Moving from School Counseling Compliance to Cohesion: Making Mandates

Meaningful

Robert Feirsen, Carol Dahir, and Daniel Cinotti

New York Institute of Technology

Abstract

The New York State Education Department (2016, 2018) recently passed sweeping reforms impacting school counseling practice, preparation, and credentialing. School districts are now required to have a comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP) for all students in grades K-12. A statewide survey collected perception data from school counselors, building leaders, and school counseling supervisors regarding the implementation of important aspects of these new regulations. The authors conclude that the core of success lies in the collaboration of building leaders and school counselors to sustain meaningful implementation of comprehensive school counseling programs.

Keywords: school counselors, building leaders, principals, policy

Moving from School Counseling Compliance to Cohesion: Making Mandates

Meaningful

Amidst the COVID-19 contagion, experts (Centers for Disease Control, 2020) say disruptions from this pandemic constitute an adverse childhood experience (ACE) for every child. Now more than ever before, a comprehensive school counseling program is needed to support student long-term recovery from this global crisis (Perez-Sadler, 2020) and ensure academic and social-emotional growth. Comprehensive school counseling programs (CSCP) include universal interventions for every student to help them process their experience, promote resilience to adversity, and help students and families cope with the stress and trauma caused by the pandemic (Rumsey & Milsom, 2019).

The New York State Education Department recently updated the regulations that address school counselor practice, preparation, and certification. Beginning with the 2019-2020 school year, each school district is required to implement a comprehensive developmental school counseling/guidance program for all students in grades kindergarten (K) through grade 12 based on the American School Counselor Association's (ASCA) *National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* (2019). Regulatory language establishing requirements for the preparation, certification, and expected practice of school counselors had last been updated in New York State in 1978. As the ASCA continued to demonstrate the value and impact of school counseling programs since the late 1990's, the New York State Education Department sat quietly on the sidelines, maintaining the status quo. Potentially, regulatory change places New York State in a pivotal position to take a leadership role in the

implementation of CSCP and demonstrate how these new mandates have a meaningful impact on students.

Opinions differ on the impetus for change by the New York State Board of Regents. However, *The Every Student Succeeds Act* (2015), the national spotlight on career and college readiness and social-emotional development, and ongoing efforts of ASCA to refine standards-based CSCP, influenced the long overdue shift to 21st century school counseling paradigm in New York State. NYSED revisions focused on key aspects of school counseling practice.

Effective July 1, 2019, the regulatory amendments, *Part 100.2(j)* required that all K-12 students have access to a certified school counselor and to a comprehensive school counseling program that prepares each student to participate effectively in their current and future educational program (NYSED, 2017). The comprehensive program must include student competencies utilizing career/college readiness, as well as the academic and social/emotional development standards. The state education department referenced the ASCA National Model (2012) as the basis for these changes. Consequently, New York State school counselors join their colleagues nationwide in utilizing the National Model as the foundation for program design, delivery, and evaluation.

Review of the Literature

Although Gysbers put forth a comprehensive guidance model in the early 80's (Gysbers & Moore, 1981), it was the development of the ASCA National Standards (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) and the first edition of the ASCA National Model (2003), that shifted school counseling practice from a delivery of a constellation of responsive and reactive activities and "random acts of guidance" (Bilzing,1996) to a whole school all

students focus. No longer would school counselors predominantly focus on a smaller percentage of the student population who had significant academic or social emotional need. The movement in the United States to improve school counselor practice and outcomes was led by ASCA and the Education Trust, with the support of organizations including the National Association of College Admission Counseling, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, ACT, and the College Board. The ASCA National Model (2003) established a structure for school counseling programs and integrated the transformed school counselor skills of leadership, advocacy, teaming and collaboration, social justice, and data informed practice as the process to inform the content (Education Trust, 2009).

The ASCA National Model and the multitude of subsequent state spinoffs have had a far-reaching impact on the work of school counselors across the nation and the students they serve. Subsequent revisions of the model (2005, 2012, 2019) continued to refine, reinforce, and reflect current research demonstrating positive outcomes on student success (Lapan, 2012; McMahon, et al., 2017; Whiston, Tai, et al., Eder, 2011). Carey and Dimmitt (2012) purported that positive student outcomes closely relate to having an organized program in schools that is aligned with the ASCA National Model (2012). School counselors should focus on the activities which increase the positive critical school-wide outcomes that best support student success (Dimmit & Wilkerson, 2012; Griffith & Greenspan, 2017; Zyromski, et al., 2017).

Why Comprehensive School Counseling?

A comprehensive school counseling program is an integral component of the school's academic mission. Comprehensive school counseling programs, driven by student data and based on standards in academic, career, and personal/social

development, promote and enhance the learning process for all students. (ASCA, 2012, p.1).

The CSCP has evolved from the early days of comprehensive guidance in the 80's (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012) to the highly developed and refined 4th edition of the ASCA National Model (2019 that is outcome and results-based to address the needs of every student, particularly students of culturally diverse backgrounds, low socioeconomic status, and underserved or underrepresented populations (ASCA, 2003). The specific components provide a structure, utilize various delivery methods, are aligned with standards, and utilize multi-tiered system of support (Tier 1, 2, 3) strategies. Comprehensive school counseling is intended to reflect state and local districts' expectations to address the larger goals of school improvement and the needs of individuals and groups of students.

