing its 6th Report, NACVE has specified the kinds of changes it believes should be sought. We dictate to no one. We take orders from no one. We try to listen to all and to do what we believe is right. We will continue to do so.

In closing, I would leave you with this thought mentioned by the speaker at NACVE-SACVE's joint cooperative planning session in Washington, DC just last Friday. Dr. Martin Essex, the new president of the Chief School Officers said: "Youth are for tomorrow; we are for today to help tomorrow's youth."