

**Does Holding a Teacher Education Degree Make a Difference in
School Counselors' Job Performance?**

David M. Stein and Scott DeBerard

Utah State University

Abstract

An important hiring criterion maintained by some school districts is that school counselors possess a teaching certificate and prior teaching experience. The present study examined the actual job performance of novice school counselor (interns) in relation to whether they had teacher certification and at least two years of teaching experience, or entered the school counseling profession as non-teachers. Results showed that standardized supervisors' evaluations of counselor interns' performance in four main skill areas (Professional Behavior, Clinical Skills, Teaching Skills, Hireability) were not associated with prior teacher training and/or experience. However, male, novice counselors were rated somewhat lower on the domain of Professional Behavior than female counselors. The methodological advantages of studying the teacher-counselor question using novice counselors and expert supervisor-evaluators are discussed. The implications for graduate program training and hiring practices are summarized.

Keywords: school counselor training, teaching experience, counselor effectiveness

Does Holding a Teacher Education Degree Make a Difference in School Counselors Job Performance?

One important criterion many school districts consider when screening school counselor applicants is whether they possess prior teaching experience. For example, in one regional survey, 35% of guidance supervisors avowed they would not consider hiring a school counselor who did not have prior teaching experience (Beale, 1992). Use of a teaching certification/experience hiring criterion may be guided at least in part by state licensing or certification statutes. Indeed, a review of the American School Counseling Association's (2007) summary of state school counselor certification requirements reveals that nationally, about 15% of districts require prior teacher education training (and usually, at least two years of prior teaching experience). Though the proportion of states requiring teaching experience has decreased in recent years, many administrators and teachers still seem to prefer to hire school counselors with classroom teaching experience (Peterson, Goodman, Keller, & McCauley, 2004). This preference often appears to be based on the rationale that counselors with teaching licenses are likely to be more knowledgeable about the dynamics, structure, politics etc., of schools than non-teacher counselors (Olson and Allen, 1993). Such a presumption has several important implications for how school districts define requirements for their pool of prospective counselor job applicants. It also has a major impact on the nature of academic and work experience prerequisites that college and university counselor training programs will maintain for students. For instance, if students without teaching backgrounds are admitted to counselor training programs, what additional teacher-training should be required so that their resume is credible to

school districts? On the other hand, if research data shows that formal teaching credentials are unrelated to school counselors' success, there may be a need to better educate hiring staff in school personnel offices and administrators, who may presently presume that such credentials are critical.

Overview of Empirical Research

Is there an empirical basis for the widespread belief that teacher certification/teaching experience is critical (or substantively useful) to one's role as a school counselor? Remarkably, there has been very few relevant empirical studies on the teacher-counselor question during the past 24 years. Most recent investigations of the question of whether teaching experience is important to counselor effectiveness have produced ambiguous results because of research design limitations and methodological flaws. Primarily, most recent studies have assessed counselors', teachers' and administrators' attitudes and beliefs about the relevance of teaching experience for counselors; none have specifically studied the *actual job performance* of teacher- and non-teacher school counselors. For example, Beale and Bost (1983) asked school principals whether they would likely use the selection criteria listed in a school counselor hiring checklist. One item on the list, "teaching experience," was marked affirmatively by all of the principals. It is unclear what principals' universal endorsement of this "teaching experience" item actually implied. Were principals basing their endorsement on hiring tradition, direct, personal experience, their understanding of the research on this issue, or administration policies?

In a similar vein, Quarto (1999) mailed a questionnaire to a sample of school teachers, asking them to judge three prototype school counselors on their likely

effectiveness. The prototype counselors were described as having either: 1) teaching experience; 2) community mental health experience; or, 3) insurance sales experience. The teachers reported their beliefs about the likely “general effectiveness” of each counselor type, as well as their perceptions of each counselors’ likely skill in dealing with academic difficulties and emotional/behavior problems. On all three domains, teachers assigned higher ratings to the prototype counselors designated as having teaching experience. Unfortunately, a significant methodological bias was that the authors asked teachers to avow whether they thought teaching training/experience was of greater or lesser importance than *mental health or insurance sales experience* was to the functioning of any school counselor. This would be similar to asking surgeons whether they thought nurses with pharmacy training were more competent than those with say, a real estate job background.

