



Theses and Dissertations

2005-07-27

The School Counseling Psychology Program: A Qualitative Study.

Daniel Vern Barnes
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Counseling Psychology Commons](#), and the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Barnes, Daniel Vern, "The School Counseling Psychology Program: A Qualitative Study." (2005). *Theses and Dissertations*. 527.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/527>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

THE SCHOOL COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM:
A QUALITATIVE STUDY

by

Daniel V. Barnes

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of

Brigham Young University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education

Brigham Young University

August 2005

Copyright 2005 Daniel V. Barnes

All Rights Reserved

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a dissertation submitted by

Daniel V. Barnes

This dissertation has been read by each member of the following graduate committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

Date

Lane Fischer, Chair

Date

Aaron P. Jackson

Date

Melissa A. Heath

Date

Ronald D. Bingham

Date

P. Scott Richards

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

As chair of the candidate's graduate committee, I have read the dissertation of Daniel V. Barnes in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographical style are consistent and acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the graduate committee and is ready for submission to the university library.

Date

Lane Fischer
Chair, Graduate Committee

Accepted for the Department

Mary Anne Prater
Department Chair

Accepted for the College

K. Richard Young
Dean, School of Education

ABSTRACT

THE SCHOOL COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM: A QUALITATIVE STUDY

Daniel V. Barnes

Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education

Doctor of Philosophy

The service role and functions of school counseling and school psychology have been discussed extensively for several decades. The literature from each professional discipline is replete with calls to expand the training and service capacity of these school professionals. Simultaneously calls are made for even broader educational reform as it specifically relates to student pupil services. From within this context an integrated school counseling and school psychology program known as the School Counseling Psychology Program was organized and administered at Brigham Young University. This qualitative dissertation study highlights the perceived strengths and limitations of this integrated training program. The impact of integrated services and collaboration among student service professionals is highlighted from a regional perspective that reaffirms the value of grassroots level research. Lastly, the conceptual barriers and

recommendations of administering an integrated school counseling and school psychology training program are presented and discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I complete this dissertation study and my doctoral program in Counseling Psychology from Brigham Young University I am filled with gratitude. I am most grateful to my loving and lovely spouse and our four wonderful children. I am grateful for my program committee, the McKay School of Education, and Brigham Young University. Lastly, I am grateful for the mercies of my Heavenly Father and His Beloved Son, Jesus Christ.

This dissertation study is honorably dedicated to my spouse Melinda, and Joseph, Jacob, Jarom, and Amanda, our adorable children. My wife and our children have made a tremendous sacrifice while we have completed my doctoral program. I will be eternally indebted to my dear spouse for her loving patience, courage, faith, and strength that I have drawn upon these past years. My children have been patient, beyond measure, as their father has been occupied with completing his doctoral studies. Also, I am grateful to my parents whose constant encouragement and support have strengthened me through this process.

The support of my program committee and their loving friendship has been greatly appreciated. As I reflect upon my dissertation study I am humbled by their courage and find hope in their individual and collective commitment to truth. Their supportive willingness is an illustrative living example of their commitment to know self

and their efforts to help those they teach to do the same. I am specifically grateful to Lane for his friendship and “can do” attitude which helped me to find hope, confidence, and direction through this process. Additionally, I am grate to Ron for his personal attention, and our joint professional endeavors which formed the vehicle for his mentorship and our friendship.

Lastly, I am grateful for the patience of a loving Heavenly Father who despite my stubborn independence has remained present to bless, strengthen, replenish, and inspire throughout this endeavor. Furthermore, I am grateful for Jesus Christ, God’s Son, whose selfless atonement is available for all who seek Him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Review of Literature	5
Overview	5
The Profession of School Counseling	6
School Counseling Role and Function Debate	10
School Counseling Reform	15
The Profession of School Psychology.....	19
School Psychology Role and Function Debate	23
School Psychology Reform	30
Collective Student Pupil Services Reform Efforts	36
BYU's Experiment	38
Method	41
Population and Sampling	42
Instruments and Measures	44
Procedures	46
Methods of Analysis	51
Results	54
Overview.....	54
Broad Themes	58

Program and Degree Structure	59
Program Components	66
Program Administration	71
Program Perspectives	79
Summary of the Results	83
Discussion	90
Overview	90
Thematic Summary and Recommendations	94
Educational Reform Implications	105
References	108
Appendices.....	115
Appendix A	115
Appendix B	161
Appendix C	162
Appendix D	164
Appendix E	166
Appendix F	168
Appendix G	170
Table 1	59
Table 2	67
Table 3	72
Table 4	79

Introduction

Overview

Student services. The professional sub-disciplines of school counseling and school psychology emerged over time. The development of both school counseling and school psychology programs was heavily influenced by socioeconomic, national, political, legal, and international factors and the blending influence of related and more developed disciplines (Fagan, 2002; Goodyear & Bates, 1992; Paisley & Borders, 1995). Over the years, the most striking similarities between these traditionally distinct professional disciplines have been the decades of on-going role and function debate, the calls for reformation among school counseling and school psychology, and the collective interest in improving the delivery of student pupil services (Adelman & Taylor, 2000, 2002; Arman, 2000; Chemamie & Sutter, 1993; Fagan, 1995, 2002; Hart & Jacobi, 1992; Herr, 2002; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; House & Hayes, 2002; Lapan, 2001; Murphy, DeEsch & Strein, 1998; Reschly, 2000; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Short & Talley, 1997; Sink & MacDonald, 1998; Smith, 1995; Ysseldyke et al., 1997).

School counseling role. For school counseling, several role and function descriptions have been proposed around critical concerns. For example, the reality of mental health problems and the necessity of having counselors trained and available to provide assistance (Arman, 2000; Lockhart & Keys, 1998; Murphy et al., 1998); the importance of serving all students with a broad assortment of strategies through the delivery of comprehensive developmental counseling programs (Hart & Jacobi, 1992; Paisley & Borders, 1995; Perry, 1995; Rowley, 2000; Sink, 2002; Sink & MacDonald, 1998); the recognition of the value of comprehensive developmental programs coupled

with the reality of increasing mental health problems and the idea of integrating both aspects (Arman, 2000; Hackney, 1990); the value of collaboration among public school student services entities (House & Hayes, 2002; Murphy et al., 1998; and Rowley, 2000), and the calls to consider integrated service teams (Herr, 2002; Shephard-Tew & Creamer, 1998); and the realization that despite the recent efforts to bring clarification to the role of school counselors, the role of the elementary school counselor has not been clarified nor supported (Hill & Nitzschke, 1961; Lenhardt & Young, 2001). All of which are being balanced by the need to become more clear and purposeful in this time of educational reform and associated role and function adjustments aimed at meeting the needs of students (Adelman & Taylor, 2000, 2002; Herr, 2002; Lapan, 2001).

School psychology role. For school psychology, the history of role and function evolution through the twentieth-century has much to do with compulsory education, which resulted in the partnership with special education. This partnership has now become the foundation for the current calls to broaden the scope of the services of school psychologists (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Bradley-Johnson & Dean, 2000; Cheraimie & Sutter, 1993; Elliott, 2000; Fagan, 1995, 2002; Hagemeyer, Bischoff, Jacobs, and Osmon, 1998; Hall, 2002; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; Huebner, 1993; Nastasi, 2000; Oakland & Cunningham, 1999; Reschly, 2000; Shapiro, 2000; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Short & Talley, 1997; Sigmon, 1987; Wise, Smead & Huebner, 1987; Woody & Davenport, 1998; Ysseldyke et al., 1997.) During this period, school psychologists' role and functions as an assessment-sorter, intervention specialist, consultant, evaluator and administrator became progressively solidified (Fagan, 1995; Hagemeyer et al.). Within the most recent decades, persistent calls have been made for role and function modification (Cheraimie &

Sutter, 1993; Fagan, 2002; Reschly, 2000; Short & Talley, 1997). Yet, despite the observed need for change, little, if any, has occurred (Fagan, 2002) as several authors have commented on the strengths and limitations of school psychology's close working relationship with special education (Fagan, 2002; Oakland & Cunningham, 1998; Reschly, 2000; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Sigmon, 1987).

School counseling psychology program. In response to this failure to reform, the Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education in the David O. McKay School of Education at Brigham Young University (BYU) conceived, formulated, and implemented an integrated school counseling and school psychology program beginning in 1997. This program was designed with the intent of combining the traditional training of school counseling and school psychology, enabling graduates to become dual certified and qualified to provide the traditional expected service roles and functions of both school professionals. However, since this program's inception in the mid 90's to the present date, little data has been collected, and few perceptions have been formalized. Thus, little is known about the perceptions of these professionals most closely associated with the program regarding the effectiveness, the associated strengths, and the limitations of this unique and inclusive approach to integration and reform.

Purpose of the study. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to gather a relevant thick description of the perceptions and experiences of key persons who represent the context of the School Counseling Psychology Program at BYU, regarding the training program's perceived strengths and limitations. This information, collected through focus group interviews, will assist in gaining a deeper understanding of how the program has functioned and what purposes it has served. It is anticipated that the results of this study

will be suggestive of future program development and research. Additionally, this study will expand the relevant data pool pertaining to the national efforts to improve the quality of training and ultimately the value of services provided by school counselors and school psychologists.

Review of the Literature

Overview

The review of the literature is comprised of five main sections beginning with an overview of the profession of school counseling, which emerged as a sub-specialty from the discipline of counseling. This overview touches upon socioeconomic, national, political, legal, and international factors that influenced the discipline of counseling generally, and the professional sub-specialty of school counseling, leading to the second section which is a thorough discussion of the long-standing role and functions debate pertaining to the discipline of school counseling. This discussion includes a review of the various shifts in emphasis with the primary goal of broadening services through comprehensive programming, multidisciplinary collaboration, and integration.

The third section is an overview of the profession of school psychology, which also focuses on the influence of socioeconomic, national, and legal factors, such as, compulsory education, the educational testing movement, and the emergence and influence of special education, leading to the fourth section which is a thorough discussion of the long-standing role and functions debate pertaining to the discipline of school psychology with an emphasis on the need to expand, improve, and diversify school psychology services in addressing a broader range of concerns.

The fifth section is a focused summary of the collective calls for integrated student pupil services reform efforts for the professions of school counseling and school psychology. This discussion leads to the introduction of the School Counseling Psychology Program (SCPP) at Brigham Young University (BYU) and the purpose of this study.

The Profession of School Counseling

Origin of counseling. The profession of counseling, like many other disciplines and sub-specialties, has developed over time and has been influenced heavily by socioeconomic, national, political, legal, and international factors. In their overview of counseling Goodyear and Bates (1992) identified three essential and enduring attributes that define the discipline of counseling. First, counseling arose from social activism and is connected to the shift from an agrarian to an industrial society, as well as mass immigration and several factors influencing gender and culture. Second, the discipline advanced through vocational guidance and was heavily influenced by World War II and the resulting emphasis on career counseling. Lastly, the predominant emphasis on the growth and development of “normal” individuals within the context of rehabilitation and counseling centers at colleges and universities has remained constant.

Evolution of school counseling. Just as professional disciplines are connected to the context of their environments, so are the sub-specialties connected to the primary discipline. Paisley and Borders (1995) synthesis of the evolution of the professional sub-specialty of school counseling begins with guidance programs in the late 1800’s, that focused on teaching social skills, appropriate behavior, and character development. Their synthesis noted the shifting focus decade to decade from guidance to vocational and educational decision-making, personal growth, responsive services for at-risk students, and the present developmentally focused programs designed for all students.

Furthermore, Paisley and Borders synthesis is supported by the following statement by Hart and Jacobi (1992): “Since the turn of the century several school counseling service delivery models have guided practice ranging from moving through vocational guidance,

guidance, assessment, psychological counseling to comprehensive developmental guidance (p. 30).”

Paisley and Borders (1995) purported that a few significant factors, mainly federal legislation and the involvement of professional associations, have heavily influenced the profession of school counseling. The 1958 National Defense Education Act (NDEA), and the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) helped to strengthen and increase the discipline of counseling through specialized programs. In addition, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), and the National Career Development Association (NCDA) have demonstrated interest in the profession through the establishment of interest networks, ethical standards, support for legislation, and the development of standards for training programs to guide the preparation of school counselors.

Developmental guidance. Recently a wave of comprehensive developmental counseling programs have spanned the United States. According to Sink and MacDonald (1998), the majority of states have adopted comprehensive developmental guidance programs, and the majority of states without comprehensive development models are in the process of developing them or encouraging their districts to implement such programs. In 1997, 41 states had a commitment to comprehensive guidance programs, and more were expected and encouraged to develop their school counseling programs around developmental theory and the specific needs of their state (Sink & MacDonald).

In addition, but not separate from the comprehensive developmental guidance movement, has been the Educational Trust Initiative to reform school counseling which was backed by the Reader’s Digest DeWitt Wallace fund. This initiative has facilitated

the collaboration of school counseling faculty at various academic institutions with regionally-based district school counseling staffs. These teams developed “new visions” for school counselors with an initial emphasis on refocusing and strengthening the academic training programs for school counselors (House & Hayes, 2002).

Role and function shifts. In the past, as well as currently, counselor educators have passionately debated the role and functions of school counselors with respect to the preventative and comprehensive developmental perspectives. Some avidly support the mental health focus, arguing that school counselors are in the best position to provide this needed service due to their professional training and helping position (Guerra, 1998b). However, those who support comprehensive guidance claim that the mental health model is inappropriate because the daunting student-to-counselor ratios force counselors to exclude services except to the most “troubled” students (Guerra, 1998a, 1998b).

During the past decade, the comprehensive developmental guidance movement has become more widely accepted (Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Lenhardt & Young, 2001; Paisley & Borders, 1995; Sink & MacDonald, 1998), and more recently this approach has been strengthened through the Educational Trust Revamping School Counseling Initiative (House & Hayes, 2002; Paisley & Borders, 1995). Although comprehensive developmental guidance has become a primary focus, several authors have argued for various refinements. For example, several authors have encouraged the professional school counseling community to work collaboratively with other pupil services entities in forming multidisciplinary teams (House & Hayes, 2002; Murphy et al., 1998; Paisley & Borders, 1995; Rowley, 2000; Shepard-Tew & Creamer, 1998; Sink, 2000). Some have written about the similarities of training standards for school counselors and school

psychologists (Murphy et al., 1998). Others have remained focused on the increasing unmet mental health needs of students and suggest redefining the role of the school counselor (Arman, 2000; Lockhart & Keys, 1998). Others have promoted education reform that will lead to the integration of services ending the long history of fragmentation and marginalization of student pupil services (Adelman & Taylor, 2002; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March; Herr, 2002). And still others have suggested that in spite of everything we need to answer critical questions before we chart the course for reform (Lapan, 2001).

Current status of school counseling. As decades passed and as school counseling service delivery models have transitioned from one emphasis to another, the continued on-going role and function debate has been the one constant among the professional counseling and education communities with a wide variety of passionately held positions (Arman, 2000; Cunanan & Maddy-Bernstein, 1994; Hackney, 1990; Hart & Jacobi, 1992; House & Hayes, 2002; Lapan, 2001; Lenhardt & Young, 2001; Lockhart & Keys, 1998; Murphy et al., 1998; Paisley & Borders, 1995; Schmidt, 1984; Sink, 2000). The only primary point of full agreement has been the need to eliminate the administrative and auxiliary functions which are consistently added to the everyday activities of school counselors (Cunanan & Maddy-Bernstein). This disconnect has continued despite pleas to find consensus and new solutions to longstanding problems that may require new ways of viewing the current situation. For example, Schmidt (1984) strongly suggested that the survival of any profession must have the following ingredients: (a) a consensus regarding the function, roles, and professional training of its members; (b) a universal or common expectation from consumers of its services, and (c) a history comprised of data

which both demonstrates and supports the efficacy of the same profession. Hackney summarized the role and function development as follows:

Both school and community counseling have grown into roles and functions determined as much (or more so) by external forces as by their own legitimate character. In large measure, we wear ‘hand-me-down’ clothing, attempting to maintain our professional image while chafing from the misinterpretations of our role by our clientele and peers. (p.79)

Throughout the professional literature in which the professional roles and functions of school counselors are discussed, it is apparent that divergent views continue to persist. However, despite the divergent perspectives there are a few points of general agreement, which are expressed by Cunanan and Bernstein (1994):

School counselors have traditionally been expected to fulfill diverse—and often conflicting roles . . . the ambiguity regarding counselor roles and expectations has created confusion among teachers, support staff, parents, and students, as well as stress for counselors . . . Counseling educators and researchers are in agreement—auxiliary or administrative functions must be eliminated from the counselor’s day-to-day activities if they are to be effective in fulfilling their role. (p. 4)

School Counseling Role and Function Debate

Overview. Throughout the school counseling literature, several roles and functions have been proposed. The most salient themes include the following: (a) the reality of mental health problems and the necessity of having counselors trained and available to provide these services to students (Arman, 2000; Lockhart & Keys, 1998;

Murphy et al., 1998); (b) the importance of serving all students with a broad assortment of strategies through the delivery of comprehensive developmental counseling programs (Hart & Jacobi, 1992; Paisley & Borders, 1995; Perry, 1995; Rowley, 2000, Sink, 2002; Sink & MacDonald, 1998); (c) the recognition and value of comprehensive developmental programs coupled with the reality of increasing mental health challenges and the idea of integrating both aspects (Arman, 2000; Hackney, 1990); (d) the value of collaboration among public school student services entities (House & Hayes, 2002; Murphy et al., 1998; Rowley, 2000); (e) the calls to consider integrated service teams (Herr, 2002; Shephard-Tew & Creamer, 1998); (f) the realization that despite the recent efforts to bring clarification to the role of school counselors, the role of the elementary school counselor has not been elucidated nor supported (Hill & Nitzschke, 1961; Lenhardt & Young, 2001); and (g) the need to become more clear and purposeful in this time of educational reform and associated role and function adjustment (Adelman & Taylor, 2002; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March; Herr, 2002; Lapan, 2001).

The signing of the NDEA marked a critical time for the expansion and development of counseling programs generally, which the profession of school counseling has been a natural outcome. Since this time the roles and functions of school counselors have developed as Hackney (1990) described, much through the influence of external forces. Ironically, the roles and functions of school counselors have not developed equally across all service levels. Hill and Nitzschke (1961) made a passionate call for elementary school professionals to develop a satisfactory definition of their purpose and function.

The guidance function in the elementary school is not yet well defined. It would seem that the time is at hand for leaders in elementary education and in guidance to combine their judgments to formulate a clearer definition of elementary school guidance. (Hill & Nitzschke, 1961, p. 155)

Elementary school counseling. Though several decades have passed, elementary school counseling remains a profession devoid of a clear and unified role definition. Lenhardt & Young (2001) stated: “The school counseling profession has arrived at a crossroads, one pointedly marked by the need to define the profession, create a unified identity, and establish a public presence” (p.187). Several decades of research and debate on the role of school counselors have brought clarification to secondary school counseling but not to elementary school counseling (Lenhardt and Young). Despite the 75 years of its existence as a service entity, only 15 states and the District of Columbia have mandated counseling services at the elementary level. Lenhardt and Young (2001) suggested that elementary school counselors have a unique role “as the hub of school services” by providing connections for students, teachers, parents, families, communities, and administrators. These assertions were supported in a comparative study of elementary, middle, and secondary school professionals conducted by Hardesty and Dillard (1994). Their study revealed three major differences between the elementary and secondary counselors, (a) elementary counselors perform more consultative and coordination activities, (b) elementary counselors perform less administrative duties, and (c) elementary counselors work more systemically as compared to secondary counselors who had an individual focus.