Research has shown that fully implemented CSCP support every student's progression through school, and help each emerge more capable and more prepared than before to meet the challenges and changing demands of the millennium (Carrell & Hoekstra, 2014). Six states that committed to implement comprehensive programs demonstrated increased ACT scores and state achievement tests, decreased suspension rates, decreased discipline rates, and increased attendance and graduation rates (Carey & Dimmit 2012). Results from Rhode Island suggested that comprehensive programs led to decreased suspension rates and fewer self-reports of bullying, while the Nebraska study showed increased attendance and enhanced student achievement on state math and reading tests (Carey & Dimmitt, 2012).

Comprehensive school counseling programs operate in the larger context of all school-based programs and are among the many that building leaders supervise.

School counselors who operate within a CSCP are tasked with the responsibility of demonstrating their impact on students; counselors are also required to be proficient in accessing, analyzing, interpreting, and presenting data (ASCA, 2019; Protheroe, 2010; Wilkerson et al., 2013). Without a collaborative relationship with the building leader, school counselors are working in isolation. Collaboration can eliminate non-counseling duties that detract from providing direct services to K-12 students (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012). Counselors cannot succeed in their roles if building leaders assign them tasks more fitting for an administrative assistant, rather than offering programs, activities and support that positively affect student success (Lowery, et al., 2018).

Challenges to Change

The literature continues to reveal a lack of administrator knowledge of comprehensive school counseling programs and the appropriate role of school counselors (Dahir, et al., 2010; Frye, et al., 2018). Prior research on the principal-school counselor relationship (Dahir et al., 2019; Janson & Militello, 2009; Leuwerke & Walker, 2009) identified principal perceptions of the role of school counseling to include many non-counseling activities, not directly tied to improving student achievement. The overburdening of counselors with administrative responsibilities may be particularly acute in rural schools (Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016).

At the building level, counseling program impact can be advanced or constrained by the actions of building leaders. Positive relationships between principals and school counselors can increase counselor job satisfaction and their perceptions of high-quality program implementation (Clemens, et al., 2009). A willingness on the part of principals and counselors to engage with each other over time to develop respectful, collaborative relationships can build school capacity for improvement (Odegard-Koester & Watkins,

2016). Research points conclusively to the relationship of counselors and principals to effect positive school change and improved academic outcomes for students (Cisler, & Bruce, 2013, College Board et al., 2009; Dahir et al., 2010; Dahir, et al., 2019; Frye et al., 2018; Korkut et al., 2009).

Federal and state governments have frequently used mandates to compel change in schools (Cuban, 1998; Olson 2017). However, attempts to change school practice through mandates can arouse strong resistance. Both administrators and faculty at the school level may find it difficult to understand the meaning of required changes in policy or practice, thereby reducing commitment and motivation (Tomal et al., 2013). Even when stakeholders support new policies, mandates may require "unlearning" former ways of approaching responsibilities (Will, 2019), as may be the case in New York State since NYSED's amended regulations impact the scope of practice for both building leaders and school counselors. Mandated implementation requirements often fail to recognize that schools are composed of many connected parts; coordination among these parts may not be able to take place within the period allotted by statute or regulation (Alvy, 2017). The NYSED's two-year implementation timeline included no provisions for professional development to build the knowledge base of the key players, the school counselors and building leaders, to help them acquire the skills needed to move the traditional school counseling service model to a fully developed comprehensive program. The realization of these regulatory actions across the state is grounded in the attitudes, knowledge, and skills of those at the forefront of leading the implementation: school counselors, school counseling supervisors, and building leaders.

Purpose of the Study

The New York State Education Department has mandated major changes in school counseling programs, practices, and outcomes; therefore, it is important to determine how school building leaders (e.g., principals, assistant principals, headmasters, deans), school counseling supervisors, and school counselors themselves view these changing roles and responsibilities. Assessing the key players' readiness and openness to implement the newly mandated requirements will provide insight into the knowledge and skills essential to school counselor success and the practices that ultimately improve student outcomes.

The purpose of this study is to examine the similarities and differences in thinking among building leaders, school counselors, and school counseling supervisors on specific activities and services as mandated by the amended New York State Education Department regulations. This investigation of school counseling priorities, perceptions, practices, and building expectations additionally should provide insight into what is needed to implement CSCP that move beyond minimum mandates and deliver a comprehensive strategy for the benefit of students.

The primary research question of this study was to what degree do the perceptions or thinking among school building leaders, school counseling supervisors, and school counselors differ around specific principles and practices addressed in the initial implementation stages of the NYSED regulations?

Method

Instrument

The Assessment of School Counselor Needs for Professional Development [ASCNPD], Dahir & Stone, 2019) served as the basis for the instrument. The instrument

was developed initially to capture the attitudes, beliefs, and practices of New York City high school counselors after the 1st edition of the ASCA Model was released, and on a larger scale subsequently, to assess school counselor perceptions across Alabama (Dahir et al., 2009), and the school counselor/principal relationship in Tennessee (Dahir et al., 2010). More recently, the instrument was used to collect data and establish a baseline regarding attitudes, beliefs, and practices of New York State school counselors (Dahir et al., 2019) prior to the implementation of the amended regulations. For purposes of this study, four of the 65 questions were slightly modified to align with the conceptual revisions in the fourth edition of the ASCA National Model. For example, the term "social-emotional development" replaced "personal-social development"; "career development" was replaced with "college and career readiness," as changed in the ASCA National Model (2019).

An analysis of the psychometric properties of the ASCNPD (Burnham et al., 2008) showed high evidence of validity and reliability. Correlations among the subscales of the survey were all moderate to high, ranging from .20 to .57 (all p <.01). Internal consistency was assessed by Cronbach's alpha coefficient, and it was determined internal consistency was in an acceptable range for an exploratory study of .69 to .94. The 65-item adaption intended to gather perceptions on school counseling priorities, perceptions, frequency of activities, and expectations and utilizes a 5-point Likert scale.