Only one literature review of the topic has been published to date. Baker (1994) examined “older” research studies (pre-1980) separately from “newer” research (post 1980). Baker correctly presumed that research from older studies may not be applicable to screening prospective school counselors during the 1990s, given the dramatic changes in the training, accreditation standards and job roles of school counseling programs that occurred during those particular decades. Nonetheless, when Baker considered all studies published prior to 1980, he concluded: “When effectiveness of counselors was operationalized as characteristics that are important in counseling relationships, the data sometimes indicated that teaching experience could be detrimental, or there were no differences among counselors” (p. 321).

Subsequent to Baker's literature review, Olsen and Allen (1993) asked a large sample of school principals to directly evaluate individual counselors at their schools. The authors found no significant, overall differences in principals' ratings of counselors who had teaching experience and those who did not. Yet, within a small subgroup of middle school counselors (18% of the overall group), differences were found. (i.e., counselors who had been school teachers were rated higher on teacher consultation, individual counseling, and advisory committee participation). On the other hand, no differences between groups were reported on 10 other critical job tasks. Furthermore, when counselors from all K-12 levels were combined, no significant overall differences were found between counselors who had teaching experience and those who did not.

More recently, Criswell (2005) asked K-12 teachers whether they perceived counselors with teaching experience were more effective than counselors without teaching experience in five job domains. A statistically significant difference in perceived effectiveness favoring counselors with teaching experience was found. The breadth of teachers' actual experience working with both teacher and non-teacher counselors is unclear. Thus, it is uncertain whether a few, some or most teachers across the K-12 grade levels in this study had an adequate frame of reference for offering valid, comparative judgments.

More recently, Bringman and Lee (2008) asked counselors with and without prior teaching experience to rate how competent they felt they were in offering developmental classroom lessons. The researchers found that both groups of counselors rated themselves at the favorable, high end of the scale. There was a modest, statistically-significant difference i.e., teacher-counselors were somewhat higher than nonteacher

counselors. The difference in teaching confidence dissipated however, when counseling experience in schools per se was considered. The researchers suggest that additional research examining teacher versus non-teacher counselors' actual performance and competence in various counseling roles and activities is needed.

Methodological and Measurement Issues

Taken together, neither the arguments in support of hiring counselors with teaching experience nor assertions regarding the possible risks and limitations of doing so have been based on empirical data on actual counselor performance outcomes in the schools. As has been noted, past studies are of limited value because they primarily addressed the teaching experience/nonexperienced question by surveying teachers' and principals' personal beliefs regarding whether counselors should possess teaching experience. Obviously, such surveys may have much to say about administrators' perceptions and *a priori* beliefs, but these may or may not be based on *actual job performance data* on school counselors. Researchers have also assessed teacher and non-teacher counselors' self-appraised skills or confidence, rather than utilizing objective measures of job performance.

Furthermore, researchers addressing the teacher-counselor question have not used the most ecologically valid sources of evidence regarding school counselors' performance in studies. That is, when researchers have sought to assess the job performance of teacher and non-teacher counselors, they have routinely asked teachers, principals or superintendents to conduct the evaluations. It would be optimal to ask experienced, senior school counselors to evaluate early-career, novice counselors in a standardized manner. Such individuals are in a position to closely track

the daily activities of counselors and evaluate them in every component of their job role. Though teachers and principals interact with school counselors in a number of contexts, their perspective is based on episodic contacts with the counselor. On the other hand, senior school counselors are in an optimal position to evaluate the job performance of junior counselors, as they work with them daily. In addition, confounding the evaluation of highly experienced teacher/non-teacher school counselors is the fact that both groups have accumulated substantial, informal on-the-job training regarding teaching and the dynamics and politics of schools. Therefore, to avoid this confusion when addressing the teacher versus nonteaching counselor question it is best to study very “new” school counselors.

The present study was designed to address the question of the relevance of possessing a teacher education credential to actual school counseling performance. It addresses the methodological limitations of past studies by examining the teacher/nonteacher school counselor question using: 1) experienced, expert school counselors as evaluators; and 2) studying teacher and non-teacher novice counselor, rather than experienced (i.e., “school-seasoned”) counselors; and 3) using an objective standardized assessments of actual job performance. The study focuses on several related questions:

1. In general, do practicing school counselors who supervise novice school counselors (interns) tend to award higher job performance ratings compared to those who possess teacher education degrees relative to those who do not?