Mental health needs. The Columbine High School tragedy seemed to re-affirm calls which emphasized the mental health needs of students and the necessity of focusing more on these factors (Arman, 2000). The ever-expanding stress placed on families and the public schools coupled with the movement toward mainstreaming of special education children continues to accentuate the need for mental health services (Lockhart & Keys, 1998). Adelman and Taylor (2002) argued that social, physical, and emotional health problems have been identified as barriers to teaching and learning. In fact, their study reveals that teachers from economically disadvantaged rural and urban areas report only 10-15 percent of their students come to school motivationally ready and able to engage in the process of learning. But approximately 75 percent of the students from affluent suburban areas are “ready” and able to learn (Adelman & Taylor). Furthermore, Lockhart and Keys argued that the push to mainstream students has increased the need for redefining the school counselor’s role to that of school mental health counselor. However, presently counselors are prevented from assuming a role that would allow them to address the increasing need for such services. According to Lockhart and Keys,

There is no indication demographically that the need for mental health services in the schools is a fad that is soon to change. Instead, given the expanding social stress on families and the public schools’ move toward inclusion in the mainstream of all children without regard for mental health problems, the need for mental health services in the school is more likely to increase than decline. (p.6)

Comprehensive developmental guidance. The proponents of comprehensive developmental guidance models retort by arguing for comprehensive services to all

students and not just to those who they identify as “psychologically troubled” (Hart & Jacobi, 1992). Additionally, House and Hayes (2002) suggested that the mental health role be replaced with a focus on academics and student achievement. Sink (2000) supports comprehensive developmental guidance because of the broad assortment of strategies targeted to assist all students in a productive and developmentally appropriate manner and in such a way that they earn the title, “psychoeducational resource specialist.” Perry (1995) suggested that the heart of education reform is change and that the soul is comprehensive developmental guidance, and as such, the primary tool to assist counselors in meeting The National Goals 2000. Some additional driving factors behind the comprehensive developmental guidance movement and the Education Trust Initiative to reform school counseling has been: (a) the belief in the capacity of all students to learn at high levels; (b) the school counselor, in assuming a leadership role can help the school and community remain focused on supporting student achievement; and (c) that service networks need to be created and coordinated (Hart & Jacobi, 1992). The three proposed main focuses of reform have been: (a) to improve the professional training and requirements for licensing of school counselors; (b) to improve in-service training to help support counselors and others who are involved in the guidance function; and (c) to utilize more effective instruction methods and counseling interventions in addressing student needs with the primary goal of increasing the overall college-enrollment rates and achievement of students (Hart & Jacobi, 1992).

The comprehensive developmental guidance effort has been strongly supported and widely adopted (Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Hart & Jacobi, 1992; House & Hayes, 2002; Lenhardt & Young, 2001; Paisley & Borders, 1995). According to Sink (1998) 41

states across the U.S. have committed to comprehensive guidance, which was expressed in the form of developed comprehensive guidance programs or programs under development. Burnham and Jackson (2000) sampled the adherence to comprehensive developmental programming, and they found that despite wide discrepancies there was evidence to suggest that school counselors are performing the functions outlined in current comprehensive models. Gysbers and Henderson (2000) recommended a three-component model of comprehensive developmental guidance which contains: (a) content comprised of the competencies driving the program; (b) organizational framework with a specific emphasis on structural and program components; and (c) resources that are available to power the program. One of the primary goals of comprehensive guidance programming is to reduce the time spent performing administrative and clerical tasks often referred to as non-guidance activities (Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Gysbers & Henderson, 2000).

School Counseling Reform

Blending perspectives. At times it is easy to view the mental health emphasis and the comprehensive developmental guidance movement as opposing perspectives. Yet, there are suggestions of wedding the developmental and prevention perspectives. Hackney (1990) suggested the following: “We cannot miss the call for a developmental orientation. Nor can we ignore the plea for a prevention-based response to societal needs” (p. 91). He purported that a vacuum has developed in the delivery of services, and that counselors are in the best position to intervene because of their specific orientation to human development, relationship needs, education, career development, and interpersonal and group dynamics knowledge and skills (Hackney, 1990). A decade

later, with the Columbine School tragedy as the impetus, Arman (2000) made a similar plea; however, he suggested that we avoid asking how such a tragedy could occur and focus on solutions for the future. He recommended that counselors, supervisors and counselor educators need to reconceptualize their counseling and comprehensive guidance programs and acknowledge the mental health needs of students.

Collaboration. Amidst the larger role debate, collaboration among school professionals is viewed as a vital function. Rowley (2000) comments about the importance of collaboration as he asserts that more can be accomplished by school professionals working together than by working separately. In so doing, Rowley (2002) acknowledged the fundamental commonalities due to the following characteristics of school counselors and school psychologists: a focus on development, consultation, coordination, and problem solving. Yet, he stressed that these commonalities are insufficient to overcome the separate nature of these training programs, and he attributed this separation to federal, state and regional role expectations for each professional, the structure of each work setting, and a history of not collaborating with each other. Despite this separation he argued that the use of collaboration through a comprehensive developmental guidance model would increase the effectiveness of both professionals for the following reasons: (a) this model has already proven to be effective in assisting student achievement; (b) this model is congruent with the developmental orientation of school psychologists and school counselors; (c) this model holds that collaboration is essential among school professionals for the delivery of integrated comprehensive guidance services; and (d) this model is the most widely supported approach to counseling services (Rowley, 2000).

Although Murphy et al., (1998) did not specifically endorse the comprehensive guidance model they suggested that the training standard similarities for school counselors (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, CACREP) and school psychologists (National Association of School Psychologists, NASP) present unique opportunities in providing student services through comprehensive collaborative models. Murphy et al. specifically noted standards for knowledge of multicultural, human development, and curriculum factors. Additionally, they acknowledged the similar emphasis on consultation, counseling, assessment, and the development and delivery of comprehensive services. They presented collaboration as a tool for eliminating the overlapping functions and roles that often create service gaps and decrease self-efficacy through commitment to a shared mission with each professional possessing complementary and unique skill and knowledge assets. However, they suggested that before strong collaborative relationships can be developed between both professionals, the significant barrier represented by separate support and guidance structures must be overcome. Yet, they suggested that through a collaborative approach the popular movement toward providing mental health services in the public schools could be accommodated by combining the strengths and skills of these school-based professionals. Furthermore, collaboration has been emphasized in the initiative to revamp school counseling through the Education Trust. House and Hayes (2002) encouraged school counselors to become effective collaborators who have the capacity to network, lead, advocate, create partnerships, establish learning communities, and operate in an interdisciplinary manner toward integration.

Service integration. Shepard-Tew and Creamer (1998) advocated for multidisciplinary teams consisting of counselors, school psychologists, social workers, and nurses capable of meeting the academic, emotional, social, and physical needs of school-aged children through collaborative direct services. Likewise, Herr (2002) suggested that integrated services receive greater attention with a specific focus on bringing medical, mental health, and financial services together at select school sites to intervene with children who come to school and run the risk of social and academic failure. Further, he purported that fully integrating the services of school counselors with other mental health professionals is important, although too few studies have been devoted to this topic (Herr, 2002). Another related problem associated with reform efforts is the fact that different schools require or encourage different models of intervention and are likely to continue to do so because needs vary from one school district to another, one region to another, and one state to another.

Lapan (2001) asserted that the continued development of school counseling depends upon the discipline's ability to improve answers to the following questions:

- 1) How can counselors' roles, duties, function, and interventions be transformed to be of greater benefit and impact for all students;
- 2) How can counselor time on task be of greater benefit and impact for all students;
- 3) How can a program be tailored to better meet the needs of each school;
- 4) How can the program become central to the overriding mission of each school;
- 5) How can better partnerships between school personnel, parents, and business and community leaders be established;

6) How can counselors better advocate for their programs with local, state, and national policymakers? (p. 291)

Herr (2002) claimed that past reform efforts have been attempted in a vacuum because they have only focused on the content and structure of public education and overlooked critical societal changes. During the most recent decades, problems due to social, physical, and emotional health have been identified as barriers to teaching and learning. However, despite numerous relevant programs and services, the work of student pupil services continues to be viewed as secondary to the primary function of instruction (Adelman & Taylor, 2002). Recently, the calls for reform have become broader and more inclusive as educational, community, and student pupil services systems have been encouraged to merge in various ways (Adelman & Taylor, 2000, 2002, 2003; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March; Herr 2002; Smith, 1995). They also suggested that reform efforts must take hold at the grassroots or school district levels (Fagan, 2000; Herr, 2002; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000) with the support of program graduates who have a shared vision and a substantial commitment to effect change (Dawson, 2000).

The Profession of School Psychology

Origin of school psychology. School psychology was informally yet heavily influenced by applied and experimental psychology and teacher education. After official training programs were initiated in 1929, they were formally aligned and blended with teacher education and clinical psychology programs (Fagan, 2002). Porter (1984) described the beginnings of school psychology as a time when there were no programs and no plans to become school psychologists, but a great interest emerged among select

individuals to come together to solve problems. Fagan stated that preparation programs were predated by the use of the title “school psychologist.” Hence, school psychology developed as a sub-specialty characterized by applying a child-clinical method in an educational setting (Fagan).

Evolution of school psychology. Fagan (2002) asserted that the mental testing movement from 1890-1930 had a significant impact on the training model for school psychologists. He referred to this period of time as the “formative years” of school psychology. Sheridan and Gutkin (2000) further revealed the foundation of school psychology by acknowledging that school psychology was anchored on a medical model perspective, which was initially adopted to facilitate the conceptualization, treatment, and service functions of the discipline. They purported that the medical model places an emphasis on assessment, diagnostics, and the treatment of pathology. However, despite the mental testing movement and school psychology’s adoption of the medical model, Fagan (1992) claimed that compulsory schooling was the most defining action for school psychology, other pupil personnel services, and the resulting link between school psychology and special education (Fagan, 1992, 2002; Oakland & Cunningham, 1999; Reschly, 2000). “The preeminent force behind the need for school psychological services was compulsory schooling. The increasing enactment and enforcement of compulsory attendance laws between 1890 and 1930 dramatically changed public education” (Fagan, 1992, p. 236). Fagan (1992) claimed that compulsory schooling facilitated the emergence of special education, the increasing segregation in the public education system, and provided a fertile ground for the rise of pupil personnel services which

includes at a minimum guidance counselors, school psychologists, vocational counselors, and school social workers.

Psychoeducational assessment. Twentieth-century America and compulsory education influenced a long history of ascribed role and functions definitions for school psychology. This history solidified school psychology's primary and most salient role and function as sorter via psychoeducational assessment (Bradley-Johnson & Dean, 2000; Cheramie & Sutter, 1993; Fagan, 1995, 2002; Hagemeyer et al., 1998; Hall, 2002; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; Huebner, 1993; Nastasi, 2000; Reschly, 2000; Short & Talley, 1997; Sigmon, 1987; Woody & Davenport, 1998; Ysseldyke et al., 1997). Further, this history included adherence to a medical model perspective which is comprised by attending to assessment, diagnostics, and the treatment of pathology (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). During this period, the role and functions of assessment/sorter, intervention specialist, consultant, evaluator and administrator have become progressively solidified (Fagan, 1995; Hagemeyer et al., 1998), and they have been inseparably connected with special education where the need to determine eligibility for special education services and behavior modification is paramount (Fagan, 1995; Hagemeyer et al., 1998; Hall, 2002; Hosp & Reschly 2002; Reschly, 2000).

Current status of school psychology. Within the most recent decades, persistent calls for role and function change have been made (Cheramie & Sutter, 1993; Fagan, 2002; Reschly, 2000; Short & Talley, 1997); yet, despite the calls for change little if any role and function change has occurred (Fagan, 2002). Several authors have commented on the strengths and limitations of school psychology's close working relationship with special education (Fagan, 2002; Oakland & Cunningham, 1998; Reschly, 2000; Sheridan

& Gutkin, 2000; Sigmon, 1987). Presently, there seems to be consensus regarding the need for school psychology to expand, improve, and diversify the delivery of services to address a broader range of developmental concerns, with a greater emphasis on prevention and serving all students (Cheramic & Sutter, 1993; Oakland & Cunningham, 1998; Short & Talley, 1997). Additionally, there have been considerable demographic changes during this same period. The most pronounced changes have been an increase in the representation of female school psychologists across all levels (Hosp & Reschly, 2000, 2002), a rising racial and ethnic representation despite a heavily populated Caucasian majority presence, and the predominance of practicing school psychologists who are trained at the specialist-level (Reschly, 2000).

In summary, Lambert and Goodman (1992) in the Encyclopedia of Education Research stated the following regarding the defining aspects of school psychologists:

Nearly all definitions of school psychologist reflect a consensus that the school psychologist is the cognitive, social, and behavioral scientist in the school setting who designs, administers, and/or participates in a school psychological services delivery system. Through the application of psychological theories and research, the school psychologist develops and uses methods for appraising the psychological and educational needs of children and youths and thus establishes the basis for recommending and providing needed psychological services within an educational system.

(p.1158)

School Psychology Role and Function Debate

Overview. School Psychology has a rich history, and one of the richest aspects of this history has been the repeated recommendations for role and function change. Over the years, several authors have commented on and supported the need for role and function evolution and have gone so far to suggest that the role and functions are changing (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Bradley-Johnson & Dean, 2000; Cheramie & Sutter, 1993; Fagan, 1995, 2002; Nastasi, 2000; Reschly, 2000; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Woody & Davenport, 1998; Ysseldyke & et al., 1997). Bradley-Johnson and Dean (2000) purported that the extensive role debate in school psychology has yielded more articles than in any other discipline. The years of persistent requests to change the role and function of school psychologists has been obvious, yet actual changes of the discipline and the services provided to individuals and public schools is yet to be experienced at a significant level (Fagan, 2002; Nastasi, 2000). Nastasi (2000) made the following statement regarding role expansion in school psychology: “The enduring image of the school psychologist as evaluator for the purposes of special education placement reflects the realities of practice and failure to change despite repeated calls for role expansion that date back to the 1980’s” (p. 550).

Fagan (1995) used the descriptive terms of “sorting” and “increased segmentation” to describe twentieth-century American education and the long history which resulted from accepting compulsory education. Throughout this process two of the primary roles and functions of school psychologists emerged which have recently been joined by two developing roles and functions. First, the role of sorter which is the most visible because it is linked to the placement of children for special education programs

through psychoeducational assessment. Second, is the role of the individual and group intervention specialist. The newly developing third and fourth functions of consultant and engineer are becoming more visible; however, the sorting and repairing functions linked directly to psychoeducational assessment are still primary. Hagemeyer et al., (1998) presented a similar list with five major functions, (a) assessment, (b) consultation, (c) intervention and counseling, (d) research and evaluation, and (e) administration.

Educational assessment professional. The role and function of psychoeducational resource professional has been well established in school psychology as it is often the most common role and function (Bradley-Johnson & Dean, 2000; Chermie & Sutter, 1993; Fagan, 1995, 2002; Hagemeyer et al., 1998; Hall, 2002; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; Huebner, 1993; Nastasi, 2000; Reschly, 2000; Short & Talley, 1997; Sigmon, 1987; Woody & Davenport, 1998; Ysseldyke et al., 1997). Despite the never-ending calls for role and function change from the professional literature, over 50 % of professional service time is spent in providing psychoeducational assessment (Reschly, 2000). Although significant regional differences exist, generally half to two-thirds of school psychologists' time is spent determining eligibility for special education services which has been a constant trend (Hosp & Reschly, 2002). The typical role expectations involve evaluation for special education eligibility and placement, and behavior modification (Hagemeyer et al., 1998). The role of consultation is also well established (Fagan, 1995, Hall, 2002; Hosp & Reschly 2002; and Reschly, 2000), but no regional differences appear to exist in time spent providing this service which amounts to 25 percent of the service time. Overall, school psychologists were very satisfied with their colleagues and work duties; however, they were generally dissatisfied with the potential for promotion,

and wage satisfaction varied by region and level of pay. School psychologists still report a desire to do less assessment and more direct intervention, consultation, and research with nearly equal parts. Fagan (2002) asserted that school psychologists spend their time doing what their school districts require through special education. These functions also happen to reflect the emphases of their academic training programs. Further these competencies coincide with standards required by training programs to achieve, in part, program accreditation and enable graduates to receive certification and/or licensure to practice.

Medical model. School psychologists have implemented a medical model perspective to facilitate the conceptualization, treatment and services functions of the discipline. The attention has been upon assessment, diagnostics, and the treatment of pathology. Sheridan and Gutkin (2000), argue that this focus leads school psychologists to seek to ask and answer the wrong questions. According to Sheridan and Gutkin (2000) these questions should not rest solely upon pathology and maladjustment, but rather upon determining what roles and environments either foster or suppress the emergence of children's problems. In addition to the impact of the medical model, a number of structural barriers are imposed with the endorsement of this model. They include the following: (a) the heavy reliance upon reports and brief meetings ultimately yielding insufficient information to those who are responsible for implementing treatment recommendations; (b) meetings are rare and too brief, fail to focus adequately upon intervention planning, and at best only involve teachers superficially; and (c) often legislative policy dictates the "what" and "how" regarding services. These problems are further complicated in that school professionals are rarely afforded the opportunity to do

advocacy work to influence policy makers (Sheridan and Gutkin, 2000). Sheridan and Gutkin (2000) suggested the implementation of an ecological theory approach, originally proposed by Apter and Conoley (1984) designed to restructure and re-focus the psychological services provided in the public school system. This approach acknowledges that all students are a part of a social system, difficulties are indicative of problems within the system and not viewed as a deficiency within the student, discordance is viewed as a poor match between student and environmental factors, and the ultimate goal is to make adjustments to the system until it works for each student.

Link with special education. School psychology has flourished as a specialty area for the past 20 years despite the focus on psychoeducational assessment at the exclusion of other services (Short & Talley, 1997). The long-standing tie between special education and school psychology coupled with the influence of legislation has markedly influenced the employment and role functions of school psychologists (Reschly, 2000). Reschly (2000) referred to this long-standing tie as a two-edged sword that has provided constant financial support, which has directly supported school psychology but created the heavy demand for psychoeducational assessment. However, despite the constant calls for role and function change, which often include criticisms of the relationship between special education and school psychology, Fagan (2002) and Reschly (2000) asserted that school psychology's development has been contingent upon it. "Historically, had we never been attached to special education, there never would have developed a school psychology practice as it is known today by more than 25,000 practitioners" (Fagan, 2002, p. 7).

Broaden services. The history of role and function evolution in school psychology coupled with the special education partnership has become the foundation for the current calls to broaden the scope of school psychology (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Bradley-Johnson & Dean, 2000; Elliott, 2000; Huebner, 1993; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; Oakland & Cunningham, 1999; Shapiro, 2000; Sigmon, 1987; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Wise et al., 1987; Woody & Davenport, 1998; Ysseldyke et al.; 1997). Based upon the recommendations from Blue Print I (BPI), Woody and Davenport (1998) asserted that the goals of BPI have not yet been met because the time spent in assessment has not decreased substantially over the years, and as such, they support the recommendation that school psychology break away from the snare of psychometrics by providing a broader-range of services to the entire school. Furthermore, in response to Blue Print II, Ysseldyke et al., (1997) purported that School Psychology's portion of these challenges are the need for increased collaboration, the shifting away from psychometrics and labeling, expanding involvement and broadening the role, and focusing on the success of all students. Oakland and Cunningham (1998) summarized the general consensus regarding the association with special education and the desire for having a broader role and function definition with the following statement:

School psychologists often have divided feelings about their work in special and general education. They recognize that special education's financial resources often support services and that their work in special education is important. However, many want to have a broader impact by working with general education students and their parents, teachers, and administrators. Many believe that their working environments do not

permit them to utilize the full range of services they are prepared and want to offer. (p. 48)

There is general agreement to broaden the role and functions, but unfortunately less agreement in where to focus these expansion efforts. For example, Ysseldyke et al., (1997) asserted that the current necessary practice changes and challenges include the need to acquire and become proficient in new skills by improving training and practice, addressing the on-going role confusion, developing more effective methods of instruction, recruiting and retaining culturally diverse students, demonstrating accountability, working in a bifurcated system with multiple masters, extending greater efforts to collaborate at interdepartmental and intersystem levels, and addressing professional burnout.