Participants

The participants in this study are district administrators, building principals, assistant principals, directors of school counseling/guidance/pupil personnel services, and practicing school counselors employed in public and private schools New York State. Participants' contact information was elicited from various New York State

professional associations (e.g., the New York State School Counselors Association [NYSSCA]). Approximately 9,000 surveys were sent, and 788 were completed, representing a response rate of 8.7%. Of the respondents, approximately 4.6% (n=37) performed roles as supervisors, department chairs, or school counselor leaders (coded as "district/building supervisors"), 11.1% (n=87) served as principals or assistant principals (coded as "building level administrators"), and 83.6% (n=658) worked as practicing school counselors in the state of New York. The remaining 0.7% of the respondent group (n=6) represented superintendents and assistant superintendents of school districts.

Subscales

There are four subscales of the ASCNPD. The "School Counseling Priorities" subscale has 18 items and assesses the degree of relative importance of school counselor priorities. The items describe activities and tasks that contribute to the overall well-being and needs of a school, as defined in the ASCA National Model (2019). The "School Setting Perceptions" subscale has 19 items and addresses respondents' beliefs regarding appropriate roles for school counselors. Additionally, several items ask the respondents to address collaboration and consultation roles. The "Frequency" subscale has 16 items and asks how often counselors have worked with students on specific skills such as "managing emotions," "strengthening interpersonal relations," and "social-emotional issues." Finally, the "Expectations" subscale has 12 items that assess school counselors' involvement in system support activities that provide ongoing support to the school environment, as well as administrative expectations regarding tasks, some of which are considered as non-counseling responsibilities (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Chandler et al., 2008).

Procedures

"Survey Monkey" delivered the survey electronically. Survey Monkey is a digital survey platform used to design, disseminate, and collect surveys. The distribution site list included public school districts and school buildings, charter schools, and private/parochial/independent schools. The data were transferred from "Survey Monkey" to SPSS, where all statistical analyses were performed. Participants' responses to the question regarding their current position were coded as follows: 1= "district admin" (superintendent, assistant superintendent), 2= "district/building supervisor" (director of school counseling, department chair, lead counselor, etc.), 3= "building admin" (principal, assistant/vice principal, dean, etc.), and 4= "school counselor."

With a 65-item survey, there were some missing data. A Missing Values Analysis, performed in SPSS, determined if there were specific questions or subsections of the survey that were disproportionately omitted (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2011). The test revealed no discernible patterns in items left blank. Further review of the analysis revealed eight respondents who omitted 10 or more items while completing the survey. These data were omitted pairwise when completing 55 items or more, and list-wise when the number of items missing was deemed excessive.

Analysis

One-way analysis of variance was used to compare mean scores on each of the 65 subscale items in relation to the participants' reported position within their school district (coded as previously described). Due to the large number of comparisons, a post-hoc Bonferroni correction was used to control for family-wise Type I error (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2011). The post-hoc Bonferroni analysis clarified the significant relationships between each item and the participants' identified position.

Results

Of the 65 items on the ASCNPD, mean scores for 22 items showed significant variance in relation to the participants' position within their school; thus, for 2/3 of the items the participants' role was not significant. The post-hoc Bonferroni analysis clarified the significant relationships between each item and the participants' identified position.

Post-hoc Bonferroni Results

Post-hoc Bonferroni tests indicated several items with significant differences between groups. Building administrators placed significantly higher priority on providing (a) "professional development to teachers," (b) "developing and implementing prevention programs," (c) "participating in department and/or grade-level meetings," (d) "counseling students with behavioral problems and students with special needs," and (e) "helping teachers improve classroom management than either supervisors or practicing counselors (Table 1).

Post-hoc Bonferroni analyses also indicated that building administrators and school counselors differed in their perceptions of several important practices. The following items revealed significant differences between building administrators and school counselors (Table 2):

(a) "School counselors are part of key decision-making teams

(b) "Administrators work with school counselors to improve student academic performance."

(c) "Teachers ask counselors to consult with them on improving classroom management techniques."

Supervisors of school counseling and building leaders differed in their perceptions of the frequency with which school counselors addressed specific activities

with students. Specifically, supervisors perceived school counselors to be working with significantly more frequency on "career/college readiness strategies" and "developing educational and career plans" than building administrators. School counselors and supervisors differed from building administrators in their perceptions of the frequency with which counselors worked with students on improving grades. Both groups indicated this activity happens much more frequently than was reported by building administrators in this study. Lastly, school counselors reported working with students to strengthen interpersonal skills (such as communication) much more frequently than counselor supervisors (Table 3).

Finally, school counseling supervisors had a different level of expectation for school counselors with regard to individual educational/career planning. Supervisors of school counselors expected counselors to: (a) be involved in student programming, (b) implement an individual student progress plan annually beginning in the 6th grade that is updated each year and (c) require students to maintain an educational/ career-planning portfolio in grades 9-12 to a greater degree than the counselors themselves. Supervisors of counselors also had higher expectations that counselors were attending conferences and workshops during the school year. Both counselors and building administrators expected counselors to keep records documenting the amount of time spent on specific activities more so than was reported by supervisors of school counselors (Table 4).

Discussion

School building leaders, school counseling supervisors, and school counselors revealed complementary points-of-view in the majority of the survey items addressing school counseling priorities, practices, activities, and building expectations. Slightly less

than one-third of the survey items disclosed significant differences. This is a reason for optimism that New York State's attempt to mandate major changes in the design, delivery, and evaluation of school counseling will be successful.