2. Beyond teaching versus non-teaching training/experience, are there any relationships between counseling interns' gender, school category (elementary, junior, or high school), and the job performance ratings of school counselors?

Method

The interpretation of the results of the present study is dependent in part on an understanding of the context in which the data were collected. Thus, an outline of the training of the novice counselors used in the present study, particularly their internship training requirements and how evaluations are conducted is provided.

The graduate school counseling training of the participants in the present study was provided by an M.S. graduate program in Psychology/School Counseling. Outlined below are some of the key training features and internship procedures relevant to the present study. In the final semester of their M.S. program, trainees complete their required, culminating experience, a 600-hour school counseling internship in a K-12 school setting. These internship sites all utilize a Comprehensive Guidance Program based on Gysbers' (2004) model. It should be also noted that the internship follows a 200-hour practicum experience in a school setting. Therefore, the program provided both the teacher-counselor and non-teacher counselor interns with the same amount of exposure to counseling within school settings. Also, since the internship was a training program requirement, all graduate interns enrolled in the program participated (i.e., there was no self-selection bias in this sample).

Participant Characteristics

Counselor interns. Of the 142 school counselor interns included in this study, 78% were women and 22% men. Also, 88% were Caucasian, 7% Hispanic-American,

3% Asian-American and 2% represented various other ethnic groups. Their mean age was 29 ($SD = 5.86$). With regard to pre-masters-degree university training, 41% of the participant group of intern counselors were either teacher education majors or had trained/certified in that area. The other subgroup of participants were the designated non-teachers: Psychology (32%), sociology (6%), social work (6%); other social science degree programs (5%: economics, criminal justice, youth leadership; communications). Also, 10% of the total group had earned arts, humanities, or languages baccalaureate degrees.

All counseling interns agreed to receive written evaluations from faculty and their internship (school counselor) supervisors, and understood that assessment information would likely be included in various program evaluation studies. Therefore, all students enrolled in several graduate cohorts participated in the study.

Professional counselor evaluators. Important to the ecological validity of the present study was the level of oversight and supervision provided to interns by their school-based supervisors. The 139 internship supervisors (92% women, 8% men) who provided evaluation data on school counseling interns were experienced, certified school counselors (or in two cases, licensed school psychologists). They were all full-time employees of public schools and at a minimum, had at least 4 years experience as a school counselor and 2-15 years of experience supervising practicum and internship trainees (or mentoring new school counselors). They represented all three levels of schools: elementary (19.6%); junior high/middle school (36.3%); and high school (44.1%).

All supervisors agreed in advance to meet with interns one-on-one for at least one hour per 15 clock hours of intern service. They also agreed in advance to complete an evaluation form on behalf of the intern they supervised. Thus, all had regular, intensive contact with supervisees; and the submission rate of standardized evaluations was 100%.

Assessment of job performance. As has been noted, the outcome measure for the present study is a standardized evaluation form developed by the first author (Appendix A). This evaluation form had been completed on behalf of all school counselor interns in the program for the prior 12-year period. Basic content validity of the instrument was established by obtaining continual feedback from practicing school counselor supervisors regarding the skills relevant to the internship training experience, as well as state and CACREP training standard. The evaluation form contains 25 items that are rated on a Likert scale ranging from 1-5, reflecting supervisors' judgment of counselors' competence. Items comprising the evaluation have previously been subjected to a principal components analysis using varimax rotation. The analysis sorted items into unique subgroups (subscales) possessing high, within-factor correlation. The component loadings of items that define the inventory subscales are presented in Appendix B. Four subscales emerged from the principal components analysis which accounted for a total of 66% of the overall variance. They reflect the following knowledge and skill constructs: 1) Professional Behavior (such as ethical judgment, punctuality, ability to secure the respect of teachers, ability to adopt a student advocacy role, verbal and written communication skills, responsiveness to supervision, ability to work collaboratively; 2) general Clinical Skills, reflecting competence in areas

such as individual and group counseling, communication skills and assessment; 3) Teaching Skills and Instructional Technology Competence; and 4) a Hiring Desirability factor (i.e., supervisors' ratings of the likelihood they would hire this student as a counselor, were they in a position to fill a vacancy); and supervisors' level of comfort about giving the student feedback regarding their performance.