Primary and secondary services. Cheramie and Sutter (1993) and Huebner (1993) suggested that the development and emergence of assessment, counseling, and consultation service provision in school psychology is critical because it integrates primary and secondary prevention efforts. Primary and secondary service expansion is a common focus (Cheramie & Sutter, 1993; Elliott, 2000; Huebner, 1993), of which counseling and crisis intervention services are frequently suggested (Cheramie & Sutter, 1993; Huebner, 1993; Sigmon, 1987; Wise et al., 1987). Among these areas of focus, counseling is viewed as the most preferred service (Cheramie & Sutter, 1993; Huebner, 1993; Sigmon, 1987), as it is perceived as a way of improving school psychology competencies and service abilities in the future (Sigmon, 1987); however, it consistently receives lower personal perceived effectiveness ratings from school psychologists (Cheramie & Sutter, 1993; Huebner, 1993). In addition to providing counseling services,

crisis intervention has been specifically mentioned (Huebner, 1993; Wise et al., 1987) as there is a reported feeling of being inadequately trained to respond to approximately one-third of the situations that present in schools (Wise et al., 1987).

Bradley-Johnson and Dean (2000) argued that the time has come to (a) increase time for indirect services (consultation, research, program development, and in-service training); (b) study specific school psychology approaches with the aim of blending theory with practice; (c) increase the emphasis on prevention of both academic and mental health problems supported by research (formative and summative evaluation skills to conduct needs assessments); (d) work with various stake holders rather than functioning as direct providers (parents, teachers, administrators, and school personnel); and (e) broadly define a diversified approach specific to a school setting that is broader than race, ethnicity, and gender.

Hosp and Reschly (2002) supported a greater focus on direct intervention, consultation, and research. More recently, Elliott (2000) suggested that a greater emphasis must be placed upon the following functions: (a) program evaluation; (b) prevention and intervention services; (c) alternative assessment representative of the growing diversity within the United States; (d) reduction of student to professional ratios; (e) prioritization of services with more reliance upon technology; and (f) improving collaboration by valuing and focusing more on teachers, parents, and other school professionals. Adelman and Taylor (2003) expressed and summarized this struggle with the following statement: “Probably few school psychologists will argue against the desirability of being involved in a broadened agenda for policy, practice, and research. The problem for them is how to escape the box they are in so they can do so” (p. 90).

Huebner's (1993) study of recent school psychology graduates revealed the greatest reported professional development needs were in the areas of general counseling skills, crisis intervention, consultation, vocational career training, family counseling, and program development. Huebner (1993) suggested that the profession of school psychology should focus on counseling skill development in training programs because they are poorly addressed in pre-service training programs, school principals have preference to involve school psychologists in counseling activities, and counseling functions have a high correlation with job satisfaction. However, it is important to note that some question the presumed appropriateness of the counseling role for school psychologists (Cherame & Sutter, 1993) despite the high correlations between the provision of counseling services and job satisfaction.

School Psychology Reform

The two levels. The role and function reformation calls have typically occurred on two levels. First are the recommendations to broaden services that do not require significant professional identity and training shifts such as inter-disciplinary intra-system collaboration (Bradley-Johnson & Dean, 2000; Elliott, 2000; Ysseldyke et al., 1997), and a greater emphasis on primary and secondary services (Cherame & Sutter, 1993; Elliott, 2000; Huebner, 1993; Wise et al., 1987) to name just a few. Second are the models to require the restructuring of student support services and significant shifts with respect to professional identity and training, such as community-based public health perspective (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March; Short & Talley, 1997), the eight-component health care model (Christenson, 2000; Nastasi, 2000), and school-based mental health services (Casat, Sobolewski, Gordon, & Rigby, 1999;

Motes, Melton, & Simmons, 1999; Pumariega & Vance, 1999; Shapiro, 2000). The central anchoring points behind these more aggressive reform initiatives rests upon the traditional philosophy of public education that has considered social issues other than education outside their area of responsibility (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March) and the assertion that the driving forces associated with special education are the reasons why school psychology has been unable to evoke role and function change despite repeated urging calls (Nastasi, 2000).

When considering educational reform Adelman and Taylor (2003) provided a key perspective when they openly acknowledged that public schools are in the business of education and not mental or physical health. As such they argued that the following threefold system is embraced by school policy makers: (a) to assist in the socialization of youth; (b) to prepare students to play a major role in the nation's economic growth; and (c) to teach in ways that preserve the current political system. Sigmon (1987) asserted that the role of the school psychologist is often "conflict-laden" because the discipline holds child advocacy as a basic tenet whereas school administrators place the needs of the institution above the students. Adelman and Taylor (2003), Center for Mental Health in Schools (2001 March), and Short and Talley (2001) purported that this perspective complicates the efforts of school psychologists, as well as other pupil services professionals to effect change. For example, they contended that learning depends upon a multitude of factors which constitute the learning environment, and schools must expand to address the reciprocal effects of health, social and economical status, and education.

Community-based perspective. The community-based public health perspective rests on the premise that public schools are important resources capable of providing public health and primary care services (Short & Talley, 1997). “The nature, mission, and structure of schools make them key agents for integrating health care and education into a comprehensive community-based prevention medium” (p. 237). Adelman and Taylor (2003) purported that marginalization is evident by the fact that consolidated improvement plans supported by appropriated resources are not extended to school psychology programs. And for these reasons Adelman and Taylor (2003) passionately advocated that school psychology adopt a public health perspective and move toward empirically validated treatments that reinforce the school’s mission to overcome marginalization and fragmentation. Additionally, they recommended that school psychology broaden its services and ability to serve more than a small proportion of youth who have chronic and severe problems. The focus of promotion of social-emotional development was specifically recommended. Further, Short and Talley (1997) suggested the eight national education goals comprised in Goals 2000 set the standards and helped to establish the mechanisms necessary to meet them. They purport that Goals 2000 has implications for school psychology as it will require major education system changes which pertain to structuring how standards are set, services are provided, and progress is measured.

Health care services. Nastasi (2000) presented a model for health care and school psychology reform that integrates knowledge and methodology from related professions and is more of an extension than a full replacement for school psychology programs. This model consists of foundational components (e.g., action research, participatory

sharing with other stake holders, interdisciplinary teams, active collaboration with others, as well as ecological factors), fundamental components (e.g., continuum of care, prevention, risk reduction, early intervention and treatment, integrated services, and culture specificity) and a conceptual framework. Christenson (2000) supported Nastasi's framework that is child-student focused rather than discipline focused. According to Christenson, 16 states have adopted or are in the process of implementing this model, which is consistent with the 8-component model of school health programs (comprehensive school health education, physical education, school health services, school nutrition services, school counseling, psychological and social services, healthy school environment, school-site promotion for staff, and family and community involvement). The weaknesses associated with the school mental health movement deal with the lack of research-based evidence demonstrating a connection between the coordination of school health and enhanced academic learning (Christenson, 2000).

Mental health model. The school-based mental health model and the school health program model rests on a similar foundation since public schools are viewed among the most predictable and extensive providers of mental health services for children (Casat et al., 1999). School-based models are located at the school-site and are fully integrated with the community of the school. The primary goals of a school-based program are to improve the behavioral, emotional, and academic functioning of children, youth, and their families (Motes et al., 1999). Shapiro (2000) suggested that the time has come for school psychologists to think bigger by becoming advocates for the promotion of mental health and curriculum changes designed to decrease the number of presenting problems that threaten academically healthy children. Supporters of school-based

programs emphasize the potential of improving accessibility and quality by securing early intervention before problems become chronic and maladaptive (Casat et al., 1999). The advantages of school-based service approaches include regionalization for efficiency and the opportunity for increased direct liaison between mental health professionals and school personnel (Casat et al., 1999). Although school-based mental health programs and systems are clearly in the early stages of development, some assert it is apparent that a new era of mental health services for children has come (Pumariega & Vance, 1999). The full range of educational, psychological, family and community problems continue to reinforce the need to reconsider integrated comprehensive services (Motes et al., 1999).

Collaboration and integration. Hosp and Reschly (2002) found that the attitudes and beliefs among school psychologists regarding discipline reform were very similar. Intraprofessional collaboration and integrated multidisciplinary approaches are viewed as essential keys for school psychology reform specifically (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March; Dawson, 2000; Shapiro, 2000; Short & Talley, 1997; Smith, 1995; Ysseldyke et al., 1997), and pupil personnel services generally (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March). Dawson (2000) and Shapiro (2000) agreed that the key to school reform lies in the necessity to partner with public education professionals to systematically approach this problem to task resolution. Shapiro (2000) asserted the following as the obstacles preventing school psychologists from addressing this problem critically. First, the association with special education to determine eligibility for services. Second, the difficulty effecting change in public education. Third, the scarcity of time that limits program development and evaluation efforts (Shapiro, 2000). And fourth, the shortage of school professionals across every level of public education

(Dawson, 2000). Ysseldyke et al., (1997) suggested a similar list by acknowledging the need for increased collaboration, the shift away from psychometrics and labeling, the focus on the success of all students, and the need to expand involvement and broaden the role of school psychologists.

I call for a significant shift in our energies to partner with our colleagues in cognitive and instructional psychology, special education, and education leadership and start attacking the problems in ways that lead to academically healthy and successful generations of children yet to come.

(Shapiro, 2000, p. 569)

District-level research. Sheridan and Gutkin (2000) acknowledged the long-standing calls for professional reform within school psychology and suggested that the lack of conceptual perspectives that take hold at the grassroots level is what is lacking. It is unrealistic to expect that one synthesis will completely turn the field around. Yet, through such efforts a critical mass of ideas and perspectives will eventually lead to the promotion of a new practicing paradigm. Fagan (2002) made a similar assertion with the following statement: “Perhaps it is time to encourage research on the role and function at a district-level using case study and qualitative research designs to understand the variables that most directly influence practice rather than emphasizing training and policy change” (p. 8). Dawson (2000) asserted that reform efforts can be facilitated through training programs with the following statement:

Ideally, every school psychology graduate student would be enrolled in a program in which the faculty has made a substantial commitment to

fostering the very same school reform efforts that they want their students to pursue when they finish their training. (p. 574)

Collective Student Pupil Services Reform Efforts

Overview. The Center for Mental Health in Schools (2001, March) report indicated that the necessary reform efforts will require the restructuring of school and community resources as well as the restructuring of the provision of services within public schools. Past reform efforts have had limited efficacy largely due to the reality that the bifurcated service delivery system positions complementary programs and service personnel against one another coupled with the impact of a specific problem focus rather than a concentration of reducing barriers. Furthermore, the impact of the existing reform efforts have facilitated the emergence of three critical themes (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March): (a) the need to move from fragmentation to cohesive interventions; (b) the need to move away from narrowly focused, problem specific, and specialist-oriented services to comprehensive general programmatic approaches; and (c) the need to move toward research-based interventions, with higher standards with a continuous emphasis placed on accountability.

Marginalization and fragmentation. Marginalization is evident by the lack of attention given to consolidation plans and certification reviews, and fragmentation is evident by the lack of cohesive interventions. Smith (1995) earlier asserted that school counselors and psychologists should work collaboratively through multidisciplinary teams is an approximation of The Center for Mental Health in Schools (March 2001) recommendation and vision. Smith (1995) purported that school counselors bring a holistic developmental perspective with strong interpersonal skills, program planning,

and vocational assessment career knowledge; school psychologists have expertise in academic and cognitive assessment, behavioral management, educational psychology, and classroom interventions, and as such make more effective prevention and intervention programs through collaborative working teams (Smith, 1995). Furthermore, these proposed changes are more significant than minor shifts in training focus; these changes are aimed at moving student pupil services away from marginalization and fragmentation into a position of primary importance and presence in accomplishing the mission and purpose of public schools (Adelman & Taylor, 2000; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March). A position where the external and internal barriers to providing non-fragmented and marginalized services will be acknowledged and addressed (Adelman & Taylor, 2000; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March), and where the traditional philosophy of public education that has considered social issues other than education outside their area of responsibility (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March) will be updated and revised.

Regional implementation. Sheridan and Gutkin (2000) suggested that the lack of conceptual perspectives is the reason why the long-standing calls for professional reform have not taken hold at the grassroots level. They suggested that such efforts will eventually constitute a critical mass of ideas and perspectives that will ultimately lead to the promotion of a new practicing paradigm. Fagan (2002) made a similar assertion as he encouraged district-level research on the variables that directly influence practice at the most basic service level. Additionally, Herr (2002) readily acknowledged the reality that the models of service provision often vary from one school to the next as the specific needs of students, availability of resources, and educational priorities converge.

However, despite the wide-spread service variability for the disciplines of school counseling and school psychology, Dawson (2000) asserted the ideal that student graduates enter the professional service community with the same school reform commitment of the faculty in their training programs.

BYU's Experiment

School counseling psychology program. Within the context of this on-going role and function debate across both disciplines coupled with the associated calls for student pupil services reformation, an integrated school counseling psychology program was conceived, formulated, and administrated through the Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education in the David O. McKay School of Education at Brigham Young University (BYU). This program was designed with the intent of combining the traditional training of school counseling and school psychology, enabling graduates to become dual certified and qualified in providing the traditional expected service roles and functions of both school professionals.

By nature, the design of this program is unique as it combines the training from two traditionally distinct disciplines. And as such, the departmental faculty determined that the most appropriate title for the program was School Counseling Psychology, which leads into the professional practice title as School Counseling Psychologist. In part, this program was designed in response to several local school districts requests to have access in hiring professionals who were prepared to provide testing, assessment, counseling, and consultation. Additional factors that influenced the development of this program were professional identity and practice problems based upon the personal experiences of the program faculty combined with the information gained through national surveys and

feedback obtained through the BYU-Public School Partnership and Counseling and School Psychology Task Forces. The reported primary goal of this program “is to prepare highly skilled school counseling psychologists who are capable of functioning in the demanding public school environment as professionals trained in a variety of assessment and intervention techniques (School Counseling Psychology Program Handbook, 2003-2004).” Please refer to Appendix A for additional information pertaining to the specific structure, objectives, and curriculum of the School Counseling Psychology Program. However, since this program’s inception in the mid 90’s to the present date, little data has been collected, and few perceptions have been formalized. Thus, little is known about how this program has worked (functioned specifically) and the associated strengths and limitations of this unique and inclusive approach to integration and reform.

Purpose of the study. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to gather a relevant thick description of the perceptions and experiences of key persons who represent the context of the School Counseling Psychology Program at BYU regarding the training program’s perceived strengths and limitations. This information, collected through focus group interviews, will assist in gaining a deeper understanding of how the program has functioned and what purposes it has served through focus group interviews.

Anticipated contribution of the study. The openness of this approach will allow for the development and exploration of expected, new, and unexpected themes, providing new insights, awareness of a rich perspective, and a deep understanding of the meaning of central themes regarding this training program (Kvale, 1996). Furthermore, the focus group interviews will allow emerging themes to be explored and understood openly and

without constraint of predetermined categories. In this sense, the interviews become “focused inter views” founded upon the perceptions and experiences of individuals representative of the context of this unique training program (Kvale, 1996; Patton, 2002). It is anticipated that the results of this study will reveal new ideas and perspectives on this integrated training model. Further, it is anticipated that this information will demonstrate how this program has worked generally as well as its perceived strengths and limitations in a manner supported by school counseling and school psychology discipline leaders with regard to recent reform suggestions (Fagan, 2002; Herr, 2002; Sheridan and Gutkin, 2000).

Method

Overview

Design. A qualitative focus group interview design was selected to obtain a rich thick descriptive understanding of the School Counseling Psychology Program (SCPP) based upon the perceptions of a representative sample from its context. The open non-predetermined nature of this design allows for expected, new, and unexpected insights to emerge. It also allows for a broad awareness of the perceptual impact of this training program to be revealed and understood. Regarding qualitative interviewing, Kvale (1996) purported the following: “An interview is literally an inter view, an inter change of views between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest (p. 2).” He further stated:

An interview is a conversation that has a structure and a purpose. It goes beyond the spontaneous exchange of views as in everyday conversation, and becomes a careful questioning and listening approach with the purpose of obtaining thoroughly tested knowledge. (p. 6)

In summary, a qualitative interview approach was selected because little is known about how well the School Counseling Psychology Program (or SCPP) has worked. Further, a design was required to provide depth and detail without the constraint of predetermined categories, thus facilitating the acquisition of a rich thick description and enhancing an awareness of expected, new, and unexpected central themes.

The population relevant to this study is representative of the context of the SCPP who are its various participants. The participant pool for this study was purposively identified with the express aim of increasing the likelihood that crucial thematic data

would emerge (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Kvale, 1996; Patton, 2002). The subjects in the study were those who responded to the invitation to participate and who later provided feedback through involvement in a focus group interview, or adjunctively with written descriptive responses submitted via email from individuals who were unable to participate in the focus group interviews.

Data. The data for this study were obtained through focus-group interviews. The focus group interviews were conducted on the foundation of the hermeneutic dialectic circle of interpretation interviewing approach (Erlandson et al., 1989; Kvale, 1996; Patton, 2002). The establishment of trustworthiness was built into the study by establishing (a) credibility, through data triangulation, referential adequacy materials, peer debriefing, and member checks; (b) dependability, through a dependability audit; and (c) confirmability, through a confirmability audit (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

Population and Sampling

The population of this study exists in the context of the combined program in School Counseling Psychology (SCP). As such, the participant sample was purposefully solicited from within this context, namely (a) graduates of the combined program, (b) field placement supervisors, current supervisors who oversee or direct the work of the recent graduates, and school administrators who are in a unique position to have direct contact with graduates of the program or oversee standards, curriculum, and certification efforts that are associated with the program, and (c) the core teaching and supervising faculty in the SCPP at BYU.

Former students. The first school counseling and school psychology cohort completed the program and received their Master of Science Degrees in August of 1999. Subsequent school counseling psychology cohorts have also completed the program respectively in 2000, 2001, and 2002. At the time this study was initiated, the cohort groups who began their study in 2001-02, 2002-03, and 2003-04 were still enrolled in the program and hence not included in the sampling process. This decision was made on the basis that they had no post-degree professional service experience to report.

Thirty-six of the 56 total program graduates from this four-year period were mailed the *Study Introduction and Participation Letter* (see Appendix B), two copies of the *Consent to be a Research Subject* (see Appendix C), and the *Graduate Information Form* (see Appendix D). Thirteen past graduates responded by submitting a signed release, and a completed *Graduate Information Form*. Thus, nine of the 13 responders agreed and were available to participate in the two student focus group interviews. Four participants were interviewed in the first graduate focus group, five were interviewed in the second group, and one student submitted feedback through email. The participants in the study represented the second, third, and fourth cohort groups. In all cases, the graduates from the first cohort group were either not willing or unavailable to participate in the study.

Public school professionals. The field placement site supervisor, current supervisor, and school administrator sample was purposively solicited to participate based upon several factors. These factors included the extent and duration of their involvement in supervising the role and function training of program students, overseeing training related aspects associated with the SCPP, and involvement with credentialing

standards for training programs within the State of Utah. In all, 36 school professionals representing professional school counseling and school psychology from across the five regional school districts who represent the BYU Partnership School Districts were sent the following: *Study Introduction and Participation Letter* (see Appendix B), two copies of the *Consent to be a Research Participant Form* (see Appendix C), and the *School Professional Information Form* (see Appendix E). In the end, 10 school professionals submitted completed forms, five of whom were willing and able to participate in the focus group interview. A sixth individual provided feedback via email.

Program faculty. The seven School Counseling Psychology teaching core faculty as listed in the program handbook (see Appendix A) and one emeritus professor were sent study participation invitation letters, two copies of the *Consent to be a Research Participant Form*, and the *Faculty Information Form* (see Appendix F). In the end, six current faculty members and the emeritus faculty member elected to participate in the study for a total of seven participants for this interview group.