Nevertheless, significant differences cannot be dismissed. For building leaders, the work of school counselors appeared to fall into two categories: one broad and one focused, with each addressing a set of activities essential for whole school improvement (Amatea & Clark, 2005; Edwards et al., 2014). Through a wide-angle lens, building leaders emphasized important leadership roles for school counselors on shared-decision making teams, participating in grade level or department meetings, and assisting with professional development for the rest of the faculty. On the other hand, building leaders also rated such "traditional" activities such as answering teacher requests for support and working with students who demonstrate behavioral issues and learning differences more highly than counselors or counselor supervisors. Building leaders also perceived that teachers request support from counselors to a greater degree than counselor supervisor respondents do.

Similarly, school counselors emphasized the importance of the long-established roles of working with students to improve their grades and strengthen social skills, perhaps reflecting pressing, immediate responsibilities that typically occupy a great part of the counselor day. Building leaders and counselor views also aligned in connection with documenting counselor time on task.

In contrast, counselor supervisors generally presented a view more associated with the principles of comprehensive school counseling and aligned most closely with the new elements contained in the New York State mandates, including prioritizing college and career readiness, and the development of individual student progress

reviews plans beginning in 6th grade. School counselor supervisors have higher expectations than either school building leaders or counselors themselves for counselor involvement in professional growth activities.

Differences in perceptions and beliefs among building leaders, school counselors, and counselor supervisors may be attributed to positions in the organizational hierarchy (Belling, 2009; Sherer, 1998). These roles vary in position in the chain of command, accountability, access to resources, and communications networks; they also differ in relationships with students, parents, faculty and staff, and the school community at large. Given this set of circumstances, how can significant differences, in approximately one-third of the survey items, be reconciled among the key players to produce effective comprehensive school counseling programs?

It is unlikely that mandated compliance with the amended regulations alone will result in a coherent, comprehensive, and sustained strategy to address student needs. The answer instead may lie in the connections established between school counselors and the building leader, typically, the building principal. A collaborative working relationship between the building leader and the school counselor plays an important role in improving student academic success as well as college and career readiness (Dahir et al., 2010; Dimmitt & Wilkerson, 2012; Finkelstein, 2009; Stone & Dahir, 2016). The current emphasis on improving every student's achievement outcomes, promoting equity for students from underserved communities, ensuring all students are college and career ready, implementing whole-school, social-emotional learning initiatives (West et al., 2018), and helping students cope with the trauma inflicted by COVID-19 make it clear that close collaboration between counselors and building leaders , in pursuit of school wide goals is now, more than ever, paramount to student success.

Limitations of the Study

The response rate for the rather large population of administrators, supervisors and practicing counselors in the state of New York was small (8.7%). Data collection for this study preceded the actual statewide implementation requirement, with the exception of New York City Department of Education, which was granted an additional year for preparation and training. As a result, other tasks may have assumed a higher priority in the perspective of building leaders. This may represent non-response bias on the part of those professionals who are not yet aware of or concerned with these mandates (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2011). Although the sample included a variety of school counseling and leadership positions, the participants represented only a single state, one that has not engaged in regulatory updates in the preparation and practice of school counselors for more than 40 years.

Implications and Recommendations

The study revealed four primary themes that, if addressed, potentially could reduce the significant differences found in almost one third of the items. Closer alignment of the thinking of building leaders and school counselors around intentional collaboration, clear communication, role ambiguity, and initiative and leadership may remedy the gaps revealed in the data concerning priorities, perceptions and expectations.

An intentional and collaborative relationship between the counselor and building leader has the potential to target priorities and increase effectiveness for individual students and the school as a whole (Lashley & Stickl, 2016). Success in this regard will require gaining and sustaining the principal's attention, no small feat at a time when

principals' responsibilities have increased dramatically and many competing issues vie for consideration on any given day (Alvoid & Black 2014; Wang, et al., (2018).

School counselors should seek to expand the building leader's knowledge base (Frye, et al., 2018) beyond the notifications about regulations provided by the State Education Department through bulletins and guidance documents and apprise them of what is needed to establish a CSCP. When speaking with building leaders, counselors can utilize the active listening skills honed in their work with students and parents to develop better understandings of the building leader's views (Clemens, et al., 2009) and then craft their responses to promote CSCP goals in a more effective manner. Research suggests that interaction of this type can facilitate the development of deeper professional relationships between counselors and building leaders and result in better coordination of efforts, a mutual appreciation of the ethical and practical dilemmas each face, and the improvement of school climate (Campbell, 2004; Clemens, et al, 2009; Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016).

With a shared foundation of knowledge established, counselors should work to ensure that the building leader assigns a high priority to the transition to comprehensive programs envisioned in the NYSED mandates. Kotter's work (2008) suggests this can be facilitated by establishing a sense of urgency, primarily through showing that the current state of affairs differs markedly from other possible paths. School counselors can present data to the building leader that identifies in clear terms student academic needs and areas for social-emotional growth. This strategy can also stimulate the sense of moral purpose that motivates educators (Fullan, 2003), thereby increasing the building leader's 's commitment to change.