Procedures

Prior to the graduate student's internship experience, the school counselor supervisor received a letter of orientation regarding internship requirements from the graduate program. In addition, the school counselor supervisor completed an internship contract form during a planning meeting with the intern. The training contract specifies training goals, objectives, and activities. The primary goal is for the novice counselor to become involved a wide variety of areas encompassed by the comprehensive guidance program, adopted by the public school system statewide. Particularly relevant to the present study is the fact that the supervisor received an advance copy of the standardized evaluation form he or she would complete on behalf of the student at the end of the training experience (see Appendix A). They are asked to review the evaluation items on the form with the intern at the beginning of the internship, so that both supervisor and intern understand the criteria upon which the intern would be assessed. Also, supervisors are encouraged to review this formal evaluation with interns when it is completed at the end of the internship period.

To optimally address the study's research questions, participants' undergraduate major and teaching licensure status were documented, along with their final internship supervision evaluation scores. The educational/licensing grouping of supervisees'

represented the majors found in the college organizational structures of many universities: 1) social science or health majors with no teacher education/certification (i.e., such majors as psychology, sociology, family studies, youth leadership, criminology, anthropology, communications, recreation and social work); 2) liberal arts major with no teacher education/certification (humanities, history, arts, theatre, music, foreign languages, etc.) or 3) interns with teacher education/certification BA/BS program (major or minor in elementary, secondary, special education, early childhood). Teachers who completed a BA/BS major and later in their career, a teacher certification program, and who had two or more years of teaching experience were placed in the third group as well. This classification scheme was subjective, but was deemed to be consistent with how academic disciplines are commonly grouped within particular colleges at most major universities.

Data analysis. The first analyses compared supervisors' evaluations of novice counselors who had completed a BA/BS as part of a teacher education and certification program, with two other groups with no teacher education (i.e., liberal arts major and social sciences major groups). An accessory analysis examined whether statistically significant differences in supervisors' ratings existed between male versus female school counselor trainees.

Though group comparisons involving the supervisors' evaluation subscales (Professional Behavior, Clinical Skills, Teaching and Instructional Technology Competency, and Hireability) were of primary interest, analyses involving each item on the supervision evaluation inventory were also conducted. It should also be noted that since a few individuals completed their internships at more than one school, the

evaluations for that student were averaged, so that a given student contributed only one “averaged” evaluation form to the data set.

Results

Supervisors’ Standardized Evaluation Data and Group Comparisons

Table 1 presents the teaching and non-teaching group status of counselors, and supervisor scores for the four evaluation domains. Scores cited in the tables represent mean rating scores based on the 1-5 Likert scale of the evaluation inventory. One-way analyses of variance failed to reveal any statistically significant group differences in evaluation scores between the counselor apprentices who were non-teachers (i.e., social science majors; or those possessing a BA liberal arts degrees, or teaching majors/licensed teachers: (a) Professional Behavior ($F(2,141) = 1.52, p > .221$); (b) Clinical Skills ($F(2,141) = 1.60, p > .212$); Teaching Skills ($F(2, 141) = 1.94, p > .148$); and (d) Hireability ($F(2,141) = 1.59, p > .205$).

Table 1

Supervisor Ratings: Counselors with Social Science, Teaching, Liberal Arts Training

Major	Supervisor Evaluation: M(SD)			
	Clinical Skills	Prof. Behavior	Teaching Ability	Hireability
Social Science	4.69 (.56)	4.76 (.48)	4.42 (.45)	3.64 (.24)
Teacher	4.38 (.62)	4.49 (.52)	4.27 (.56)	3.63 (.20)
Liberal Arts	4.31 (.69)	4.53 (.55)	4.36 (.52)	3.63 (.21)

An item-by-item analysis (t-tests) of the supervision evaluation inventory was also conducted, focusing on skills and competencies that one might expect counselor-teachers to optimally perform (e.g., classroom instruction ratings and SEOP

conferences). No significant differences were found between any groups that could not be attributed to chance and/or simply the large number of analyses that were conducted (all $p > .20$).