Instruments and Measures

As is appropriate for a qualitative program evaluation design, the data gathered for this study was obtained primarily through group interviews with the aid of a general interview guide approach (Patton, 2002). The general interview guide approach is used to ensure that relevant topics are addressed during each interview, although this is accomplished through an open-ended format that is not supplied or predetermined by the interviewer (Patton, 2002). The interview guide approach provides a list of question areas or issues to be explored during the interview, but allows the investigator to freely explore, probe, and ask questions to better illustrate and understand various points. The

primary purpose of this approach is to ensure that certain general thematic areas are explored during each interview (Patton, 2002). Patton (2002) purports that an interview guide is the preferred and essential tool for conducting focus group interviews as it allows for the expression of individual experiences, perspectives, and counterpoints while maintaining a focused interview. The interview guide outline was developed by attending to the following (a) the program handbook, (b) national accreditation reports (NASP and CACREP), (c) the university departmental review, (d) two early in-progress program evaluation studies, and (e) anticipation of potentially relevant themes based upon the researcher's personal experience and perspective (see Appendix G).

The following is a complete list and short description of the instruments that were developed by the researcher for this study (see Appendix B-G):

- a) *Study Introduction and Participation Letter*—the letter that was sent to all possible research participants across participant groups.
- b) *Consent to be a Research Participant*—the informed consent for participation in study.
- c) *Graduate Information Form*—the brief survey form used to obtain personal and career information from graduates of the program.
- d) *School Professional Information Form*—the brief survey form used to obtain personal and career information from public school professionals who participated in the study (i.e., field placement, current employment, and administrator).
- e) *Faculty Information Form*: The brief survey form used to obtain personal and career information from the program faculty.
- f) *School Counseling Psychology Interview Guide*—the general focus group interview guide used for all participate groups involved in this study (graduates, school professionals and program faculty).

Procedures

Overview. All the participant groups were interviewed in a focus-group format using an open-end general interview guide (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002). Interview subjects were selected on the bases of their response to the invitation to participate and their availability to take part in the focus group interviews. A purposefully selected group of individuals representing each participant group (graduates, field placement supervisors, current supervisors, school administrators, and program faculty) was sent a letter describing the study and an invitation to participate (see Appendix B). Enclosed with this letter was the *Consent to be a Research Subject* form, the *Graduate Information Form*, the *School Professional Information Form*, or the *Faculty Information Form* depending upon their unique relationship with the program (See Appendix D-F) and a postage-paid return envelope. The representative interview participant groups were then contacted by phone and email to finalize the composition, location, and time for each focus group interview. The interview guide (Kvale, 1996; Patton, 2002) coupled with the hermeneutic circle of interpretation approach was used for each interview (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002). The content generated during the first interview with the program faculty was obtained exclusively from their responses to the general open-ended interview guide. Ultimately, the faculty's responses to this question, the remark made in response to other comments, and various points of clarification became the additional building blocks for the next interview group. This process continued in a circular and building fashion from one interview group to the next until the interviewing process concluded with the school professional group.

Former students. A list of the names and graduation dates of past SCPP graduates was obtained from the Counseling Psychology and Special Education (CPSE) departmental secretary and used to obtain the most recent personal contact information available for each graduate. The graduate focus group interviews were scheduled and conducted around the availability of the interviewees. Each group was comprised of graduates who represented different cohort years and graduating classes.

Public school professionals. As the field placement site supervisors and current employment supervisors were often the same individuals, they were identified through departmental field placement records and included in the same interview group. Additionally, school administrators who oversee standards, curriculum, and certification were included with this interview group. Contact information was obtained through departmental records, on-line school district directory searches, and with the assistance of former students.

Program faculty. The primary core SCPP teaching and research faculty were identified from the School Counseling Psychology Student Handbook and were invited to participate as one focus group. The researcher's faculty advisor recommended including an emeritus professor who was a key participant in the development of the SCPP. This contact information was obtained from public records and used to extend the invitation to participate in the study.

Interviewing environment. The focus group interviews were all conducted in a modern interviewing research laboratory located in the Richards Building on the Brigham Young University Campus in Provo, Utah. This laboratory is equipped with four independently functioning cameras with a synchronized audio and video recording

system the operation of which required paid technical assistance. The use, configuration, location, and equipment available in this research laboratory helped ensure confidentiality and provided sufficient space to adequately support the small focus group interviews. These high quality reliable audio and video interview recordings were sufficient to support later review and analysis. A light lunch or a full casual dinner was served during each interview session for focus group participants.

Ethical considerations. The three broad areas of ethical concern for participating in this study, namely informed consent, confidentiality, and adverse consequences resulting from participation in the study were carefully considered and guarded throughout the study (Kvale, 1996). Informed consent was obtained at the time of invitation and reviewed prior to interviewing to avoid subject reactivity prior to study participation. All prospective and actual subjects received a copy of the *Consent to be a Research Subject* form (see Appendix C). This consent form was carefully developed by the researcher for the following purposes: to introduce the evaluative study, outline the data gathering procedures, address the risks and benefits associated with study involvement, explain confidentiality, and clarify elective participation in the study and personal rights (see Appendix C). Furthermore, those who agreed to become research subjects by participating in the research interviews had the opportunity to discuss these broad areas of ethical concern prior to engaging in the focus group interviews.

Group organization and assignment. Each of the interview groups was organized by participant group, and each was largely dictated by participant willingness and availability. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, all references to former students and school professional participant's names, gender, or other identifying information

were withheld from the results and discussion sections of this study. Additionally, the raw data were withheld from departmental faculty to reduce the potential risk of adverse and undesired consequences associated with giving specific programmatic or personal feedback. Examples of this identifying information include, (a) cohort group, (b) district affiliation, (c) service role, and (d) the total number of interviewees per participant group. Only broad non-identifying information was retained in the data text, after which it was developed into interview themes and submitted back to individual participants to satisfy a member check on the constructed themes. With regard to the faculty participants, their names were withheld; however, at times the specific nature of the school professionals and former students' feedback required the use of programmatic or departmental titles to elucidate the results of this study. As required by informed consent procedures, the use of these titles was approved by the respective faculty participants.

Trustworthiness procedures. Several trustworthiness procedures were implemented throughout various stages of the data gathering process. For example, data triangulation, referential adequacy materials, peer debriefing, and member checks were implemented to establish credibility. Triangulation is the process of gathering data through different questions, different sources, and different methods to capture divergent constructions of reality (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002). Triangulation occurred across the three interview groups (different sources), and through the process of reviewing accreditation and university review reports and early program evaluation reports (different methods) (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002). These resources also represented referential adequacy materials, as they provided a holistic view of the context of the SCPP. Peer debriefing is the process of

stepping away from the context of the study to review insights, perceptions, and analysis with others who have sufficient general understanding but are outside the context of the study (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002). This process occurred with professional colleagues at the Utah State University Counseling Center and the Brigham Young University-Idaho Counseling Center as an adjunctive and supportive function to on-going individual supervision. Member checks involve sharing both the data and the interpretations of the data with those who were responsible for the original creation for verification (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002). This process occurred with each interview group as individual participants were invited to review and rate their level of agreement with the constructed themes and to provide additional written feedback.

Additional trustworthiness efforts included a dependability audit to ensure dependability and a confirmability audit to ensure confirmability of the data (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002). The dependability audit allowed for an external check to be conducted on the study. The audit trail was supported through a research journal, email correspondence, an interview schedule, and frequent consultation sessions with a work colleague at Brigham Young University-Idaho in an effort to provide an on-going account of the process of the study. Furthermore, a confirmability audit was conducted to allow an external reviewer to confirm the conclusions, interpretations, and recommendations made by the investigator (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002).

In summary, these audits were supported through a documentation trail which included an investigator's journal, email correspondence, an interview schedule, noted

critical incidents, documents, interview notes, and the charts and tables that lead to conclusions, interpretations, and recommendations posed through this study (see Appendix H, Audit Statement).

Methods of Analysis

The analysis of the data began with the construction of the interview guide. This process began and continually built as the focus group interviews were scheduled and conducted, and concluded when the broad content themes emerged in the context of the interview data, member checks and audit data in the tradition of the hermeneutic dialectic circle of interpretation (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Regarding the hermeneutic dialectic process, Guba and Lincoln (1989) assert that the interpretive character is representative of a hermeneutic approach, and the focus on contrasting and comparing differing views is representative of the dialectic process. Despite a focus on understanding divergent views, the purpose is to come to a richer higher-level of understanding and not to justify one's own purposes or attack alternative positions. This point is clarified by Guba and Lincoln (1989):

Nevertheless, the major purpose of this process is not to justify one's own construction or to attack the weaknesses of the constructions offered by others, but to form a connection between them that allows their mutual exploration by all parties. The aim of this process is to reach a consensus when that is possible; when it is not possible, the process at the very least exposes and clarifies the several different views and allows the building of an agenda for negotiation. (p.149)

These procedures were designed for the express purpose of arriving at a valid common understanding of the meaning of the transcribed interviews (Kvale, 1996; Patton, 2002). The use of data triangulation, referential adequacy materials, peer debriefing, and member checks helped to establish credibility of the data gathering process, the data, and the interpretation of the data. The audits were conducted to help establish both the dependability and confirmability of the data gathered and the interpretations extended (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

This process allowed the themes and any contradictions to emerge and be explored across participant groups in a back and forth processing, parts-to-whole and whole-to-parts manner in an effort to formulate a good gestalt allowing the interview data to stand alone (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002).

Furthermore, Kvale (1996) cautions that the transcription process changes the interview through decontextualization and detemporalization. Decontextualization refers to the outcome occurring when the content of the interview is isolated from the context of the interview. Detemporalization refers to the process of fixating a living conversation and, in essence, “freezing” it into stagnant written words. To avoid decontextualization and detemporalization the focus group interviews were not transcribed, rather the audio and video taped recording were reviewed repeatedly to isolate the relevant themes.

Additionally, the use of the hermeneutical dialectic process, and the integrated efforts to establish credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of the content themes were selected and used to reduce the threat of decontextualization and detemporalization of the focus group interviews. (Erlandson et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002).

The context rich perspective offered more breadth than anticipated and unexpected interview themes emerged naturally through the data gathering process. The two student and the school professional groups were video recorded. These recordings were used to generate the original interview themes from which member and audit checks were obtained. Since the faculty focus group interview recording failed, the researcher's notes and a debriefing session with the faculty supervisor were used to reconstruct the original content from which themes were identified and member checks were obtained. The failed recording prevented an audit on the original theme construction for the faculty interview.

Finally, the *Graduate Information Form* (see Appendix D) was designed by the researcher and used to gather information pertaining to current position, job title, licensure status, post-graduation employment positions, and the contact information of current supervisors and directors if needed. The *School Professional Information Form* (see Appendix E) was designed and used to gather information pertaining to educational background and degrees held, current position title, and professional licensure/certification status. The *Faculty Information Form* (see Appendix F) was designed and used to gather information regarding educational training and degrees held, professional service experience, and professional licensure/certification.

Results

Overview

The data gathered for this study were obtained from professionals involved with the SCPP at BYU, including former students, program faculty, and regional school professionals with degrees in school psychology or school counseling who provided supervision and training or who oversaw training standards for these professionals. The SCPP was a 64 semester-hour master of science degree program with 52 hours of academic course work and 12 hours of field placement training. The full-time core faculty was comprised of seven faculty members with varying levels of involvement with the SCPP.

Two circumstances required the modification of the intended data analysis process. First, the information forms for the graduates, school professionals, and faculty were determined to be of little or no value. Some forms were completed in great detail, whereas others were either not returned or returned with limited data. Secondly, at the conclusion of the faculty focus group interview, the researcher was informed the audio recording had failed. Fortunately, the researcher had taken extensive notes during this interview. The researcher and committee chair used these notes and their collective memories to collaboratively reconstruct the content and process of the interview. Furthermore, the researcher informed the faculty participants of the failure and received a careful member check.

Due to the sensitive nature of some of the reported data, some demographical and programmatic faculty role information has been modified. This was done in an effort to protect individuals' professional identity and to minimize the potential for negative

impacts. However, it is important to note that through this process the content obtained from the focus group interviews was not modified.

Faculty Leadership

The following is a summary of the personnel changes which impacted the faculty composition and leadership structures for the SCPP from 1998-2004. These personnel changes began at a time when the integrated program was in its infancy. One new faculty member was introduced and given the assignment of coordinating field placement activities, and the Department Chair maintained a dual assignment as the Program Coordinator for the 1998-99 academic year. Two new faculty members were added, and a different faculty member was invited to serve as the Program Coordinator for the 1999-00 academic year. During the 2000-01 academic year, there were no new faculty members added, but the current Program Coordinator left the department to serve as the Associate Dean of Students. At this point, the program leadership shifted temporarily back to the Department Chair.

Another new faculty member was added to replace the vacancy created during the previous year, and a faculty member hired two years previously was given the assignment of Program Coordination for the 2001-02 academic year. During the later portion of that year, high levels of upheaval were experienced in the department when the program administrator submitted a letter resigning from his faculty position. However, even later that same year, he rescinded the letter of resignation and requested a personal leave which was granted for the upcoming academic year.

Another new faculty member was added for the 2002-03 academic year. This addition was made in anticipation of the Department Chair's planned retirement for the

spring of 2003. Another faculty member assumed this administrator's responsibilities while his colleague was on personal leave. That year was one of the transition years to a three-year program and as such no students were completing internship training. That transition helped ease the instructional and supervisory burden of administering the program in the absence of a faculty member. Later during that academic year the faculty member on personal leave resigned permanently from his position and moved out of the state.

The 2003-04 academic year marked more changes with the retirement of the Department Chair and a faculty member returning from his assignment as the Dean of Students to fill the recent vacancy. Of particular interest was the decisive step to discontinue the SCPP by not admitting another group of new beginning students to the SCPP for the upcoming academic year.

Interview Groups

Former students. The participants in the two graduate groups met each other with fondness, as if the event were a reunion. The cohort bonds were readily apparent. Members of the cohort groups hugged each other, asked questions about each other, laughed and smiled, and shared critical updates regarding their peers. The former students were generally easy to engage. Once the interview began it flowed from topic to topic until the discussion came to a natural end. The only exception was when students showed some reservation to openly address specific concerns about the faculty. However, once the topic was broached the former students spoke freely, in great detail, and with considerable passion. As the former students discussed their experiences, some were surprised by their peers' painful experiences. Within each group, some were

surprised to hear the details of their peers' experiences and the depth of their suffering. On one occasion, they deliberately turned toward each other and began discussing possible hypotheses that could explain their pained experiences with all the faculty as they were completing the program.

For the researcher, there were times during these interviews when the disclosed content was expected. However, there were also times when the researcher was surprised by the extent to which students struggled in their interpersonal relationships with the program faculty. Given the closeness of the researcher's working relationships with the previous Department Chair, who was also a temporary Program Coordinator, care was taken to acknowledge past roles and invite openness and discussion. On a few occasions, during the interviews, the researcher wondered if he too had impacted the students in negative rather than positive ways given his frequent administratively-based assistantship assignments.

Faculty. The faculty interview was initially rather slow paced, yet, a very comfortable experience. Of the faculty present for the interview, the majority are serving on the researchers' dissertation committee for the present study. For this study, one of the seven full-time core faculty members reported feeling uncomfortable with the proposed study and elected to not participate. An emeritus faculty member who was the previous Department Chair and a former Program Coordinator participated with the current faculty. Group members respectfully deferred to each other, were supportive, offered points of clarification, and otherwise interacted in a collegial professional manner. Further, it was apparent that the faculty members had discussed program problems as they had reached a consensus for program changes and were largely unified

in the bases of these changes. Generally, the faculty were united in their feedback and perspectives on the program.

School professionals. The school professional group interview differed from the previous interviews with the program faculty and former students. Most of these individuals were familiar with each other, the former students, and the program faculty, but the majority were unknown to the interviewer. Collectively (as a group) and individually, the school professionals were very thoughtful and respectful with each other, the process, and content of the interview. The group members tracked each other and offered reflective comments. It was obvious that their support for each other extended beyond professional service roles. They were perceived by the researcher as highly committed to the study and the profession. Their attendance and participation in the interview represented a personal and time sacrifice. During the interview, the researcher became aware that nearly all the participants had completed their graduate training at BYU in programs offered through the department. The school professionals would occasionally comment reflectively on the collective and individual nature of the faculty. Their reflections were based on their own unique history of interpersonal experiences and observations, and as such, the school professionals were not naïve spectators.

Broad Themes

The broad themes which emerged through this study are the product of the tradition of the hermeneutic dialectic process of interpretation (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993; and Guba & Lincoln, 1989) and span the four interview groups consisting of former students, full-time departmental faculty, and school professionals.

The broad research themes were established through the context of the SCPP, as the data were attained through the four focus group interviews. Each of the broad themes are comprised of sub-themes which received varying levels of support across all interview groups with anywhere from three to six sub-themes within each. The four broad themes are (a) program and degree structure, (b) program components, (c) program administration, and (d) program perspectives.

Program and Degree Structure

The broad theme of Program and Degree Structure is comprised of (a) program origin, (b) degree, (c) two- versus three-year, (d) accreditation, (e) dual role training, and (f) decision to change (See Table 1).

Table 1

Program and Degree Structure Content and Sub-Theme Endorsement for the Four Participant Groups

<i>Program & Degree Structure Sub-Themes</i>	<i>SG1</i>	<i>SG2</i>	<i>SPG</i>	<i>FG</i>
-Program Origin				✓
-Degree	✓	✓	✓	✓
-2 vs. 3 Years	✓	✓		✓
-Accreditation	✓	✓	✓	✓
-Dual Role Training	✓	✓	✓	✓
-Decision to Change				✓

Note. The check mark represents theme endorsement by participant group.

SG1 = Student Group 1; SG2 = Student Group 2; SPG = School Professional Group; FG = Faculty Group.

Program origin. This sub-theme pertains to the faculty's perspectives on the philosophy of the program and the institutional pressures to make program refinements. The origin of the SCPP was influenced by several factors. The idea spawned from the collective notes of several faculty retreats in response to recommendations from an Institutional Review that the program area restrict master-level offerings to one program. In addition to the institutional review, several other external and internal factors drove the departmental faculty's decision to organize the combined program. For example, the Utah State Board of Education decided to accredit the University of Phoenix's program in School Counseling. This action relieved pressure on the faculty to train large numbers of school counselors to meet a perceived need in the state as student numbers were increasing and many counselors were retiring. Concurrently the demand for preparing more school psychologists increased and became another impetus. Faculty interests, their unique professional training, and their desire to prepare the best professionals were three additional driving forces. Furthermore, awareness of the existing holes in the prevailing training and service delivery models for both school psychology and school counseling was also reported as a motivating factor. In short, the SCPP was developed in an effort to combine aspects of the recent movements in school psychology toward counseling and counseling toward psychological assessment. The resulting SCPP was perceived by the faculty as an active effort to take a pioneering step forward by integrating the training of both professionals and in so doing create a unique blend of a school professional.

Degree. This sub-theme pertains to the coursework offerings, program structure and the Master of Science degree awarded to program graduates. Regarding the degree, former students and school professionals complained that the program required them to

complete extra coursework beyond what is required for counselors or school psychologists without a comparable salary adjustment following graduation and entry into the profession. They felt their degree was not recognized for what it required with respect to coursework and supervision experience. They complained that a graduate with a 36 hour masters program in counseling was paid the same salary as their 64-72 hours masters program. Former students and school professionals described this inequity as an issue that would ultimately result in later-career payment losses. Related to equitable payment, the school professionals asserted that “it would be easier to change the degree structure than to change the hiring and payment structures of school districts.”

The department wrote a formal letter to accompany graduates’ transcripts which was designed to support requests for higher pay. However, the former students expressed frustration because this letter was not recognized by their districts. The result being they felt misled by the Department Chair’s “promises” regarding degree recognition, future salary levels, positions, and departmental advocacy efforts on their behalf.