Together, school counselors and building leaders can engage the school community in a network of support dedicated to ensuring that all students, including the underserved and underrepresented, reach their academic, social-emotional, and college and career potential (Lowery et al., 2019). School counselors are well positioned to assist building leaders in this regard (Young & Bryan, 2018). The new school counseling mandates emphasize whole-school approaches to school counseling that provide building leaders with opportunities to utilize counselor skills and resources to promote school improvement. As key communicators in the school building, counselors can assume "go to person" roles for building leaders, enabling school leadership to share responsibilities for implementing new programs and practices (Fibkins, 2015). As boundary spanners (Aldrich & Herker, 1977), counselors can draw upon their informal connections across disciplines and grade levels in the school building to bring people together for the common good (Beale & McCay, 2001), provide feedback from the school community to the building leader (House & Hayes, 2002), focus on social justice inequities (Geesa, et al, 2019), and work effectively with internal and external stakeholders (Yavuz et al., 2017). Counselor participation on shared decision-making teams can help ensure that school personnel remain committed to social justice. Intentional collaboration can support a culture of continuous improvement and sustain new initiatives in a school community through an ongoing process of "learning, doing, and learning from doing" (Thompson et al., 2016, p. 4).

The role of school leaders, particularly building principals, role in this strategy cannot be overstated. However, successful implementation of the CSCP may require counselors to assume more responsibility for resolving the role ambiguity that has accompanied the position of school counselor over the years (Cinotti, 2014). As Will

(2019) recognized, reluctance to let go of traditional past practices can pose a significant hurdle in the change process. School counselors may also lack the comfort level needed to analyze data and utilize it for program and school improvement (Young & Kaffenberger, 2011) or an understanding of—and confidence in—leadership skills (Strear et al, 2019). To address these issues, it will be important for school counselors to engage in the professional development expected by their supervisors, supplemented by forward-thinking collegial groups that address practical, job-embedded concerns, much like those advocated for teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Collaboration with school counselor educators at universities can similarly provide access to resources that strengthen counselor understanding of evolving roles (McMahon et al., 2009).

In the long-term, the effect of the mandated changes in school counseling in New York State will be determined not by whether building leaders and counselors merely comply with the formal requirements of the regulation, but whether they implement and sustain practices that create whole-school, comprehensive counseling programs that address the needs of all students. Mandates by themselves cannot ensure lasting change; building leaders will have to move beyond mere compliance with formalities (Alvy, 2017) to engage in a long-term process of building capacity and promoting alignment and integration of comprehensive school counseling with other school initiatives and daily school activities. McCallum's dictum cannot be forgotten: "Implementation is everything" (as cited in Alvy, 2017, p. 80).

At the same time, school counselors will need to adopt a strong and intentional position of advocacy for CSCP. They must develop effective channels of communication with the building leader to generate an appreciation of how the new statewide mandates

for school counseling can lead to the accomplishment of school wide goals and a commitment to social justice. They will similarly need to demonstrate an understanding of the building leader's perspective and take a leadership role in promoting student growth in order to sustain the level of counselor-building leader trust and shared vision required for productive collaboration (Lashley & Stickl, 2016).

Conclusion

The New York State Education Department requires the school counseling profession to take hold of the present, plan for the future, and shift practice in almost 4500 school buildings across the state. Through advocacy and commitment, the regulatory changes can establish a formidable presence in New York State that move both the school counselor and school leader communities from mere compliance to full, meaningful program implementation. Finding common ground and purpose in the new expectations can lead to meaningful change in school counseling practice and outcomes. Olson (2017) reminds us, "Without structures in an organization to transfer policy into practice there will be no change" (p.14). The journey from compliance to coherence has thus just begun; time and commitment will allow the promise of fulfillment to be realized.

References

Aldrich, H., & Herker, D. (1977). Boundary spanning roles and organizational structure. *The Academy of Management Review, 2*(2), 217-230.

Alvoid, L., & Black Jr., W. L. (2014). *The changing role of the principal: How high-achieving districts are recalibrating school leadership.* Center for American Progress. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED561099.pdf

Alvy, H. (2017). Fighting for change in your school: How to avoid fads and focus on substance. ASCD.

Amatea, E. S., & Clark, M. A. (2005). Changing schools, changing counselors: A qualitative study of school administrators' conceptions of the school counselor role. *Professional School Counseling.* https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X0500900101

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

American School Counselor Association. (2005). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (2nd ed.). American School Counselor Association.

American School Counselor Association. (2012). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). American School Counselor Association.

American School Counselor Association. (2019). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (4th ed.). American School Counselor Association.

American School Counselor Association. (2014). *The ASCA mindsets & behaviors* for

   student success: K-12 college- and career-readiness standards for every

   student. American School Counselor Association.

American School Counselor Association & National Association of School Counselors

   (2020). *School reentry considerations supporting student social and emotional*

   learning and mental and behavioral health amidst COVID-19.

   https://schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/Publications/SchoolReentry.pdf

Beale, A.V., & McCay, E. (2001). Selecting school counselors: What administrators

   should look for in prospective candidates. *The Clearing House, 74*(5), 257-260.

Belling, S. D. (2009, October 13). *Who are they? Employee perception of organizational*

   decision making. [Paper presentation]. PMI® Global Congress 2009—North

   America, Orlando, FL. https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/employee-perception-

   organizational-decision-making-66

Bilzing, D. (1996). *Wisconsin Developmental Guidance Model.* Wisconsin Department

   of Education.

Boyer, E. L. (1988). Exploring the future: Seeking new challenges. *Journal of College*

   Admissions, 118, 2–8.

Bruce, M., & Bridgeland, J. (2012). *True north: Charting the course to college and*

   career readiness. College Board Advocacy and Policy Center.

Burnham, J.J., Dahir, C.A., Hooper, L.M., & Stone, C.B. (2008). An examination of the

   psychometric properties of the assessment of school counselor needs for

   professional development survey (ASCNPD). *Research in the Schools,15*, 51-63.

Campbell, C., & Dahir, C. (1997). The national standards for school counseling

   programs. American School Counselor Association.

Carrell, S. E. & Hoekstra, M. (2014). Are school counselors an effective education input? Economics Letters, 125(1), 66-69.