Table 2 presents an accessory analysis; that is, means scores for performance ratings as a function of gender. One statistically significant difference on supervisors' evaluations of job performance was related to counselors' gender. Female counselors were rated higher on Professional Behavior than males ($F(1,141) = 8.80, p = .003$). The effect size associated with this difference would be considered to be of moderate, practical relevance ($ES = .55$). None of the other analyses revealed statistically significant differences. The small sample size (males who were also non-teaching, liberal arts majors, $n = 8$) prevented an evaluation of whether gender might interact with type of major in affecting counseling evaluations by supervisors.

Table 2

Supervisors Performance Ratings and Counselors' Gender

Gender	Supervisor Evaluation M(SD)			
	Clinical Skills	Prof. Behavior	Teaching Ability	Hireability
Male	4.30 (.61)	4.28 (.63)	4.29 (.58)	3.53 (.29)
Female	4.42 (.66)	4.59 (.54)	4.33 (.55)	3.63 (.20)

Discussion

The failure to identify the types of differences that many professionals believe likely exist among counselors with, versus without teaching experience invites a number of speculations. First, it may be that any deficiencies among teacher non-teacher counselors are small or extremely difficult to identify. Certainly, our own school

counselor trainees historically avow that they like working with school-aged children individually and in groups, and tend to possess a strong “helping” motive. Such persons may be naturally more comfortable interacting with children in classroom or small group teaching settings. That is, they may possess a high aptitude for teaching. Second, it may be the case that if differences between these two groups existed early in training, significant deficiencies are remedied through school based, experiential training (e.g., practicum and internship experiences with K-12 schools). Indeed, a common concern reflected in the available literature (e.g., Beale, 1992) is that counselors without prior teaching experience do not have an adequate grasp of the school culture and policies. However, a number of items included in the standardized counselor supervision rating form used in the present study addressed some of these school-specific issues. For example, items in the evaluation addressed such things as counselors’ ability to earn the respect of teachers, administrators and parents, grasp of school policies, procedures and legal issues. The present evaluation data suggest that non-teacher counselors’ performance in these other areas was as good as that of teacher-counselors. If group differences (teachers/nonteachers) exist upon entry to graduate programs, it is likely that the overall training regimen (particularly practicum and internship training experiences) are providing enough opportunities for trainees to learn to function well in schools. More specifically, they can quickly learn to competently offer brief classroom presentations, micro lessons, glean an understanding of the culture of schools etc. This latter point of course, has significant implications for training programs. Non-teacher trainees may benefit from regular exposure to school settings e.g., “shadowing” a school counselor prior to formal practicum and internship experiences.

Also, brief, formal training in classroom management, presentation skills, and how to engage children in group discussion, and basic instructional technology skills seem fundamental.

The accessory analysis involving the question of counselors' gender and performance evaluations revealed one significant difference out of the four performance domains evaluated by supervisors (i.e., Professional Behavior). It should be noted that about half of the inventory items were found to correlate with this evaluation domain most strongly (principal components analysis results) and therefore, it is the most prominent subscale of the inventory. A number of speculations regarding why women counselors were evaluated somewhat more highly than men can be offered. As one example, over 90% of counselor supervisors were women; this, in turn, reflects the fact that there exist significantly fewer male school counselors within school districts in the region in which the study was conducted. Doughty and Leddick (2007) suggest that some evaluation differences among male and female supervisors can be expected to occur due to the normative cognitive styles of male versus female supervisees. For example, males may be more task-focused and females, more relationship focused in their conceptualization of roles with children in school settings. Such differences may color the way female supervisors appraise male versus female novice counselors. Certainly, additional research on gender similarities or differences in supervision dyads may help clarify how and why supervisors tend to rate male and female supervisees differently.

A primary methodological advantage of the study is that it was specifically designed to identify teaching-related deficiencies (if they existed) among non-teacher

counselors, when such deficiencies might be expected to be most pronounced. That is, the non-teacher counselors evaluated in this study did not have the benefit of years of experience working in schools, which would have confounded the results. Eliminating this concern by using early-career school counselors (advanced school counseling interns) is a more valid way of documenting true teacher-non-teacher differences, should they actually exist.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

One key limitation of the present study was the absence of a broad range of evaluation measures for counselor-interns' job performance. Future research might profitably obtain more detailed evaluations of knowledge and skill in particular components of job roles (e.g., consultation, group counseling, teaching *pre and post* practicum and internship). Also, little is known about how supervisors' more intimate knowledge of novice counselors' skills compares to that of other school staff (e.g., teachers, parents, principals).