Two- versus three-years. This sub-theme pertains to the duration of the program and various perspectives on two- and three-year program training models. The SCPP training model was originally compressed into two calendar years and offered in this manner for four cohort groups. The three-year model was then introduced during the 2001-02 academic year. Regarding a two- or three-year program model, the former students all recommended three years for training and learning purposes. However, many of these same students selected the program because they could become eligible for both school licenses in just two years. In so doing, they could avoid an extra year of school expenses for the same “consistently poor public school wages.” Yet, despite their

economic preference for two years, former students felt this program model was too compressed (“too short”), required too much time in-class, and left them concerned about their competence levels once they graduated.

Accreditation. This sub-theme pertains to the focus on obtaining national accreditation for the school psychology and school counseling aspects of the combined program-- NASP accreditation for school psychology, and CACREP for school counseling. Although, the two-year program allowed for students to graduate and get employed quickly, it initially became the primary accreditation concern with NASP/NCATE. To date, the faculty have prepared and submitted three folio applications for NASP accreditation, none of which were successful. Program faculty argued unsuccessfully that the two calendar year program was equivalent to a three-year program because it was year around. In 2000 NASP changed the accreditation standards increasing the demands for school psychology training programs. This change further increased the challenges and expectations for accrediting school psychology programs. During this same period, CACREP accreditation was sought for the school counseling component. Full accreditation for school counseling was extended to the program, which left the school psychology component as the only non-accredited aspect. Although the faculty continued to make program modifications to meet NASP standards, it became clear to them that both accrediting bodies were becoming less interested in accrediting a program that integrated the training of a related, but separate specialty area. According to the faculty’s report, in time both CACREP and NASP requested program title changes to reflect a singular rather than a dual identity program, leaving the perception that both

national accrediting bodies were heading in different directions, and that the differences between them were too deep and broad to bridge.

Upon commencing their program of study, the former students knew the program was not NASP accredited. However, they were assured by the faculty that accreditation was a high probability. In the end, former students felt misled by the program faculty due to the complications of obtaining NASP accreditation and the associated problems in becoming National Certified School Psychologists (NCSP).

Obtaining the NCSP became another related accreditation problem for some former students who left the State of Utah. In an effort to meet certification requirements a few of the former students returned to complete additional coursework, but still they struggled to obtain this credential. The former students who stayed in the State of Utah experienced no salary differences between school psychology and school counseling. Within the State of Utah, NASP accreditation is of little concern as it is not required for licensure as a school psychologist.

National accreditation was also associated with the perception of professional identity. The school professionals discussed the apparent professional differences between ASCA and NASP. Within the State of Utah school professionals report working collaboratively with each other. However, it was their perception that such collaboration is lost when professional roles are taken to a nation level. Nevertheless, the school professionals acknowledged the importance of having national accreditation, and having accrediting bodies housed within a learned society. The school professionals perceived NASP accreditation as important because it is housed within a learned society, namely NCATE. They disregarded the significance of CACREP due to the perception that this

accreditation is tainted by the historical differences between ASCA and the American Counseling Association (ACA) with regard to training standards and professional role and function.

Dual role training. This sub-theme pertains to factors associated with the process, external demands, and outcomes of training students in the integrated school counseling and school psychology program. The former students and school professionals provided mixed feedback for this sub-theme. Both former students and school professionals valued dual training. However, the former students reported experiencing less integration than they expected when they left the program.

The former students asserted that school principals appreciated an employee who could do both aspects, namely a “switch-hitter.” In fact, school professionals reported some of the larger schools had combined positions because dual trained persons were available to hire. Further, it was their perception that these individuals provided more consistent services and interventions than their traditionally trained peers. This perception supported their assertion that combining professional roles strengthens both the school counseling and school psychology related service delivery functions.

Generally, the school professionals claimed former students were successful and highly sought across settings.

The former students expressed appreciation for being eligible for dual certification. They valued the breadth of dual training and reported feeling competent to perform both role functions. They openly expressed their disappointment in knowing dual training was no longer available at BYU.

A related topic pertains to setting factors. The former students, faculty, and school professionals all postulated greater role related conflicts were more likely at the secondary level. They based this assertion on the historical trend that elementary settings have a less rigid professional role structure than secondary settings. Also, they asserted the professional role functions were solidified and better funded at the secondary level. While on the other hand, funding is less available for elementary settings creating a financial hindrance.

The difficulties associated with dual training were mainly related to funding and structural problems at the school or district level. The school professionals argued that funding separates service capacity more so than professional roles. They stated, “Bifurcation is a funding source problem, not a professional role or identity problem.” For example, some positions were not allocated sufficient time to perform dual role functions. School professionals asserted the funding for specific functions are tied to school psychology through special education, but counseling is devalued as it has no such funding sources. Generally, each site varied, as some service systems were more separated and others were less so. As such, the faculty stated the demands of dual training often required multiple site placements for practicum and internship.

Decision to change. The content of this sub-theme was obtained from the faculty. It is comprised of factors related to program outcomes and the faculty’s efforts to provide a nationally accredited training program. The decision to change from the integrated SCPP to a traditional school psychology program was influenced primarily by (a) school system structures that created a practical impediment, (b) the changing faculty composition, and (c) the faculty’s desire to have a NASP accredited program.

The practical impediment was formed through funding source problems and the representatively greater ease in securing funding for school psychology related functions. The faculty composition was constantly changing. Increasingly the faculty became more comprised of members professionally trained as school psychologists. This change was associated with the declining representation of current faculty who were professionally trained and interested in school counseling. Lastly, was the accreditation factor, as NASP was concerned about accrediting a program with “counseling” in the program title.

By the faculty’s report, these factors combined and pointed them in the direction of restructuring a traditional three-year program in School Psychology. This decision was made with the hope that more desirable program outcomes could be obtained through giving up CACREP accreditation in turn for NASP accreditation. Additionally, professional identity factors were cited as the faculty felt they had underestimated the role identity and professional role (“turf”) concerns that arose as they administered the program. This turf issue, from their perspective, was also a factor influencing the national accreditation problems for the combined program. Throughout this process, the faculty felt as if they were “outsiders” who were attempting to make a difference within a system that they could not influence.

Program Components

The broad theme of Program Components is comprised of (a) school psychology, (b) school counseling, and (c) field placement (See Table 2).

Table 2

Program Components Content and Sub-Theme Endorsement for the Four Participant Groups

<i>Program Components Sub-Themes</i>	<i>SG1</i>	<i>SG2</i>	<i>SPG</i>	<i>FG</i>
-School Psychology	✓	✓	✓	
-School Counseling	✓	✓	✓	
-Field Placement	✓	✓	✓	✓

Note. The check mark represents theme endorsement by participant group.

SG1 = Student Group 1; SG2 = Student Group 2; SPG = School Professional Group; FG = Faculty Group.

School psychology. This sub-theme is comprised of former student and school professional perspectives regarding the programmatic aspects associated with school psychology training. The former students asserted that the assessment component of their training was strong. Initially, their confidence with assessment was attributed to the heavy emphasis on report writing and assessment in the program. Generally speaking, they reported their skills were comparable to their traditionally trained peers from other school psychology programs. However, they comparatively felt poorly training in research-based interventions. They also expressed a desire for more in-depth training in Special Education Law and Individual Education Plan (IEP) interventions.

The school professionals considered the SCPP students as excellent school psychologists. Furthermore, they expressed their perception that adding counseling training to the curricula strengthened their service capacity as school psychologists.

School counseling. This sub-theme is comprised of former students' and school professionals' perspectives regarding programmatic aspects and outcomes associated with school counseling training. The past graduates collectively stated that too little time was spent on counseling skills. They desired a greater emphasis on counseling skill development throughout the program. They complained about having to spend extra post-graduation time developing counseling skills through self-directed study and post-degree supervision. They also complained that field placement sites were unpredictable. Some were supportive of providing supervised counseling interventions and other placements were not. The resulting site specific variability in supervised counseling experiences interfered with the development of this skill set for some of the former students. Also, some of the former students were interested in school counseling work at the elementary level, but these counseling-related options were not available largely as a result of state-wide funding decisions.

During these interviews, former students expressed their negative impressions of the role and function of the profession of school counseling. For example, they openly shared their perception that most school counselors are “monkeys who don’t do much,” in a “paper-pushing position,” and “administrators without administrative pay.”

The school professional group openly questioned the overall emphasis placed on school counseling in the program. It was their assessment that students perceived counseling as merely “relationships and talking.” Regarding counseling, the school professionals stated, that “students seemed to grapple with the complexity of a specific case and lacked the skills to take a situation apart in an effort to help students.” Furthermore, the school professionals viewed students as “reluctant” and uncomfortable

assuming the teaching aspect of school counseling because they were not introduced to it during the program. Lastly, the school professionals shared their perception that School Counseling was only a tangentially related aspect of the students' training and not an integrated component of the program.

Throughout the interviews with former students and school professionals, they consistently endorsed the primary traditional service roles of each school professional. For example, school counselors were generally perceived as reliant upon educationally based models of intervention; whereas school psychologists were perceived as primarily reliant upon assessment and psychometrics. Conversely, though were the divergent perspectives of the faculty regarding the role and training emphasis of counseling in school psychology preparation programs.

Field placement. This sub-theme is comprised of former student, school professional, and faculty perspectives on practicum and internship placement activities. The field placements were specifically designed to provide students with supervised professional training in aspects of the practice of school counseling and school psychology. The former students' reflective comments were illustrative of the reality that training experiences were heavily influenced by site-related factors. They collectively complained about receiving too little support from the faculty, having problems accessing integrated sites, experiencing "internship placement politics," and finding field placement disorganization throughout all aspects of the program.

They would have preferred clearer communication from the faculty regarding the strengths and limitations of a specific site, a reduced focus on testing and report writing, and fewer program-related prescribed tasks. Due to these factors, former students felt

poorly prepared after graduation to manage “regular school stuff.” Many asserted the scope of their training experiences were skewed. They perceived that sites were often forced to make accommodations for the highly prescribed requirements of the program. They would have preferred receiving training in a setting where the position demands drove their training experience instead of the lengthy list of program-based prescribed tasks.

The faculty readily acknowledged these points of concern and referred to them as practical impediments. It was the faculty’s understanding that these aspects interfered with the integration of program objectives through field placement experiences. The faculty claimed these problems were encountered due to the unique nature of the combined program. They discovered that the service approach at some sites was less compatible with a combined training model, whereas, personnel at other sites were supportive and worked collaboratively with them. According to the faculty, these placement problems were driven by the ever-increasing emphasis on school psychology requirements in the program and the greater ease in securing funded training experience for school psychology related service.

The school professionals experienced a tighter program structure for students from the SCPP than the structure expected by neighboring institutional programs. They would have preferred more freedom. The very specific requirements of the program complicated supervision and increased the expectations until it became a burden to supervise SCPP students.

The school professionals found it difficult to “balance training because of the prescriptive nature” of all placement activities. They asserted that the very specific

nature of field placement assignments began to force a priority for school psychology. And, in so doing, they claim it marginalized school counseling by leaving insufficient time to train in school counseling. They also viewed funding sources as another factor leading to the marginalization of counseling. Generally, they found that resources were readily available for providing learning opportunities in school psychology. Therefore, this availability of opportunity led to “placements for school psychology” and “just specific assignments for school counseling.” As a result, the school counseling professionals began to feel disrespected because of this professional training priority discrepancy. In time, they felt the message was “anyone can do school counseling stuff.” Additionally, they came to believe the professional service role of school counseling was devalued and that the program faculty were biased in favor of school psychology.

Some school professionals eventually refused to participate. The reported reasons for discontinuation varied, but the most prominent and burdensome factors were, the highly prescribed nature of the placement activities, the bias toward school psychology, and the overall disorganization of field placement activities. However, others continued despite the heavy burden and restricted return. For example, at one site the activity log alone consumed 12% of the interns’ paid service hours.

Program Administration

The broad theme of Program Administration is comprised of (a) disorganization, (b) program faculty, and (c) student management (See Table 3).

Table 3

Program Administration Content and Sub-Theme Endorsement for the Four Participant Groups

<i>Program Administration Sub-Themes</i>	<i>SG1</i>	<i>SG2</i>	<i>SPG</i>	<i>FG</i>
-Disorganization	✓	✓	✓	
-Program Faculty	✓	✓	✓	✓
-Student Management	✓	✓		

Note. The check mark represents theme endorsement by participant group.

SG1 = Student Group 1; SG2 = Student Group 2; SPG = School Professional Group; FG = Faculty Group.

Disorganization. This sub-theme pertains to the combined perspectives of former students and school professionals regarding the unclear or constantly changing expectations for coursework and field placement requirements. These aspects were perceived as manifestations of program disorganization. The former students complained about the constantly changing course and program requirements. They reported these changes were at times a weekly occurrence. The frequency and nature of these changes gave students the impression the program was just “slapped together.”

On other occasions the former students observed faculty disagreements regarding requirements and standards. They reported receiving mixed messages from the faculty regarding these aspects. Through these incidents, they perceived the faculty were not united in terms of curriculum, requirements, and standards. In short, the students purported that “anything unorganized is uncomfortable,” and studying in the program was “uncomfortable and painful.”

The school professionals also experienced and commented on the changing standards and how these changes became an additional burden for supervision and the completion of field placement assignments. Scheduling and assignment changes often came at very short notice. They stated, “Schools were told one thing while the program was doing something different.” This process made all aspects of the program difficult for school professionals and former students.

Another very specific and related incident which illustrated programmatic disorganization was the third-cohorts’ experience with their comprehensive examination. These former students complained extensively about this experience. They claimed the departmental portion contained numerous typing and structural error problems. For example, questions and response options were truncated, the question numbers did not always track sequentially, and at other places the response options did not fit with the associated question. The students were upset further as no professors were available to answer questions, resolve concerns, or clarify misunderstandings.

The chaos of this event was precipitated by unclear messages regarding the focal areas of the exam. After the examination, students complained to the Department Chair. They reported their concerns were received in a supportive and empathic manner. However, in the end, they felt unsupported because they did not witness signs of follow through. Some of these students stated that this experience “summed [their] experience in the program.” Meaning, their experience of the program was that of disorganization, errors, feeling misled about several factors, and ultimately left without supervision, leadership, protection, or follow through as they addressed their concerns. It is important to note that aside from those involved in the third-year cohort comprehensive

examination experience, the other students either appreciated the department's financial support in taking national exams or felt like they were being used for research purposes.

Program faculty. This sub-theme pertains to the extensive and passionate perspectives primarily directed toward one particular faculty program administrator. The students felt that they were held responsible when things were not working, and that they were ultimately blamed for what they perceived were the administrator's failures. According to their report, those who opposed him were treated with harshness and stricter grading and performance requirements. They referred to these experiences as "the wrath of [his] ego." Graduates reported that their experiences in the program were painful largely due to this administrator's influence. The message former students received was that complaining led to doubling of hours (increased workloads).

During the former student interviews, the passion of this topic area led them to exchange stories regarding their individual and collective experiences with this administrator. Some of these stories seemed to have been known collectively, while others were clearly being shared for the first time. Regardless, as the students openly shared their collective stories, they were received with a validating shock that reminded, reinforced, and validated the bases of their pained experiences with this faculty member.

For example, a story of jointly switching names on completed homework assignments was recounted. For these particular students, as well as others, they collaboratively worked on assignments. However, in so doing, they began to suspect grading bias as they consistently received very different grades. Through this particular incident, former students reported their suspicion of grading bias was confirmed. Their scores remained consistent with the printed name on these assignments, despite the fact

that they had switched papers. The student who consistently scored well, scored well again and the other received the same consistent lower score.

Those who managed to stay on the administrator's "good-side" did so by not questioning assignments or the instruction they received. A few of those who did not challenge him, talked about getting away with turning in incomplete assignments. All the while, less favored peers were required to complete several very extensive revisions before receiving either a pass or another mediocre grade. For example, when students discussed their portfolio assignments, one openly admitted to running out of time and leaving several aspects of the portfolio incomplete. In so doing, this student was expecting extensive revisions but later realized the portfolio was returned with nearly full points and comments praising the former student's work. Meanwhile, students with strained relationships had extensively gathered information and revised their portfolio to brace for the expected "slaughter" once their work was graded. In short, the grading seemed biased, inconsistent, and was perceived as a source of punishment.

Generally, the former students felt manipulated when the options for their internship placements were presented. For some, site options were promised but then taken away. Later, these students became aware of having had unrealized (undisclosed) placement options as they worked with supervising school professionals. Additionally, former students reported feeling forced to spend personal time conducting personal research endeavors for this administrator without compensation. Former students felt their struggles were minimized as the administrator would often respond with his stories illustrating greater hardships through the completion of his graduate studies.

The former students reported seeking support from other faculty members as they attempted to cope with these pressures. However, in the end, there seemed to be limits to what could be done to help. One particular student shared the analogy of having “Mr. Rogers” in one office and “Napoleon” in the other. Generally, students felt like the administrator tried too hard to do or be everything for the program. They perceived he made unilateral decisions and behaved as if he were the “faculty.” Although, in this aspect, the other faculty members were perceived as “less than key players.”

The school professionals reported that the administrator’s interpersonal nature and heavy supervision demands “burnt bridges” for on-going placement opportunities. They perceived him as a person with great passion who unfortunately “rubbed many people wrong.” Some of the school professionals considered this outcome as unfortunate, as he was perceived to be motivated by the goal of helping students, the program, and the profession.

The remainder of this sub-theme pertains to other faculty-based administrative aspects associated with the SCPP. Regarding the total faculty, former students felt unsupported and without leadership. Former students felt their voiced concerns were “brushed-off” even by faculty members whom they trusted. They felt like their program-related complaints “fell upon deaf ears,” as they ultimately felt unsupported in getting these problems resolved. Specifically, the Department Chair was perceived as being too busy to address problems, although loved for his interpersonal qualities. Additionally, it was their impression that the faculty covered too much for the program administrator by not holding him accountable for reported problems. Generally, the students asserted “the

department failed, and continues to fail in addressing issues regardless of whether the issues are faculty, student, or site related.”

Another reported student loss occurred when the then current SCPP Director left the Department to become the Associate Dean of Students. Former students reported this change had a very negative impact as it became a time when the program administrator assumed even greater responsibility. They said this loss was “huge” and stated, “[the program] fell apart when he left.”

The school professionals asserted that the program was not a bad idea. Rather, the administration of the program was the problem, as it seemed decisions and changes were based primarily upon the administrator’s feedback.

By the faculty’s report, the entire group was in full support of the program’s philosophy at the planning stage (idea work). However, the program administrator primarily assumed the duties of strengthening the program and the administrative direction. As this process unfolded, some faculty felt less relevant to the newly structured combined program. Also as student work-loads increased, they were less available to assist faculty. This situation was also perceived as a negative because it further distanced the full-time faculty and SCPP students.

In time, the administrator was joined by new faculty members who assisted with the SCPP, but the increasing core had specialized training in school psychology and focused more on this component. In the end, the faculty changes mirrored program transitions. Eventually these resulted in a composition where no full-time core faculty with school counseling experience were directly involved in the program.

Student Management. This sub-theme pertains to various aspects associated with students' experiences in the program and their reported efforts to effect change. By the former students' report, their concerns were voiced on several occasions. Initially, their expressed concerns were received supportively, and the unfairness of their situations was acknowledged. However, rather than bring satisfactory resolutions, this process brought increased workloads and stricter grading practices. All of which were perceived as another means of punishment. Generally, they reported there was no follow through and occasionally they were reprimanded for raising their concerns. For example, a former student's concern was initially received with supportive affirmations and assurances that these concerns would be handled appropriately. However, this same individual was later pulled aside and specifically reprimanded for not being patient with the program faculty. In short, the former students felt punished for voicing their concerns and trapped in a situation where they had no recourse. They were united in the assertion that the interpersonal problems were the most difficult and unpleasant aspect of completing the program.

Additionally, they complained about program advising and the end-of-semester evaluations. They reported that advice and in-person feedback were difficult and in some cases nearly impossible to obtain. The last point of concern involved perceived power differentials between students and the faculty. This distance made it difficult for students to discuss openly their concerns and challenge (question) evaluation ratings without appearing as though they truly had a "marginal or unsatisfactory disposition" in the process.