Cary, J. & Dimmitt, C. (2012). School counseling and student outcomes: Summary of six statewide studies. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(2), 146-153. https://doi.org/doi: 10.1177/2156759X0001600204

Centers for Disease Controls (2020, July 1). Considerations for K-12 schools: Readiness and planning tool. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/downloads/community/School-Admin-K12-readiness-and-planning-tool.pdf

Chandler, J., Burnham, J. J., & Dahir, C. A. (2008). Counseling versus non-counseling duties: Examining the past and present in school counseling. *Alabama Counseling Association Journal, 34*, 44-59.

Chandler, J, Burnham, J., Riechel, M., Dahir, C., Stone, C., & Oliver, D. (2018). Assessing the counseling and non-counseling roles of school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 16*(7). http://www.jsc.montana.edu/articles/v16n7.pdf

Cinotti, D. (2014). Competing professional identity models in school counseling: A historical perspective. *The Professional Counselor, 4*(5), 417-425.

Cisler, A. & Bruce, M. A. (2013). Principals: What are their roles and responsibilities? Journal of School Counseling, 11(10), 1-27.

Clemens, E.V., Milsom, A., & Cashwell, C.S. (2009). Using leader-member exchange theory to examine principal-school counselor relationships to school counselors' roles, job satisfaction, and turnover. *Professional School Counseling, 13,* 75-85.

College Board, American School Counselor Association, & National Association of Secondary School Principals (2009). *Finding a way: Practical examples of how an effective principal-counselor relationship can lead to success for all students.*

https://secure-media.collegeboard.org/digitalServices/pdf/nosca/finding-a-way.pdf

Dahir, C., Burnham, J., Stone, C. (2009). Listen to the voices: School counselors and comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling, 12,* 182-192.

Dahir, C. & Stone, C. (2019). The assessment of school counselor needs for professional development [ASCNPD].

Dahir, C., Burnham, J., Stone, C., & Cobb, N. (2010). Principals as partners and counselors as collaborators. *NASSP Bulletin, 94*(4)*,* 286-305.

Dahir, C. A., Hatch, T., & Tyson, L. E. (2015). The ASCA national standards and the ASCA national model. In B. T. Erford (Ed.), Professional school counseling: A handbook of theories, programs, and practices (3rd ed.). PRO-ED.

Dahir, C., Cinotti, D., & Feirsen, R. (2019). Beyond compliance: Assessing administrators' commitment to comprehensive school counseling. *NASSP Bulletin*, *103*(2), 118–138. https://doi.org/doi: 10.1177/0192636519830769

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development.* Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-prof-dev

Dimmit, C., & Wilkerson, B. (2012). Comprehensive school counseling in Rhode Island: Access to services and student outcomes. *Professional School Counseling*, 16, 25–135. https://doi.org/doi:10.1177/2156759X0001600205

Edwards, L. Grace, R., & King, G. (2014). Importance of an effective principal-counselor relationship. *Alabama Journal of Educational Leadership*, *1,* 34-42. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1097546.pdf

Education Trust. (2009). *Transforming school counseling initiative.*

www.2.edtrust.org/EdTrust/Transforming+School+Counseling

Fibkins, W.L. (2015). The graveyard of school reform: Why the resistance to change

and new ideas. Rowman & Littlefield.

Finkelstein, S., Whitehead, J. Campbell, A. (2009). What drives leaders to make bad

decisions. *Leader to Leader, 53*, 52-58.

Frye, H. J., Miller, L.G., & Rainey, J.S. (2018). Predicting school counselors' supports

and challenges when implementing the ASCA national model. *Professional*

School Counseling, 2(1), 1–11.

Fullan, M. (2003). *Change forces with a vengeance.* RoutledgeFalmer.

Geesa, R.L., Elam, N., Mayes, R., McConnell, K., McDonald, K. (2019). School leaders'

perceptions on comprehensive school counseling (CSC) evaluation processes:

Adherence and implementation of the American School Counselor Association

(ASCA) National Model. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice,*

34, 26-43.

Griffith, C., & Greenspan, S. B. (2017). Conducting outcomes research to identify

efficacious and effective practices in school-based counseling. In J. C. Carey

(Ed.), International handbook for policy research in school-based counseling (pp.

121–132). New York, NY: Springer.

Gysbers, N. C., & Moore, E. J. (1981). *Improving guidance programs.* Prentice Hall.

Gysbers, N. C. (2001). School guidance and counseling in the 21st century: Remember

the past into the future. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(2), 96–105.

Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2012). *Developing and managing your school*

guidance program (4th ed.). American Counseling Association.

House, R. M., & Hayes, R. L. (2002). School counselors: Becoming key players in

school reform. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 249-256.

Janson, C., & Militello, M. (2009). Where do we go from here? Eight elements of

effective school counselor-principal relationships. In F. Connolly & N. Protheroe

(Eds.), The school principal field manual for working with counselors (pp. 159-

164). Educational Research Service and Naviance, Inc.

Janson, C., Militello, M., & Kosine, N. (2008). Four views of the professional school

counselor-principal relationship: A Q-methodology study. *Professional School*

Counseling, 11, 353–361.

Kaffenberg, C., & Young, A. (2012). *Making data work.* American School Counselor

Association.

Korkut-Owen, F., Owen, D. W., & Ballestero, V. (2009). Counselors and administrators:

the collaborative alliance in three countries. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal*

of Educational Research, *36*, 23-38.

Kotter, J. (2008). *A sense of urgency.* Harvard Business Press.

Lapan, R. T. (2012). Comprehensive school counseling programs: In some schools for

some students but not in all schools for all students. *Professional School*

*Counseling, 16(*2), 84-88.