A weakness of the present study is that novice counselors' roles varied across school sites and supervisors. Some supervisors may have encouraged the novice counselors to spend more time in conferences with parents, while others may have engaged them more in prevention programs, etc. Therefore it is unclear how supervisors' emphasis of particular activities for novice counselors may have related to their judgments of performance on particular evaluation domains. While the evaluation procedures were certainly standardized in the present study, future research may benefit from examining counselors' individual and group variations in effectiveness based on their performance in more standardized tasks or roles.

Taken together, the results of the present study should prompt school districts and graduate training programs to question the assumption that having prior teacher training and experience relates to superior performance as a school counselor. The graduate training program that participated in the present study does not include extensive, formal teacher training components; however, trainees are expected to make educational presentations in their classes, and they are trained in relevant school laws, policies, etc. They spend about 750 hours in the schools during their training performing a variety of activities e.g., participating in SEOPs. There may be adequate transfer of training from such school-based experiences, such as practica, so that trainees are sufficiently acclimated to work effectively in the public schools.

School district personnel who hire counselors should be alerted to the need to base their assumption that prior teaching credentials are critical to effective school counselor performance on the best available empirical evidence. Unless a district hires personnel to both teach a specialty area (e.g., mathematics) and perform school counseling tasks, there does not appear to be a global, empirical justification for preferring counselors with one bachelorette degree area, versus another.

References

- American Counseling Association. (2007). *A guide to state laws and regulations on professional school counseling*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Baker, S. B. (1994). Mandatory teaching experience for school counselors: An impediment to uniform certification standards for school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33*, 314-328.
- Beale, A. V. (1992) Getting hired as a school counselor: Who decides and what counts the most? *Virginia Counselors' Journal, 20*, 61-66.
- Beale, A. V., & Bost, W. A. (1983). Selecting school counselors: Ranking the characteristics. *National Association of Secondary School Principals, 67*, 102-106.
- Bringman, N., & Lee, S. M. (2008). Middle school counselors' competence in conducting developmental classroom lessons: Is teaching experience necessary? *Professional School Counseling, 11*, 380-385.
- Criswell, R. (2005) School counselors with and without teaching experience: Attitudes of elementary, middle, and high school teachers. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 65*, 3704.
- Doughty, E. A. & Leddick, G. R. (2007) Gender differences in the supervisory relationship. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, & Research, 35*, 17-30.
- Gysbers, N. C. (2004). Comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: The evolution of accountability. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(1), 1-14.

- Henderson, P., & Gysbers, N. C. (Eds.) (2002). *Implementing Comprehensive Guidance Programs: Critical Issues and Successful Responses*. Greensboro, NC: ERIC Counseling and Student Services Clearinghouse.
- Olson, M. J., & Allen, D. N. (1993). Principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of school counselors with and without teaching experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33*, 10-21.
- Peterson, J. S., Goodman, R., Keller, T., & McCauley, A. (2004). Teachers and non-teachers as school counselors: Reflections on the internship experience. *Professional School Counseling, 7*, 246-255.
- Quarto, C. J. (1999). Teachers' perceptions of school counselors with and without teaching experience. *Professional School Counseling, 2*, 378-383.
- Sharpley, C. F., & Ridgeway, I. R. (1991). The relevance of previous knowledge of psychology to training in basic counselling skills. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 19*, 298-306.

Appendix A

School Counseling Student Internship Evaluation

Please CHECK the appropriate boxes below, and then offer explanatory comments if necessary in the COMMENT area below the table.

Skill Area	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	NA
Attire, professional appearance						
Diplomacy, tact in interactions with school staff, parents, children						
Understanding, implementation of ethical standards						
Promptness in coming to work, fulfilling tasks						
Adherence to policies and state laws						
Flexibility (versus rigidity) in approaching problems						
Respect earned from teachers, staff, principals						
Initiative, ability to work without prompting; initiates acquisition of new skills						
Energy, enthusiasm						
Cooperation, being a team player						
General verbal communication skills						
General written communication skills						
Working knowledge of comprehensive guidance/counseling programs: ability to plan, execute programs						
Knowledge of individual counseling theory						
Knowledge of individual counseling methods						