Program Perspectives

The broad theme of Program Perspectives is comprised of (a) strengths, (b) recommendations, and (c) mental health counseling (See Table 4).

Table 4

Program Perspectives Content and Sub-Theme Endorsement for the Four Participant Groups

<i>Program Perspectives Sub-Themes</i>	<i>SG1</i>	<i>SG2</i>	<i>SPG</i>	<i>FG</i>
-Strengths	✓	✓	✓	✓
-Recommendations	✓		✓	
-Mental Health Counseling	✓	✓	✓	

Note. The check mark represents theme endorsement by participant group.

SG1 = Student Group 1; SG2 = Student Group 2; SPG = School Professional Group; FG = Faculty Group.

Strengths. This sub-theme pertains to former students, school professionals, and faculty perceptions of the SCPP strengths. The former students perceived the greatest strengths of the SCPP as the training breadth and departmental faculty. They valued the training breadth as it led to dual certification. The former students valued the well-rounded training and the information rich coursework. From their perspective, these aspects became a valued source of knowledge, perspective, and skill development. It also allowed them to become eligible for the LPC in Utah with just two additional courses. The former students specifically mentioned three of the current faculty members and one former joint appointment clinical faculty member as strengths to the program. One was

considered as a “hidden strength” because while they were completing the program he seemed more interested and involved in the doctoral program than the SCPP. They also valued their training experiences with these faculty members. Further, they commented on how the knowledge and skills taught to them by these faculty members will have a lasting impact on their careers.

From the school professionals’ perspective, the BYU students were, and still are, better trained than students from other institutions. They specifically praised them as “good report writers,” and “knowledgeable about assessment.” They referred to these students as “great school psychologists.”

The school professionals asserted that dual training did not allow students to hide behind traditional role functions, and it broadened the skill base with the introduction of counseling skills. They also asserted this unique combination of skills gave graduates of the SCPP a competitive hiring advantage. It was their experience that former students had twice the employment opportunities. They reported that former students were offered dual and traditional service positions, and on a few occasions positions that were restructured because sites had the option of hiring a dual trained professional.

The faculty perceived the program as a “good deal for students.” They asserted that the SCPP combined the best aspects of both professional roles and brought graduates close to receiving their LPC. They proposed that students were both liked and valued in the public school setting. They also speculated that the combined program would be more effective at the elementary level because professional role functions had not yet been as highly structured or as rigid as at the secondary level.

Recommendations. This sub-theme pertains to suggested comments from former students, and school professionals regarding the administration of an integrated program in school counseling and school psychology. The former students and school professionals were unified in asserting that two problematic aspects were program modifications and faculty hiring for a dual training program.

The former students recommend continual program refinements. They were expressly opposed to the faculty's decision to discontinue the combined program. Their expressions of opposition were consistent with their perception of program related strengths. As such, it was their opinion that the program was abandoned too quickly. They recommended a focus on refinement more so than a focus on securing national accreditation. Related to the recommendation for refinement was their suggestion that program administrators be individuals who are not "fighting for tenure."

The former students recommended that departments interested in offering a dual training program like the SCPP should develop a "cohesive system with a strong leader." They perceived that "strong" leadership was needed to provide direction, and "secure the best from everyone involved." From their perspective, careful hiring was a related aspect of their recommendation for strong program and departmental leadership. Regarding hiring practices, they admonished that key faculty be replaced only by individuals who have a shared vision for a combined program.

The school professional group also asserted the combined program was abandoned too quickly. They also admonished the faculty to focus less on accreditation and spend more time in public schools presenting and conducting research. During the short period the SCPP was offered, they argued that insufficient time was provided "to

allow things to gel” before more changes were made. “Making Jell-O” was used as the illustrative example of the observed program changes over the past few years. They purported that ingredients were taken out and added too quickly in this process, which prevented the program from “gelling,” ultimately leading to the discontinuation of the program.

The school professionals also supported the former students’ recommendation for careful hiring practices. For unique programs like the SCPP, they asserted for “strong leadership” to effectively identify the needs of the department and its various programs, followed by purposeful guidance throughout the process of adding new faculty members who meet these criteria. They argue the process needs to be more than “casting a majority vote,” but accurately identifying the faculty resource needs and effectively meeting them through thoughtful hiring practices. For example, they stated, “If you want a school counseling program, hire individuals with school counseling backgrounds.”

Mental Health Counseling. This sub-theme pertains to former student and school professional perspectives on the counseling training component and the associated support for Professional Counselor Licensure experienced in the SCPP. The former students highly valued this aspect. However, they were frustrated and felt misled as they had anticipated receiving more training in this area. Yet, despite their frustration, they expressed appreciation for the training they did receive.

Related to mental health counseling, the former students were offered the opportunity to qualify for the Professional Counselor License (LPC). They highly valued this option of securing the LPC. In short, they expressed their wish that a greater emphasis had been placed on this option. Many expressed their current concern about

becoming eligible for the LPC. By their report, they were too tired to take the remaining coursework before graduation. However, now that they have graduated, they are frustrated because spring and summer offerings have been canceled leaving even fewer options to obtain the remaining coursework.

The school professionals perceived that counseling aside from guidance was under-emphasized in the program. It was their perception the program was moving away from counseling. They reflected that it seemed there was “less counseling training now than in the past.” For example, they shared their perception that students felt too confident (overly confident) in their counseling skills. They passionately proposed that “counseling is more than having a bag of tools” and “fitting tools to problems in a generic solution-focused manner.” Rather, they argued counseling is a process of relationship development and the ability to conceptualize a multifaceted case coupled with the skill to combine these aspects to make effective interventions.

With regard to mental health counseling, former students felt weak on counseling intervention training. In contrast, they felt that their training and skills were strong in the area of assessment, which was defined by them as test administration and report writing. The school professionals agreed with the former students’ perception that they were well-prepared in assessment and less well-prepared in intervention.

Summary of the Results

Program and degree structure. A combination of national, state, institutional, and faculty related factors gave rise to the development of the SCPP. The end product was the program faculty’s pioneering effort to craft a uniquely integrated program to train a new school professional. Initially the program was compressed into two years, which

greatly burdened the students in the program. The former students recommended a three-year over a two-year model for training purposes. However, the advantage of graduating in just two years from an integrated program offering dual certification was a clear incentive and a primary motivating factor for many in program selection. Another down side of this program was that former students were financially disadvantaged because their degree was a masters degree at the completion of 64 semester hours rather than a master's plus 30 or specialist degree.

National accreditation became a primary concern for the program faculty and some former students after graduation. CACREP accreditation was granted for the school counseling aspect of this program, but NASP accreditation was not granted for school psychology. In time, the faculty felt that professional role and identity pressures contributed to the accreditation problems with NASP and later also with CACREP. A few of the former students desired national school psychology certification but continued to struggle to satisfy requirements despite returning to take additional coursework.

The former students and school professionals highly valued dual training. The impact of dual training was evident even when former students were employed in traditional roles. However, from a program administrative perspective, the field placement activities were perceived by the faculty as a practical impediment. They found it difficult to organize field placement activities for several reasons (e.g., funding, required experiences, supervision, and balancing student interests).

In time, the pressures associated with NASP/NCATE accreditation, changes in the program faculty, current and former student interest in NASP accreditation, and the

struggle to organize field placements became some of the salient factors leading to discontinuation of the SCPP.

Program components. Former students felt well prepared to assume the assessment role of school psychologists. The school professionals viewed the former students as excellent school psychologists. They asserted that the counseling training strengthened their service capacity as school psychologists.

The former students felt too little emphasis was placed on counseling training. They complained that field placement experiences for school counseling varied excessively. A few shared their negative perceptions of the role of school counselors (e.g., “monkeys who don’t do much,” “a paper-pushing position,” and “administrators without administrative pay”). The school professionals also questioned the training emphasis on school counseling in the SCPP. They perceived that students struggled with the counseling intervention and educational service components of the school counselor’s professional role. In short, the role of school counseling appeared to be perceived negatively by former students, coupled with the school professionals’ perception that the role of school counseling was devalued and marginalized.

The former students complained about receiving too little support, having problems accessing integrated sites, changing expectations, and “placement politics” while they completed their field placement activities. They worried that sites were required to accommodate too much for program students through extensive demands. This issue left former students concerned about whether their training experiences were skewed to satisfy program objectives rather than future employment role expectations.

The faculty reported that funding sources drove the paid internship opportunities. They perceived the funding source and site related factors as “practical impediments” that interfered with training integration. Some sites were supportive while others disagreed with the dual training approach. Many school professionals became overly burdened by the tight structure and prescribed nature of the SCPP field placement activities. They perceived that school psychology received a greater emphasis over counseling. They also acknowledged the role of financial opportunities in marginalizing the time and training opportunities available in school counseling.

Program administration. The former students complained about the constantly changing expectations for coursework and field placement activities. It was their perception that the program faculty were not united in terms of curriculum, requirements, and standards, and as such, the program was not organized. The school professionals were burdened by the constant changes. It was their impression that “schools were told one thing while the program was doing something different.”

The third cohort comprehensive examination was another extensively discussed incident that highlighted the former students’ frustration with the program and departmental faculty. Some argued that their experience with the comprehensive examination “summed [their] experience in the program.” They specifically commented on the disorganization, errors, their feeling of being misled about several factors and left without supervision, leadership, protection, and follow through as they addressed their concerns.

The former students provided extensive feedback regarding a program administrator’s impact upon them and the SCPP. The former students generally

perceived this faculty member as biased, punitive, defensive, unfair, manipulative, and unmerciful. Generally students feared him. They stated that their program experiences were painful largely due to his influence. The school professionals reported that his interpersonal nature burnt bridges at field placement sites. They asserted that this outcome was unfortunate, because they perceived that his intent was to be helpful to students, the program, and the profession.

With regard to the remaining faculty, the former students generally felt unsupported. They voiced their concerns on several occasions to the Department Chair and other program faculty, but it seemed that nothing was done to make changes. This response caused them to feel as if their concerns “fell upon deaf ears” or were “brushed-off.” They asserted that “the department failed, and continues to fail in addressing issues regardless of whether the issues are faculty, student, or site related.”

For the faculty, once the initial program planning was completed, some began to feel less relevant to the SCPP. They reported having decreased contact with program students. During this time, a program administrator assumed primary responsibility of the SCPP. Later, he was joined primarily by new faculty members with specialized training in school psychology.

Former students reported their voiced concerns were not attended to adequately by the faculty. Their efforts to receive support and due process seemed ultimately to bring increased workloads and stricter grading practices. Others reported that their concerns were initially validated, but later they were reprimanded for not being more patient. In the end, they felt powerless and unable to find support and advocacy.

Program perspectives. The former students acknowledged the training breadth and some of the departmental faculty as the greatest strengths of the SCPP. They felt well trained as they learned to value the knowledge, perspective, and skills developed through the program. Four faculty members were specifically identified and praised as strengths of the SCPP. They respected them for the knowledge they imparted, the skills they taught through the program, and for their supportive interpersonal nature.

The school professionals viewed the BYU students as “better trained” than those from other programs. They asserted that the program helped students become “good report writers,” who were “knowledgeable about assessment,” and praised them as “great school psychologists.” School professionals asserted that their unique combination of skills gave them a competitive hiring advantage. They further asserted that dual training did not allow them to hide behind traditional professional roles and functions.

The faculty viewed the SCPP as a “good deal for students.” It allowed former students to experience the “best” aspects of both professions while also bringing them close to securing licensure as professional counselors.

The former students were saddened to learn the combined program had been discontinued. The former students and school professionals were unified in recommending that the faculty focus more on making program refinements and hiring faculty who were supportive of a dual training perspective.

The former students highly valued counseling training and the option for the LPC. They appreciated the training made available through the program. However, they were frustrated because they perceived these aspects were under-emphasized. Further, the school professionals shared their perception that the SCPP was moving away from

counseling and that former students were overly confident considering their actual skill acquisition.

Discussion

Overview

The purpose of this study was to gather a relevant thick description of the SCPP through the perceptions and experiences of former students, school counseling and school psychology public school professionals, and program faculty from BYU. To obtain this goal, focus group interviews were conducted to obtain a deep understanding of how this program has functioned and the perceived associated strengths and limitations of integrating the training curriculum for school counseling and school psychology.

Study Limitations

Purposive sampling. Purposive sampling allows emerging insights to guide which participants can provide the most divergent and typical data (Erlandson et al., 1993; Cuba & Lincoln, 1989). Although, purposive sampling was the intended and most ideal method for participant selection, subject response patterns did not make it possible to use this method. The former student and school professional interview groups were formed by a smaller than expected subset of potential participants who responded to the study invitation letter, or follow-up contacts made by phone or email. Prior to completing the study, it was anticipated that the sampling process would be influenced by participant willingness, faculty preferences, the certification and licensure status of the SCPP graduates, and sampling convenience. In the end, participant willingness and availability were the two most critical aspects that influenced sampling.

Participants. The unwillingness of the first graduating class to participate in the study was unfortunate, but not entirely unexpected. With regard to the program administration problems, prior evaluation studies of the SCPP suggest that the first cohort

group seemed to be less tolerant of their struggles with this aspect. It is the researcher's perception that this cohort group was less connected with each other, which may have resulted in them feeling less overall support as they completed the program. Further, this group was less well known by the researcher, and as such, it is possible they were less interested in participating.

A limited number of former students and school professionals responded to the invitation to participate, of which an even smaller number were available or able to attend the group interview sessions. For the former students, several were unable to participate due to distance factors, while others did not respond to direct contacts or failed to follow-through at the time of scheduling the interviews. For the majority of the school professionals, availability and the location of the interview were the most critical factors. However, despite the decreased number of school counselors and school psychologists who participated, each discipline was represented by school professionals who are currently highly involved in their respective professional fields and highly committed to their work as service professionals within a public school setting. Further, these participants were very familiar with the SCPP, the former students, and the program faculty. These factors seemed to support their desire to provide feedback and strengthened their unique and informed perspectives of the SCPP.

Information forms. The information forms for former students, school professionals, and program faculty were not returned or completed consistently, and as such the information obtained from these instruments was not useful. Unfortunately, the significance of this loss is not known. Although, given the response inconsistencies on

the returned forms it seems appropriate to question the design and the overall potential utility, effectiveness, and value of these instruments.

Study Strengths

The openness of this approach allowed for the development and exploration of expected, new, and unexpected themes, which has provided new insights, awareness of a rich perspective, and a deep understanding of the central themes that emerged through this study (Kvale, 1996). Furthermore, the focus group interviews allowed emerging themes to be explored and understood openly, without the constraint of predetermined categories. In this sense, the interviews became “focused interviews” founded upon the perceptions and experiences of individuals representative of the context of this unique training program (Kvale, 1996; Patton, 2002).

As expected, the results of this study revealed new ideas and perspectives on how this integrated training model has worked. It also revealed the perceived strengths and limitations of the SCPP, and it offered new insights into the impact of an integrated school counseling and school psychology training program within the larger context of current educational reform efforts (Fagan, 2002; Herr, 2002; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). Furthermore, some aspects of each broad theme were expected as they were raised previously through unpublished program evaluation studies conducted by Ronald D. Bingham and Daniel V. Barnes in 1999 and 2000.

Trustworthiness. Although purposive sampling would have been ideal, the results of this study were consistent with prior program evaluation studies. Moreover, the newly discovered insights are suggestive that the potential for a relevant thick and rich description were achieved through the methodology of this study. The principle of data

triangulation was another supportive aspect pertaining to this study as some results were consistent with the prior program evaluation studies and across the broad themes and participant groups comprising the current study (see tables 1-4).

For example, during the prior evaluation studies, the students had suggested that a three-year training model would enhance training and improve integration. However, the majority preferred the two-year program due to the duration of training, and direct or indirect expenses. These same students, while completing their programs of study, consistently commented on not receiving enough practical experience and training with regard to counseling skill development. However, simultaneously they reported greater comparative confidence and skill with psychoeducational assessment. A perception held by students while engaged in field placement activities was that the completion of counseling assignments was “optional,” whereas the completion of assessment-based assignments was “obligatory.” In short, students perceived a greater programmatic emphasis for traditional school psychology functions over the traditional roles associated with school counseling.

These same students, even prior to graduation and their first initial professional position, were aware of and commented on the inevitable pay equity problems associated with only receiving a masters degree at the completion of a 64 semester hour program. And lastly, these students clearly preferred integrated training regardless of degree structure. Their preference for dual training out-weighed the option of obtaining training through “traditional” school counseling and school psychology preparation programs at other institutions.

Thematic Summary and Recommendations

Program and degree structure. The creation of the SCPP was done in response to several factors. Nevertheless, the faculty realized they were taking a “pioneering step” forward by integrating the training curriculum of school counseling and school psychology in an effort to create a new school professional. The act of integrating all aspects of the SCPP rather than combining the training likely accentuated some of the program degree structure and national accreditation problems. For example, NASP had a difficult time determining whether some of the specific school psychology training standard requirements were met during field placement activities. Later, both CACREP and NASP became increasingly uncomfortable with the integrated program title “school counseling psychology.” The program faculty perceived that their separate yet similar responses were motivated out of concern for ensuring that the training standards for each profession were met. Over time, both CACREP and NASP’s discomfort with an integrated program title became obvious as each made separate requests to remove either counseling (NASP) or psychology (CACREP) from the school counseling psychology program title.

The curriculum demands for an integrated school counseling and school psychology program are numerous and challenging. Curriculum demands become increasingly critical when seeking national accreditation, and complicated when aspects of an integrated program are being reviewed for accreditation from distinct and separate entities (CACREP and NASP). Furthermore, when the curriculum demands (influenced by accreditation standards) were merged with the institutional degree stipulations the end result was the extensive condensed 64 semester hour masters only program. The

resulting degree structure coupled with the public school pay structures resulted in comparative pay equity problems for former students, and then set the stage for a complex degree structure problem the faculty felt compelled to resolve.

In Utah, the 64 semester hour masters program did not allow former students to experience the salary adjustment(s) that typically follow an earlier masters degree usually after 36 to 48 semester hours. Most school districts in Utah offer pay incentives with additional coursework beyond a masters degree or with a specialists degree. In short, the completed curriculum of the SCPP was considered equivalent to a masters plus additional hours or a specialist degree. Unfortunately, for graduates, the school districts typically followed their traditional policy of a masters plus 30 hours rather than considering the total number of hours. If the former students had graduated with an earlier masters degree plus additional hours or a specialist degree, they would have been positioned to benefit to the fullest extent possible from the public school salary level policies which appear to possess little, if any, flexibility.

The former students' perspectives on a two- and three-year training model was practical and insightful. Although the two-year model was overwhelming and believed to compromise learning and skill development, the former students preferred it over a three-year model. The three-year option was recommended for training and learning purposes, but clearly disliked due to the inevitable negative financial repercussions that would follow. Three years would require students to forgo yet another year of full-time wages while simultaneously incurring increased educational expenses for an additional year of schooling, all occurring without the financial support of a professional service-delivery salary. The two-year option allowed students to become eligible for both the school

counseling and school psychology endorsements without the added time and increased financial burden of an extra year of schooling for the same consistently poor beginning salary. However, given NASP accreditation standards, the two-year training model was not an option if the faculty were ever to secure NASP accreditation for the program.

The feedback obtained from former students and school professionals was indicative that dual training enhanced the service role of the SCPP students. They were viewed as “switch-hitters” and dual prepared because they could provide both assessment and counseling services. Program graduates were offered employment options for combined positions at larger schools. Their training was recognized for facilitating the provision of more consistent services within public school settings. The school professionals argued that dual training strengthened the professional roles and functions of school counseling and school psychology.

Regarding barriers to integration and dual training, the bifurcated funding sources were perceived as the greatest obstacle. The school professionals asserted, “Bifurcation is a funding source problem, not a professional role or identity problem.” It was the perception of the former students and school professionals that blending the roles and functions of school counselors and school psychologists was compatible when students were dual trained.