Lashley, C. A. & Stickl, J. (2016). Counselors and principals: Collaborating to improve

instructional equity. J*ournal of Organizational & Educational Leadership*, *2*, 1-21.

http://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/joel/vol2/iss1/6

Lee, V. V, & Goodnough, G. E. (2015). Systemic, data-driven school counseling

practice and programming for equity. In B. T. Erford (Ed.), Transforming the

school counseling profession (4th ed., pp. 66-91). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Leuwerke, W. C., & Walker, J. (2009). Informing principals: The impact of different types of information on principals' perceptions of professional school counselors. *ProfessionalSchool Counseling, 12* (4), 263 – 271.

Lowery, K., Mayes, R., Quick, M., Boyland, L., Geesa, R., & Kim, J. (2019). Principal and counselor collaboration for social justice advocacy: A standards alignment. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Special Issue #2 on Educational Leadership and Social Justice, 3*(2), 1-23.

Lowery, K., Quick, M., Boyland, L., Geesa, R. L., & Mayes, R. D. (2018). It wasn't mentioned and it should have been: Principals' preparation to support comprehensive school counseling. *Journal of Educational leadership, 3*(2), Article 3. https://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/joel/vol3/iss2/3

Martin. P. (2015). Transforming the school counseling profession. In B.T. Erford (Ed.), *Transforming the school counseling profession* (4th Ed.) (pp. 35-49). Pearson Merrill.

McMahon, H. G., Griffith, C., Mariani, M., & Zyromski, B. (2017). School counseling intervention research on college readiness, college access, and postsecondary success: A 10-year content analysis of peer-reviewed research. Journal of College Access, 3, Article 3. http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jca/vol3/iss2/3

New York State Education Department (2018). *Guidance pertaining to Commissioner's Regulation §100.2(j) guidance programs and comprehensive developmental: School counseling/guidance programs.* http://nyssca.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Guidance-document-100.2j-6-15-18.pdf

New York State Education Department (2016). *Report of Regents P-12 Education Committee to the Board of Regents.* https://www.regents.nysed.gov/report/apr-2016/p-12-education

Odegard-Koester, M. A., & Watkins, P. (2016) Collaborative relationships between principals and school counselors: Facilitating a model for developing a working alliance. *Journal of School Counseling, 14*(9). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1119083.pdf

Olson, M. L. (2017). *Examining challenges with measuring the effects of federal education mandates,* presented at University of Nebraska-Omaha, College of Education Spring Symposium. https://www.unomaha.edu/college-of-education-health-and-human-sciences/moec/_files/FinalResearchBrief_Olson.pdf

Protheroe, N. (2010). Making effective use of counselors to increase student achievement. Principal's Research Review, 5, 1-8.

Remler, D. K., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2011). Research methods in practice: Strategies for description and causation. Sage.

Rumsey, A. D., & Milsom, A. (2018). Supporting school engagement and high school completion through trauma-informed school counseling. *Professional School Counseling, 22*(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/doi: 10.1177/2156759X19867254

Sherer, M. (1998). Organizational position: Influences on perceived organizational properties. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, 25*(4), 3-18.

Strear, M. M., Patricia, V. V., DeCino, D. A., & Peters, G. (2019). Transformative school counselor leadership. *Professional School Counseling, 22*(1) https://doi.org/doi:10.1177/2156759X18808626

Thompson, C. L., Henry, G., & Preston, C. (2016). School turnaround through

    scaffolded craftsmanship. *Teachers College Record*, *118*(13), 1-26.

Tomal, D. R., Schilling, C. A., & Trybus, M. A. (2013). *Leading school change:*

    Maximizing resources for school improvement. Rowman & Littlefield.

Wang, F., Pollock, K., & Hauseman, C. (2018). School principals' job satisfaction: The

    effects of work intensification. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration*

    and Policy, 185, 73–90. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1179195

West, M. R., Fricke, H., & Pier, L. (2018). *Trends in student social-emotional learning:*

    Evidence from the CORE districts (Policy Analysis for California Education).

    Stanford Graduate School of Education.

    https://edpolicyinca.org/sites/default/files/SEL_Trends_Brief_May-2018.pdf

Whiston, S. C., Tai, W. L., Rahardja, D., & Eder, K. (2011). School counseling outcome:

    A meta-analytic examination of interventions. Journal of Counseling &

    Development, 89, 37–55. https://doi.org/doi: 10.1002/j.1556-

    6678.2011.tb00059.x

Wilkerson, K., Pérusse, R., & Hughes, A. (2013). Comprehensive school counseling

    programs and student achievement outcomes: A comparative analysis of RAMP

    vs. non-RAMP schools. *Professional School Counseling, 16,* 172-184.

Will, M. (2019, May 14). What's harder than learning? Unlearning. *Education Week, 7-8.*

    https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2019/05/15/whats-harder-than-learning-

    unlearning.html

Yavuz, O., Dahir, C., & Gumuseli, A. (2017). School principal perceptions of the school

    counselor's role: Traditional or transformed? Journal of Educational Leadership,

    Policy and Practice. 32(2), 81-97.

Young, A., & Kaffenberger, C. (2011). The beliefs and practices of school counselors

who use data to implement comprehensive school counseling programs*.

Professional School Counseling, 15(2), 67-76.

Young, A. & Bryan, J. (2018). The school counselor leadership survey: Confirmatory

factor analysis and validation, Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and

Development, 51:4, 235-249.https://doi.org/doi:10.1080/07481756.2018.1435190

Zyromski, B., Mariani, M., Kim, B., Lee, S., & Carey, J. (2017). The impact of student

success skills on students' metacognitive functioning in a naturalistic school

setting. The Professional Counselor, 7, 33–44.