Skill Area	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	NA
Knowledge of assessment techniques						
Knowledge of group counseling theory						
Knowledge of group counseling techniques						
Interpersonal communication skills: counseling with children, adolescents (individually or in groups); ability to establish rapport; empathy, promoting client understanding, insight, flexibility						
Response to Supervision: preparation for supervision, openness to feedback, seeks information, follows through on recommendations						
Maintenance of a child/client advocacy role in the school; ability to balance administrative needs with child/student needs; negotiating skills, and ability to garner resources on behalf of students						
Classroom teaching and presentation skills						
Effectiveness in conducting SEOPs						
Effective use of instructional technology						

[Note: This is an abbreviated version of this evaluation form; instructions to supervisors about completing it, returning it, have been omitted.]

Please comment on your ratings of any of the above categories, if you wish to elaborate or explain.

What training goals would you suggest the student pursue in the near future? What strengths can he/she build upon and what weaknesses need to be remedied?

What overall "grade" would you assign to this student ("A" to "F")?

Do you feel comfortable discussing this evaluation with this student?

Yes _____ No _____

If you were in a position to make a decision, would you hire this student as a school counselor?

Absolutely Not Probably Not Uncertain Very Possibly Absolutely Yes

Appendix B

Supervisor Evaluation: Inventory Item Loadings on Four Factors

Inventory Item Name	Author's Name for Four Components			
	Profession	Counselor	Teaching Skill	Hireability
Attire, professional appearance	.646*	.234	.379	-.078
Diplomacy, tact in interactions with school staff, parents, children	.694*	.291	.317	.085
Understanding, implementation of ethical standards	.703*	.477	.160	-.090
Promptness in coming to work, fulfilling tasks	.714*	.272	.206	.103
Adherence to policies and state laws	.634*	.507	.287	-.154
Flexibility (versus rigidity)	.706*	.333	.111	.055
Respect earned	.659*	.310	.282	.181
Initiative	.675*	.297	.172	.325
Energy, enthusiasm	.631*	.345	.173	.157
Cooperation, being a team player	.739*	.340	.156	.218
General verbal communication skills	.697*	.401	.244	.218
General written communication skills	.664*	.372	.344	.036
Working knowledge of comprehensive guidance/counseling programs	.736*	.284	.175	.226
Knowledge of individual counseling theory	.412	.541*	.138	.057
Knowledge of individual counseling methods	.322	.884*	.122	.037
Knowledge of assessment techniques	.352	.808*	.130	.037

Inventory Item Name	Author's Name for Four Components			
	Profession	Counselor	Teaching Skill	Hireability
Knowledge of group counseling theory	.307	.808*	.320	.004
Knowledge of group counseling techniques	.215	.716*	.143	.060
Interpersonal communication skills:				
Response to Supervision	.186	.870*	.144	.125
Maintenance of a child/client advocacy	.509	.549*	.134	.350
Classroom teaching and presentation skills	.500	.502*	.130	-.050
Effectiveness in conducting SEOPs	.250	.239	.461*	.445
Use of instructional technology	.301	.306	.629*	-.123
Overall Grade Recommended	.139	.141	.816*	.105
Comfort Discussing Evaluation	.080	.083	-.055	.650*
Would You Hire?	.035	-.003	.027	.767*
	-.357	-.126	.123	-.472*

Supervisor Evaluation: Eigenvalues for Principal Components & Variance

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
Professionalism	14.28	50.98	50.98
Clinical Skills	1.90	6.77	57.75
Teaching Skill	1.32	4.70	62.45
Hireability	1.13	3.94	66.38

Biographical Statements

David Stein, Ph.D. is professor of psychology at Utah State University. He directed the M.S. program in Psychology and School Counseling for 14 years and specializes in training practitioners in empirically-based treatments and counseling techniques. His primary research interests include interventions with impulse control problems, and substance abuse among teens.

Scott DeBerard, Ph.D. is associate professor of psychology at Utah State University. He manages the Health Psychology area of the graduate program in the department. Dr. DeBerard has been providing practicum and didactic instruction to masters and doctoral graduate students in the areas of empirically-validated methods for the past 10 years. His primary areas of research include quality-of-life outcomes associated with major health interventions.

Correspondence should be addressed to: David M. Stein, Ph.D., Department of Psychology 2810 Old Main Hill, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322-2810. Email: david.stein@usu.edu