Despite the strengths of dual training, the program faculty chose to discontinue the SCPP and offer a three-year school psychology program. They attributed their decision to a) the practical impediments encountered when arranging integrated field placement activities, b) the changing faculty composition over the past seven years, and

c) their desire to secure NASP accreditation for the benefit of the program and program graduates.

Given the context of the primary driving factors discussed by the faculty, it seems reasonable that time would be spent to carefully consider the SCPP and other training and service delivery preparation options. Furthermore, their decision to change to a specialist level school psychology training program seems reasonable given their desire to secure NASP accreditation and the changing faculty composition with the associated shift in faculty interest and backgrounds. However, with program modifications, a compelling case could have been made to retain the SCPP had the faculty composition been more balanced with a representative sample of professionally trained school counseling faculty who held an active interest in school counseling.

For example, at the University of Idaho, the faculty in The Division of Adult, Counselor and Technology Education, housed in the College of Education have developed and currently administer a dual degree program with a training emphasis in school counseling and school psychology. Both aspects of this dual degree program are nationally accredited. The school counseling programmatic emphasis is accredited by CACREP and the school psychology programmatic emphasis is accredited by NASP. The dual emphasis program leads to either a master of education (M.Ed.) or a master of science (M.S.) in counseling and human services and an education specialist degree (Ed.S.) after the completion of a one-year full-time school psychology internship during the third year. According to the program description, the Counseling and School Psychology Program (CASP) at the University of Idaho is a “dual degree program [that] is a blend of academic and field-based course work with an emphasis on practicum and

internship experiences at regional schools and human services agencies” (CASP Program Overview, April, 2005, <http://coe.ed.uidaho.edu/index.cfm>).

The University of Idaho’s model is comparable to the BYU SCPP model in that it combines the training of both school professionals. However, it is distinct in degree structure and training approach. The CASP program provides graduate students at the University of Idaho with the option of obtaining either a M.Ed. or a M.S. degree at the completion of the first two years, and then an Ed.S. at the completion of a full-time school psychology internship. The degree structure of the CASP allows graduates to exit the program after two years or continue for one additional year to receive the specialist degree. This approach provides graduates with a representative degree and the option to benefit fully from public school salary steps. Furthermore, the training approach is slightly different as the focus is on combined training as opposed to integrated training. For example, the CASP offers distinct field placement experiences designed to meet the specific accreditation standards for CACREP and NASP. In short, this program demonstrates that it is possible to administer a combined school counseling and school psychology program that is nationally accredited by both CACREP and NASP.

To accomplish a similar goal with the SCPP, some degree and curriculum restructuring would be required. Degree restructuring would address pay equity, field placement impediments, and the national accreditation problems which have encumbered the program, students, and faculty for the last several years. A program name change from School Counseling Psychology to School Counseling and School Psychology would help with both NASP and CACREP. This approach would also allow for the retention of

dual training and the support for obtaining the professional counselor license, each of which were highly valued options associated with of the SCPP.

Program components. The former students and school professionals all praised the program for the psychoeducational assessment skills of the students. Thus, their assessment skills were perceived as an area of strength. This component was viewed as a well taught and well-developed aspect in the SCPP. It is important to note that psychoeducational assessment is the primary role and function representing the discipline of school psychology despite the calls for reform (Bradley-Johnson & Dean, 2000; Cheramie & Sutter, 1993; Fagan, 1995, 2002; Hagemeyer et al., 1998; Hall, 2002; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; Huebner, 1993; Nastasi, 2000; Reschly, 2000; Short & Talley, 1997; Sigmon, 1987; Woody & Davenport, 1998; Ysseldyke et al., 1997). Due to the former students' skills in assessment they were considered excellent school psychologists. Conversely, the former students and school professionals consistently commented on their desire for a greater emphasis on counseling in the SCPP. Counseling training and the development of counseling skills was highly valued and desired. This feedback is suggestive that counseling skill training and development was an under-emphasized and marginalized component from both an instructional and applied perspective. Due to the former students' perceived skill deficits in counseling, they were viewed as marginal counselors who needed close supervision and guidance.

With regard to field placement, this study reveals that training experiences varied from one placement to another, and that training options for counseling and school psychology were rarely integrated. The lack of integrated sites became the impetus for requiring multiple field placement sites. Some students were very satisfied as they were

given several opportunities to be involved in professional roles, while others felt trapped by field placement requirements and their placement assignment(s). The two aspects that were the most consistently reported limitations associated with field placement activities were a) that placements were highly variable, and b) that counseling interventions and skill development were under-emphasized.

Furthermore, the school professionals desired less programmatic structure and fewer prescribed tasks. For many supervising school professions this tight structure became a heavy burden, often complicating their current role assignments. For other supervising school professionals these aspects became the catalyst for discontinuing their involvement with the SCPP. The integration, structure, and resulting problems formed the practical impediment referred to by the faculty and one of the primary factors influencing their decision to discontinue the SCPP.

The feedback pertaining to this broad theme supports the value of maintaining the strong training focus in psychoeducational assessment while also enhancing the counseling training and skill development aspect of the program. Furthermore, it is also suggestive of the need to establish and maintain a programmatic balance where the roles and functions of either discipline are not emphasized at the expense of developing the complementary role of the other. A “traditional” approach to field placement assignments would help to simplify these placements, and decrease the heavy burden experienced by site supervisors and program faculty. A combined curriculum as opposed to an integrated curriculum would still yield the desired dual training outcome, but would eliminate the confusion of integrating training requirements at non-integrated field placement sites. In addition to easing the administrative aspect of field placement

activities it would also enhance national accreditation efforts by offering focused discipline specific (traditional) training experiences.

Program administration. The frequent changes, the communication breakdowns, and the lack of consistent leadership and supervision from program faculty were a few of the reasons former students felt the program was “slapped together.” The comprehensive examination experience for the third-cohort group summed their experience as former students in the program. They specifically noted a pattern of disorganization, errors, inconsistent information, lack of leadership, no protection, and constant lack of follow-through in addressing programmatic problems. These were the hallmark characteristics of their experiences as former students in the SCPP. The school professionals also expressed their frustration with the rapid program changes as well as a pattern of “poor communication.”

The former students were particularly upset by their interactions with a program administrator. The majority of the negative feedback obtained from former students and school professionals pertained to the personality style of this administrator. The former students were suspicious of what they perceived as apparent and calculated grading bias. They claimed that assignment requirements and grading became the medium the administrator used to punish students who challenged or complained about him.

The remainder of the negative feedback was focused on the administrative aspects of the program which included the program faculty (collectively) and the department chair from an administrative standpoint. Generally, when the former students voiced their concerns they felt punished or reprimanded for complaining. The former students claimed that the management of the SCPP was problematic. They asserted the total

faculty were insufficiently involved in program refinements. According to the program faculty's report, the SCPP model was created collectively, but they acknowledged that the later on-going program refinements were heavily influenced by the program administrator. The former students were upset that their efforts to provide feedback and to obtain support in coping with the program administrator were not supported through administrative channels. The persistent perceived lack of follow-through and infrequent reprimands were specifically cited by the former students and school professionals. Former students' interpersonal interactions with some faculty members were stated as the most difficult aspects of being a student in the SCPP. In short, they felt trapped in a situation without sufficient recourse or acceptable alternatives. Often, the former students felt stuck between two options, either discontinuance from the program or the sustained suffering associated with enduring until they graduated.

The administratively-based programmatic feedback is suggestive of the importance of recruiting and retaining diversely trained program faculty with professional training and service experience representative of the distinct needs of a combined training program. It is critical that the program faculty work collaboratively in the administration of all aspects of a combined program. The feedback obtained from former students and school professionals underscores the significant role of the faculty, collectively and individually, in administering a successful program. At no point did the former students or school professional report that it was their impression the SCPP was not working. However, on several occasions both commented on how their frustrations with one particular faculty member and the administrative response to their concerns shaped their experience of the program. Lastly, the importance of providing a timely and effective

administrative response to the student's and school professional's concerns appears to be of great importance to the overall quality and the general "health" of an academic preparation program. Otherwise, even highly desired programmatic training is overshadowed by administrative shortcomings and the total training impact is diminished.

Program perspectives. The former students cited several strengths of the SCPP. Dual certification, well-rounded broad training, eligibility for the LPC in Utah, and the influence of four specifically mentioned faculty members were expressly cited by the former students. The school professionals extended this list by adding three additional points: a) students in the SCPP are better trained than their student peers from other programs, b) dual training broadens the service base within public schools, and c) the former SCPP students have a comparative employment advantage over their traditionally trained peers.

With regard to program administration, the former students and school professionals recommended that the faculty make a) fewer program modifications and allow more time for the program to "gel", b) hire individuals who are supportive of a combined program and who possess the training and service needs of an integrated school counseling and school psychology training program (it was the perception that school counseling faculty were under-represented), c) make progressive program refinements as opposed to discontinuing the SCPP in an effort to secure NASP accreditation, and d) develop a cohesive system with a strong leader capable of providing balance and perspective to a diversely trained faculty.

Lastly, the former students highly valued and consistently commented on their desire to have a greater emphasis on counseling, with a specific focus on mental health counseling and the steps necessary to obtain the professional counselor license. By the former students' report, the majority were too "burnt out" at the completion of their program to take the additional coursework necessary to obtain the LPC in Utah.

Apparently, recent summer course schedule changes have now made it nearly impossible for the former students to enroll in these courses. These changes continue to reinforce the perspective that counseling skills and licensure are marginalized aspects and outcomes of the program.

Dual certification, training breadth, the option of securing the Professional Counselor License and select faculty were the unanimous strengths of the SCPP. The value of making less frequent changes, hiring faculty representative of the goals and needs of the program, and the benefit of selecting a strong leader capable of developing a cohesive program faculty were unanimously suggested ways of improving the SCPP. Based upon the response patterns and feedback obtained through this study, it is the researcher's perspective that valued outcomes associated with successful training programs include options that enrich student training experiences and enhance their future service options as a result. For example, the option of securing the LPC and eventually providing licensed mental health services was highly desired, and as such, a likely strength and beneficial aspect for students, the professional community, and the service settings in which former students are employed.

Educational Reform Implications

Implications. The results of this study are anchored within the context of the SCPP at BYU and the regional school districts of Utah and southern Salt Lake counties. Clearly the implications are at the grass-roots or district level as suggested by Fagan (2000), Herr (2002), and Sheridan and Gutkin (2000). Despite the regional constraints of this study, the literature based educational reform suggestions pertaining to collaboration, integrated services, and merged student pupil services have been experimented upon through the administration of the integrated SCPP at BYU. (Adelman & Taylor, 2000, 2002, 2003; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March; Herr, 2002; House & Hayes, 2002; Murphy et al., 1998; Rowley, 2000; Smith 1995). From this perspective the reinforced patterns associated with educational reform efforts extend beyond the population centers of Utah and Salt Lake Counties to school districts, regions, and states across the nation.

The value of collaborative working relationships was evident by the willingness of school counseling and school psychology professionals to supervise and train students whose program demanded service integration and collaborative relationships with other student pupil service professionals (House & Hayes, 2002; Murphy et al., 1998; Rowley, 2000). This collaboration occurred in several service settings across the Northern Utah region, despite the barriers of bifurcated funding systems, school professionals trained in traditionally separate professional service programs, and the historical roles and functions associated with school counseling and school psychology.

Herr (2002) argues that integrated school counseling services receives too little attention. The SCPP model provided the faculty at BYU, the public school professionals

in the region, and the graduates of the SCPP an opportunity to experience the roles and functions of these professions from an integrated perspective. Additionally, the struggle to secure NASP and CACREP accreditation, as well as other similar efforts, can be viewed as an effort to test and clarify the professional identity and the standards heralded for school counseling and school psychology.

Despite the long history of calls for reform in school counseling and school psychology (Adelman & Taylor, 2000; Arman, 2000; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2001 March; Chemamie & Sutter, 1993; Fagan, 1995, 2002; Hart & Jacobi, 1992; Herr, 2002; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; House & Hayes, 2002; Lapan, 2001; Murphy et al., 1998; Reschly, 2000; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Short & Talley, 1997; Sink & MacDonald, 1998; Smith, 1995; Ysseldyke et al., 1997) the obstacles to reform were readily apparent as the program faculty worked to develop an integrated dual-accredited training program in School Counseling Psychology. Many of the obstacles appeared to be conceptual barriers (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000), those associated with history, tradition, and professional “turf wars.” The reality is that the needs of school districts across the nation are varied (Herr, 2002), which further reinforces the need for grass roots or district-level research to better understand them (Fagan, 2002; Herr, 2002; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). The associated strengths of the SCPP validated the importance and need for grass roots level research as well as the need to continue developing and researching the impact of integrated or combined training programs within the context of student pupil services.

Future research is needed to better understand the training and competency levels of students from integrated or combined programs compared to those from traditional

student pupil services programs. There is also value in expanding and replicating the current study after all the SCPP students have graduated and entered the professional work force. Furthermore, given the context of current educational reform efforts, any programmatic or service endeavor aimed at increasing collaboration, expanding professional service roles and functions, or the promotion of integrated or combined student pupil services will be of greatest service if they are sustained by active grass-roots level research and advocacy efforts at regional, state and national levels. As Dawson (2002) suggests, educational reform efforts are best accomplished when the program students and faculty are all committed to the same advocacy efforts. This argument could also be extended to include all student pupil services professionals as well.

References

- Adelman, H., & Taylor, L. (2000). Shaping the future of mental health in schools. *Psychology in the Schools, 37*(1), 49-60.
- Adelman, H.S., & Taylor, L. (2002). School counselors and school reform: New directions. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 235-248.
- Adelman, H.S., & Taylor, L. (2003). Rethinking school psychology. *Journal of School Psychology, 41*, 77-82.
- Arman, J.F. (2000). In the wake of tragedy at Columbine High School. *Professional School Counseling, 3*(3), 218-220.
- Bradley-Johnson, S., & Dean, V.J. (2000). Role change for school psychology: The challenge continues in the new millennium. *Psychology in the Schools, 37*(1), 1-5.
- Burnham, J.J., and Jackson, C.M. (2000). School counselor roles: Discrepancies between actual practice and existing models. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(1), 41-49.
- Casat, C.D., Sobolewski, J., Gordon, J., & Rigsby, M.B. (1999). School-based mental health services (SBS): A pragmatic view of a program. *Psychology in the Schools, 36*(5), 403-413.
- Center for Mental Health in Schools. (2001, March). A center report: Framing new directions for school counselors, psychologists, and social workers. Los Angeles, CA: Adelman, H., & Taylor, L.
- Cherame, G.M., & Sutter, E.G. (1993). Role expansion in school psychology: The need for primary and secondary prevention services. *Psychology in the Schools, 30*(1), 53-59.

- Christenson, S.L. (2000). Commentary—School psychologists as health-care providers: A means to success for all. *School Psychology Review*, 29(4), 555-556.
- Cunanan, E.S., & Maddy-Bernstein, C. (1994). The role of the school counselor (Report No. CG-025-995). Berkley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED379557)
- Dawson, M.M. (2000). Commentary on Shapiro: Big problems, big obstacles: The challenge for school psychology. *School Psychology Review*, 29(4), 573-574.
- Elliott, S.N. (2000). Commentary-- progress monitoring and trend analyses: Reactions to Reschly's synthesis. *School Psychology Review*, 29(4), 523-524.
- Erlanson, D.A., Harris, E.L., Skipper, B.L., & Allen, S.D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fagan, T.F. (1992). Compulsory schooling, child study, clinical psychology, and special education: Origins of school psychology. *American Psychologist*, 47(2), 236-243.
- Fagan, T.F. (1995). Trends in the history of school psychology in the United States. In A. Thomas and J. Grimes (Eds.) *Best Practices in School Psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 59-67). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Fagan, T.F. (2002). School psychology: Recent descriptions, continued expansion, and an ongoing paradox. *School Psychology Review*, 31(1), 5-10.
- Goodyear, R.K., & Bates, C.A. (1992). Counseling. In *Encyclopedia of educational research* (Vol. 1, pp. 247-254). New York: Macmillan.
- Ginter, E.J., Scalise, J.J., & Presse, N. (1990). The elementary school counselor's role: Perceptions of teachers. *The School Counselor*, 38(3), 19-23.

- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Guerra, P. (1998). Revamping school counselor education: The DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund. *Counseling Today*, February.
- Guerra, P. (1998). Reaction to DeWitt Wallace grant overwhelming. *Counseling Today*, April.
- Gysbers, N.C., & Henderson, P. (2000). A comprehensive guidance program: Perspective, content, organizational framework, and resources. In N.C. Gysbers and P. Henderson (Eds.), *Developing and managing your school guidance program* (3rd ed., pp. 49-80). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Hackney, H. (1990). Counselor preparation for future needs. In H. Hackney (Ed.), *Changing contexts for counselor preparation in the 1990's* (pp. 77-93). Alexandria, VA: Association for Counselor Education and Supervision.
- Hagemeier, C., Bischoff, L., Jacobs, J., & Osmon, W. (1998, April). Role perceptions of the school psychologist by school personnel. Paper presented at the National Association of School Psychologists, Annual Convention, Orlando, FL.
- Hall, J.D. (2002). Contemporary practices in school psychology: A national survey of roles and referral problems. *Psychology in the Schools*, 39(3), 327-335.
- Hardesty, P.H., & Dillard, J.M. (1994). The role of elementary school counselors compared with their middle and secondary school counterparts. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, 29(4), 83-91.
- Hart, P.J., & Jacobi, M. (1992). *From gatekeeper to advocate: Transforming the role of the school counselor*. New York: The College Board.

- Herr, E.L. (2002). School reform and perspectives on the role of school counselors: A century of proposals for change. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 220-234.
- Hill, G.E., & Nitzschke, D.F. (1961). Preparation programs in elementary school guidance. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 10*, 155-159.
- Hosp, J.L., & Reschly, D.J. (2002). Regional differences in school psychology practice. *School Psychology Review, 31*(1), 11-29.
- House, R.M., & Hayes, R.L. (2002). School counselors: Becoming key players in school reform. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 249-256.
- Huebner, S.E. (1993). Psychologists in secondary schools in the 1990's: Current functions, training, and job satisfaction. *School Psychology Quarterly, 8*(1), 50-56.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lambert, N., & Goodman, M. (1992). School psychology. In *Encyclopedia of educational research* (Vol. 4, pp. 1158-1165). New York: Macmillan.
- Lapan, R.T. (2001). Results-based comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: A framework for planning and evaluation. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(4), 289-299.
- Lenhardt, A.M.C., & Young, P.A. (2001). Proactive strategies for advancing elementary school counseling programs: A blueprint for the new millennium. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(3), 187-194.
- Lockhart, E.J., & Keys, S.G. (1998). The mental health counseling role of school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 1*(4), 3-6.

- Motes, P.S., Melton, G., & Simmons, W.E.W. (1999). Ecologically oriented school-based mental health services: Implications for service system reform. *Psychology in the Schools, 36*(5), 391-401.
- Murphy, J.P., DeEsch, J.B., & Strein, W.O. (1998). School counselors and school psychologist: Partners in student services. *Professional School Counseling, 2*(2), 85-87.
- Nastasi, B.K. (2000). School psychologists as health-care providers in the 21st Century: Conceptual framework, professional identity, and professional practice. *School Psychology Review, 29*(4), 540-554.
- Oakland, T., & Cunningham, J. (1999). The futures of school psychology: Conceptual models for its development and examples of their applications. In C.R. Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The Handbook of School Psychology* (3rd edition, pp. 34-53). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paisley, P.O., & Borders, D. (1995). School counseling: An evolving specialty. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74*(6), 150-153.
- Perry, N.S. (1995). The school counselor's role in education reform. *NASSP Bulletin, 79*(570), 24-29.
- Porter, R.B. (1984). The emerging role of school psychology. *Journal of School Psychology, 22*, 223-233.