Appendix

Table 1

Results of Post-hoc Bonferroni tests: School Counselor Priorities

Priority	Position	*M*	*SD*	Sig.
Provide professional development activities to teachers.	Building Level Admin	3.06	1.09	---
	District/Building Supervisors	2.35	1.09	.020*
	School Counselors	2.95	1.25	.023*
Develop and implement prevention programs.	Building Level Admin	3.83	1.04	---
	District/Building Supervisors	3.22	1.18	.030*
	School Counselors	3.65	1.10	1.000
Participate in academic department and/or grade level meetings.	Building Level Admin	3.86	1.10	---
	District/Building Supervisors	3.54	1.39	1.000
	School Counselors	3.49	1.21	.041*
Counsel students who have behavioral problems in class.	Building Level Admin	4.59	0.67	---
	District/Building Supervisors	3.78	1.03	.000*
	School Counselors	4.23	0.95	.006*
Help teachers improve classroom management skills.	Building Level Admin	3.15	1.34	---
	District/Building Supervisors	2.32	1.16	.005*
	School Counselors	2.90	1.25	.041*
Provide counseling services to students with special needs.	Building Level Admin	4.41	0.80	---
	District/Building Supervisors	3.46	1.35	.000*
	School Counselors	4.06	1.13	.033*

Table 2

Results of Post-hoc Bonferroni tests: School Counselor Practices

Practice	Position	*M*	*SD*	Sig.
School counselors are part of key decision-making teams	Building Level Admin	4.01	1.11	---
	District/Building Supervisors	3.56	1.28	.632
	School Counselors	3.38	1.43	.000*
Administrators work with school counselors to improve student performance.	Building Level Admin	4.44	0.97	---
	District/Building Supervisors	3.95	1.37	.349
	School Counselors	3.67	1.35	.000*
Teachers ask school counselors to consult with them on improving classroom management techniques	Building Level Admin	3.08	1.56	---
	District/Building Supervisors	2.14	1.44	.007*
	School Counselors	2.84	1.46	.886

Table 3

Results of Post-hoc Bonferroni tests: Frequencies of Specific Activities with Students

Activity	Position	*M*	*SD*	Sig.
Career and college readiness strategies	Building Level Admin	3.39	1.12	---
	District/Building Supervisors	4.03	0.83	.022*
	School Counselors	3.66	1.12	.201
Developing educational and career plans.	Building Level Admin	3.23	1.13	---
	District/Building Supervisors	4.05	0.70	.002*
	School Counselors	3.56	1.10	.171
Improving grades.	Building Level Admin	2.72	0.97	---
	District/Building Supervisors	2.64	0.79	.020*
	School Counselors	3.02	1.02	.014*
Strengthening interpersonal communication skills.	Building Level Admin	4.21	0.73	.182
	District/Building Supervisors	3.84	0.87	.000*
	School Counselors	4.39	0.73	---

Table 4

Results of Post-hoc Bonferroni tests: District/Building Expectations

Activity	Position	M	SD	Sig.
Involved in student programming.	Building Level Admin	3.18	1.30	.016*
	District/Building Supervisors	3.97	0.88	---
	School Counselors	3.32	1.34	.025*
Implement an individual student progress plan annually beginning in the 6th grade.	Building Level Admin	2.26	1.29	.006*
	District/Building Supervisors	3.17	1.22	---
	School Counselors	2.50	1.50	.032*
Require students to maintain an educational/ career- planning portfolio in Grades 9-12.	Building Level Admin	2.20	1.40	.036*
	District/Building Supervisors	3.00	1.41	---
	School Counselors	2.42	1.46	.118
Attend school counseling conferences and/or workshops during this school year.	Building Level Admin	3.37	0.88	.206
	District/Building Supervisors	3.75	0.78	---
	School Counselors	3.22	0.92	.004*
Keep records that document time spent on activities performed.	Building Level Admin	3.40	1.24	.050*
	District/Building Supervisors	2.72	1.17	---
	School Counselors	3.31	1.30	.043*

Biographical Statements

Robert Feirsen, Ed.D. is currently an Assistant Professor and Chair of the Education Department at New York Institute of Technology. He has an extensive background in P-12 education, having served as a teacher, school building leader, deputy superintendent, and superintendent of schools. His research interests include the school-counselor-building principal relationship, college readiness, and the role of conflict in organizational health. He has presented at regional, national, and international conferences on such topics as working with families to improve the transition to college, teacher and principal recruitment and retention, and, most recently, the management of conflict in schools.

Daniel Cinotti, Ph.D. is currently an Associate Professor and Director of Counseling Programs at New York Institute of Technology. Daniel specializes in the supervision and training of professional school counselors. As a counselor educator, he is an advocate for the use of comprehensive school counseling programs and his research interests include school counselor supervision and professional identity. He has presented at local, national, and international conferences on subjects such as fostering school counselor self-efficacy through supervision. His current research focuses on training future school building administrators to supervise school counselors.

Carol A. Dahir, Ed.D. is a Professor and the former chair of the School Counseling Department at the New York Institute of Technology and a specialist in school counseling program development, implementation, and evaluation. For more than 25 years, she has worked extensively with numerous state departments of education, large and small school systems, school counselor associations, and national organizations as a consultant. She has delivered more than 400 professional

development workshops in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as well as internationally in nations developing comprehensive programs. Carol Dahir continues to focus her writing, research, and presentations on effective comprehensive school counseling programs and continuous improvement for school counselors.