- Pumariega, A.J., & Vance, H.R. (1999). School-based mental health services: The foundation of systems of care for children's mental health. *Psychology in the Schools, 36*(5), 371-379.
- Reschly, D.J. (2000). The present and future status of school psychology in the United States. *School Psychology Review, 29*(4), 507-522.
- Rowley, W.J. (2000). Expanding collaborative partnerships among school counselors and school psychologists. *Professional School Counseling, 3*(3), 224-228.
- Schmidt, J.J. (1984). School counseling: Professional directions for the future. *The School Counselor, 31*, 385-392.
- Shapiro, E.S. (2000). School psychology from an instructional perspective: Solving big, not little problems. *School Psychology Review, 29*(4), 560-572.
- Shepard-Tew, D., & Creamer, D.A. (1998). Elementary school integrated services teams: Applying case-management techniques. *Professional School Counseling, 2*(2), 141-145.
- Sheridan, S.M., & Gutkin, T.B. (2000). The ecology of school psychology: Examining and changing our paradigm for the 21st Century. *School Psychology Review, 29*(4), 485-502.
- Short, R.J., & Talley, R.C. (1997). Rethinking psychology and the schools. *American Psychologist, 52*(3), 234-240.
- Sigmon, S.B. (1987). Present roles and future objectives for American school psychology. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 2*(3), 379-382.

- Sigmon, S.B. (1990). School Counseling Psychology: A vehicle for role change regarding special education. In S.B. Sigmon (Ed.), *Critical voices on special education: Problems and progress concerning the mildly handicapped* (pp. 167-173). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sink, C.A. (2000). The school counselor as a “psychoeducational resource specialist:” Reframing our role for the next century. *Professional School Counseling*, 3(3), ii-iii.
- Sink, C.A., & MacDonald, G. (1998). The status of comprehensive guidance and counseling in the United States. *Professional School Counseling*, 2(2), 88-94.
- Smith, D.K. (1995). Cooperation between school psychologist and counselors in assessment (Report No. EDO-CG-95-29). Greensboro, NC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services No. ED391986)
- Wise, P.S., Smead, V.S., and Huebner, E.S. (1987). Crisis intervention: Involvement and training needs of school psychology personnel. *Journal of School Psychology*, 25, 185-187.
- Woody, R.H., and Davenport, J. (1998). The Blueprint I revisited: Training and practice in school psychology. *Psychology in the Schools*, 35(1), 49-55.
- Ysseldyke, J., Dawson, P., Lehr, C., Reschly, D., Reynolds, M., & Telzrow, C. (1997). *School psychology: A blueprint for training and practice II*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Appendix A
School Counseling Psychology Program Handbook

**SCHOOL COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY
(M.S. Degree Program)**

***STUDENT HANDBOOK
2003-2004***

**DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY
AND SPECIAL EDUCATION**

DAVID O. MCKAY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

340 MCKB, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY, PROVO, UT 84602
(801) 422-3857
(Revised July 2005)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
Welcome	5
Program Description	7
PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	8
Program Mission Statement	8
Program Philosophy	8
Program Objectives	9
OUR ALLIANCE WITH THE UNIVERSITY	12
General Honor Code Statement	13
Sexual Harassment	13
Students With Disabilities	14
THE FACULTY	14
Full-time Core Faculty (Full time in the CPSE Department).....	14
Joint Appointment Core Clinical Faculty (CPSE Department and CCC)	15
Affiliate Faculty (BYU faculty assigned elsewhere who teach and supervise in CPSE)	15
AFFILIATED PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS	16
National Association of School Psychologists	16
American Counseling Association	16
Student Membership in ACA and NASP	17
BYU Student Organization	17
ORIENTATION and THE ADVISORY SYSTEM	17
Your Advisory Chair and Committee	17
Orientation	18
Study List for Master's Degree Students.....	20
Registering for Classes	21
Full Time Status	21
Bachelors Degree Requirement	21
Financial Aid	21
Partial Tuition Scholarships (PTS)	21
Graduate Assistantships	21
Other Sources of Financial Aid	22
Outside Employment	22
Advice To The Beginning Masters Student (Helpful Hints)	22
DESCRIPTION OF FACILITIES	23
CPSE Department	23
School Counseling Psychology Center (SCPC)	23
Graduate Student Center	24
Computer Lab	24

Counseling and Career Center (CCC) Training Facilities	25
University Library	25
PARTNERSHIPS	26
Collaboration with Counseling & Career Center (CCC).....	26
Brigham Young University/Public School Partnership	26
CURRICULUM AND SCHEDULING.....	27
Recommended Course Sequencing **	27
Academic Items	29
Transfer Credit	29
GPA Requirements	29
ACADEMIC GRIEVANCES.....	29
Graduate Student Termination, Appeals, Grievances	29
Termination of Graduate Status.....	30
Appeal of Termination	30
STUDENT EVALUATION.....	30
General Expected Student Outcomes or Competencies.....	30
Knowledge	30
Performance	30
Dispositions.....	31
Student Evaluation Methods.....	31
Knowledge Evaluations.....	32
Performance Evaluations.....	32
Dispositions Evaluations	32
End of Semester Evaluations	33
Internship Placement Prerequisite	33
End-of-semester Graduate Student Evaluation	36
Student Evaluation Sequence.....	37
Written Comprehensive Exams	39
ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL ETHICS.....	40
Informed Consent.....	40
Privacy and Confidentiality	40
Dual Relationships.....	41
Responsibility and Competence	42
Counselor Impairment.....	42
Procedures for Resolving Ethical Dilemmas	42
Plagiarism	43
GRADUATION PROCESSES.....	43
Application for Graduation	43
ENDORSEMENT POLICY.....	44

Licensure as School Counselors and School Psychologists	44
Licensure as Professional Counselors	44
Credential and Practice Caution	45
Counseling and Therapy for our Students	45

INTRODUCTION

Welcome

On behalf of our faculty, we are pleased to welcome you to the M.S. Program in School Counseling Psychology. You have been selected from among a group of highly qualified people. We think you will find that you have made a good decision in choosing to pursue this program at BYU.

Our faculty members are very competent and caring people. They have earned the reputation for being available, approachable, and fair. They also have high expectations of themselves and of you, our students. You will come to value these qualities.

We have worked hard to craft a strong masters program and are currently accredited with the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and seeking accreditation from the National Association of School Psychology (NASP). This accreditation status and effort has and will benefit the program and graduates, past, present, and future. We have studied accreditation standards, reviewed current literature, and drawn from our experience to determine the content and scope of our program. We think you will find the program to be highly relevant, comprehensive, well organized, demanding, and enjoyable.

This program combines traditional training in school psychology with additional content relative to school counseling, enabling graduates to become dual certified, thus greatly enhancing career opportunities and increasing knowledge and skill levels. In addition to offering the traditional professional preparation you would likely find at other strong programs, we are fortunate that at BYU we can also add a unique dimension to our program. This dimension involves the spiritual domain. We believe that in order to be most helpful as school counseling psychologists, we must be prepared to deal with students' spiritual issues as well as other aspects of their lives.

While studying to become helping professionals, you will introspect and examine your own emotional health and openness to change and growth. In this sense, you will likely find that your total life experience will be impacted by what you learn in the program.

As you move through the program as outlined, you will acquire knowledge, skills, and dispositions required of helping professionals. The knowledge base is clearly outlined in a sequence of courses. The skills are acquired through practica and internship experiences. The dispositional, or personal, domain is enhanced through a variety of individual and group experiences. Success in these three domains will prepare you for a professional life that promises opportunity and satisfaction.

As faculty, we view ourselves as partners with our students in learning and growing. We believe that you will enjoy this experience and find great reward in hard work and devotion to your studies. We wish you success in this challenging and rewarding undertaking.

Mary Anne Prater, Ph.D.
Professor and Department Chair

Timothy B. Smith, Ph.D.
Program Director

Program Description

The M.S. program in School Counseling Psychology (SCP) is housed in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education (CPSE) in the David O. McKay School of Education at Brigham Young University. The program is based upon a scholar-practitioner model of training. This model is an integrated approach to training that acknowledges the interdependence of theory, research, and practice. School counseling psychologists promote optimal growth for individuals, groups, and systems.

The School Counseling Psychology Program (SCPP) emphasizes the psychological, educational, developmental, and preventative functions of school counseling psychologists. Our students also intervene with young people in educational settings who are experiencing abnormal development and psychopathology. They address personal and educational difficulties that serve as barriers to success and happiness.

It is our policy to conduct regular evaluations of the program to refine and improve it. BYU's current SCP program has been developed as a result of a review process that began at a departmental Strategic Planning Initiative in the fall of 1992. External planning leaders, trained and experienced in strategic planning methods, were hired to help direct the initial steps in our program review process. Two years later, the BYU Self Study Project was conducted in association with a total university re-accreditation by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. Our advisory committees reaffirmed the need for a professional with expanded skills. Based upon these ideas and the recommendations of the University Self-study Committee, which reflected our own written perceptions of our program, we made major revisions. The current program was approved by the Graduate Council and other university officials, and we accepted the first cohort of students in the summer of 1997.

This program is unique in that it combines training from two traditionally distinct helping professions-- school psychology and school counseling. It responds to the needs experienced by many school districts--for a counselor also prepared to provide testing/assessment, and for a school psychologist also prepared to provide counseling and consultation. The program was designed to solve identity and practice problems discovered through personal experiences of faculty members, by conducting three national surveys, and by exploring these issues with members of the BYU/Public School Partnership Counseling and School Psychology Task Forces. The fact that several doctoral programs nationwide offer combined training in both school psychology and counseling/clinical psychology also justified the creation of a combined program at the masters level.

Graduates of the program are well credentialed. They are prepared for dual licensure as school counselors and school psychologists in the state of Utah. All graduates will also be eligible to become National Certified Counselors (NCC) through the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC) upon successful completion of the National Counselor Examination (NCE). Graduates may also choose to become nationally certified as School Psychologists by successfully completing the School Psychologist Test (Praxis 0400) offered by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Although we do not formally sponsor a mental health counseling

program, students who complete two additional courses in diagnostics (DSM-IV) and advanced personality assessment (including the MMPI), will have met course requirements for Licensure as Professional Counselors (LPC). Students applying for LPC licensure must also demonstrate that their internship included at least 200 clock hours of “mental health therapy.” Professional Counselor licensure also requires two years (4,000 hours) of post-degree supervised experience in a mental health counseling setting. *A school system may be considered such a mental health setting only if diagnosis and treatment are provided and a licensed mental health therapist provides requisite supervision.* For more information regarding LPC licensure, see http://www.dopl.utah.gov/licensing/professional_counselor.html

The program is distinctive among School Counseling Psychology programs because, like its parent institution, it “seeks to develop students of faith, intellect, and character who have the skills and the desire to continue learning and to serve others throughout their lives.” (“The Aims of a BYU Education”, *BYU 2001-2002 Undergraduate Catalog*, pg. 13).

Students, faculty, and staff in the SCPP agree to conduct their lives in harmony with ethical and moral values that are highlighted in the Honor Code statement available from the catalogue and summarized briefly below. The faculty believes that the most effective school counseling psychologists, regardless of their personal religious affiliation, are those who abide by high standards of ethical and professional conduct. They also believe that truth may be obtained through both scientific inquiry and spiritual or revealed sources. Faculty members believe that the integration of these areas has great potential for increasing school counseling psychologists' capability to provide effective assistance to all of the human family. Faculty members are therefore committed to integrating psychological, educational and spiritual sources of knowledge.

Students who graduate from the program are highly qualified, academically and personally for helping positions in educational settings. Their preparation and credentials qualify them for numerous employment options. Graduates have readily obtained positions as counselors, school psychologists or school counseling psychologists.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Program Mission Statement

The School Counseling Psychology Program prepares students with knowledge, skills, and dispositions essential in helping individuals to enhance personal, educational, and career development and to minimize barriers effecting their lives.

Program Philosophy

The School Counseling Psychology Program at Brigham Young University is driven by numerous influences including the current professional literature, best practices research, feedback from our advisory committees, University recommendations, and the two professional

accreditation bodies—the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

The primary goal of this program is to prepare highly skilled school counseling psychologists who are capable of functioning in the demanding public school environment as professionals trained in a variety of assessment and intervention techniques. Graduates complete coursework and supervised experiences that prepare them to certify or license in both school counseling and school psychology and to provide services at both the elementary and secondary levels. It is our philosophy that the school counseling psychologist's role in the public school setting is that of the cognitive, social, and behavioral scientist and practitioner whose primary responsibility is to design, administer, and participate in school counseling and school psychology services for the benefit of all students.

Through the application of counseling and psychological theories and research findings, the school counseling psychologist develops and uses methods for assessing the personal and educational assets and needs of children and youth. This function serves as the basis for recommending and providing the needed developmental, preventive, and intervention services within an educational context.

Program Objectives

The objectives of this program are founded on the “Conceptual Framework” of the David O. McKay School of Education. In this framework, three domains are specified--knowledge, performance, and dispositions. These domains envelop the more general objectives of the program. More specific competencies are listed in the practicum and internship manual.

Knowledge

Students will gain knowledge about the following general topic areas through their coursework and experience as they progress in the program:

Human growth and development

- Theories of individual and family development
- Theories of learning and personality
- Human behavior across various settings and conditions (e.g., normal development, psychopathology, disabilities, life crises, addictive behaviors, and environmental factors)
- Strategies for facilitating development over the life span
- Biological, social, and other factors that influence behavior

Social and cultural factors

- Trends, characteristics, and concerns of diverse groups across multiple factors (e.g., age, race, gender, religious preference, physical abilities, sexual orientation, ethnicity, culture, and socioeconomic status)
- Individual and group strategies with diverse populations

Helping relationships

- Individual and group counseling theory and processes from the current literature
- Ingredients for developing effective helping relationships
- Characteristics that are requisite to facilitating positive change at individual and group intervention levels
- The function and purpose of interviewing and assessment procedures

Career and lifestyle development

- Career development theories, techniques, counseling processes, decision making models, and career-related resources (e.g., market information, computer-based resources, journals, and guidance and assessment tools)
- The interplay between life roles (e.g., work, family, church, and etc.) and sociocultural factors (e.g., gender, ethnicity, culture, and socioeconomic factors)

Appraisal

- Theoretical and historical bases of various measurement and assessment techniques
- Psychometric statistics within the context of assessment, interpretation, and intervention (e.g., standard error, correlation, distributions, measures of central tendency)
- Validity and reliability and other psychometric concepts
- Multiple appraisal methods (e.g., performance, behavioral, environmental)
- Influence of demographic factors on the appraisal process (age, gender, socioeconomic status, language, culture, and abilities)
- Strategies and methods for test selection, administration, interpretation, and intervention.
- Appropriate use of various types of tests (e.g., intelligence, educational, interest, career, values, achievement and personality tests, etc.)

Research and program evaluation

- Qualitative and quantitative research methods and designs, and the relationship between research methods (data type, collection procedures) and analysis
- Use of electronic methods of searching and acquiring useful information
- Evaluation and appropriate application of research findings

Professional orientation

- History of helping professions, professional roles and functions, professional organizations relevant to school counseling and school psychology, particularly ACA, NASP, and their appropriate divisions
- Legal and ethical standards that guide the decisions and behavior of a school counseling psychologist
- Professional credentialing standards (licensure), advocacy, the importance of public policy, and endorsement requirements

Performance

Students will demonstrate effective performance in:

- Practicing ethical behavior as defined by the ACA and NASP professional guidelines
- Intervening effectively at preventative, developmental and responsive levels
- Competently applying individual and group counseling techniques
- Implementing socially and culturally appropriate strategies and interventions with diverse clientele
- Developing effective interviewing, and consultation skills
- Selecting, administering, scoring, and interpreting a variety of standardized tests
- Making recommendations for treatment and intervention that are congruent with psychometric concepts (reliability, validity, standard error, standard deviation & etc.), environmental factors, and demographic variables (family situation, culture, ethnicity, age, gender)
- Conducting effective career assessment and career advisement activities using the latest technology and resources
- Report writing skills
- Working in collaboration with others (parents, administrators, counseling/psychology staff, resource persons, teachers, students, and other professionals)
- Direct and indirect levels of intervention

Dispositions

Students will develop and maintain a disposition or attitude that is consistent with educational training and their personal and professional role, by:

- Maintaining effective working relationships with faculty, staff, supervisors, colleagues, and students
- Understanding human diversity and remaining current with the standards of professional services
- Acquiring and portraying the personal traits necessary to be successful in all aspects of their work
- Meeting professional obligations and practice in an ethical, legal, moral, and professional manner
- Understanding and incorporating the Honor Code of the University
- Committing with integrity to the role of an ethical and responsible school counseling psychologist
- Valuing and committing to a lifetime of learning and service by gaining more knowledge, developing new skills, and seeking to make personal improvements through openness and genuineness

OUR ALLIANCE WITH THE UNIVERSITY

Our Master of Science Program in School Counseling Psychology is one of three graduate programs in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education. The other two include (1) the Ph.D. Program in Counseling Psychology which prepares graduates to work with late adolescents and adults (with emphasis on the university counseling setting) and to work as faculty members and scholars at the university level, and (2) the Master of Science Program in Special Education.

Our Department is one of five in the David O. McKay School of Education. David O. McKay was a highly regarded educator and was for many years President of what is now Weber State University. As a beloved President of the LDS Church, he emphasized the value of education. Our programs understandably provide primarily an educational focus. The other four departments include:

Teacher Education,
Educational Leadership and Foundations,
Instructional Psychology and Technology, and
Audiology/Speech-Language Pathology.

The David O. McKay School of Education is one of 10 other Schools and Colleges (three schools and seven colleges) within the university. The other two schools include:

J. Reuben Clark Law School, and
Marriott School of Management.

The seven colleges include:

Biology and Agriculture
Engineering and Technology
Family, Home and Social Sciences
Fine Arts and Communication
Health and Human Performance
Humanities
Nursing
Physical and Mathematical Sciences

The University is considered to be primarily an undergraduate institution with a few graduate programs expected to achieve excellence. We have been fortunate to receive the necessary resources to offer high quality programs due to the generosity of faithful members of the Church. We are expected to be wise stewards of these resources.

We desire that our programs model effective professional standards and practices and reflect complete harmony with the goals of the School of Education, the mission and aims of the University and teachings of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Our mission and

objectives were developed to be harmonious with current and historical documents provided by our past and present leaders.

General Honor Code Statement

Brigham Young University exists to provide a university education in an atmosphere consistent with the ideals and principles of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. This atmosphere is preserved through commitment to conduct that reflects those ideals and principles.

As a matter of personal commitment, students, staff, and faculty of Brigham Young University are expected to demonstrate in daily living on and off campus those moral virtues encompassed in the gospel of Jesus Christ, and will—

- Be honest
- Live a chaste and virtuous life
- Obey the law and university policy
- Use clean language
- Respect others
- Abstain from alcoholic beverages, tobacco, tea, coffee, and substance abuse
- Adhere to the BYU Dress and Grooming Standards
- Support others in their commitment to comply with the BYU Honor Code

Specific policies embodied in the Honor Code include: Academic Honesty, Dress and Grooming Standards, Residential Living Standards, and Continuing Student Ecclesiastical Endorsement.

Source: *BYU 2003-04 Graduate Catalog*, pp. 8-9, 32 or see *Graduate Studies Catalog* at www.byu.edu/gradstudies/resources/.

Sexual Harassment

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination against any participant in an educational program or activity receiving federal funds. The act is intended to eliminate sex discrimination in education. BYU's policy against sexual harassment extends not only to employees of the university but to students as well. If you encounter unlawful sexual harassment or gender based discrimination, you may seek resolution through established grievance policy and procedures (see p. 20 below). You may also contact the Equal Employment Opportunity Office (D-282 ASB, 422-5895 or 422-5689--24-hours) or contact the Honor Code Office (4440 WSC, 422-2847).

Students With Disabilities

Brigham Young University is committed to providing an accessible working and learning atmosphere for all students. If you have any disability which may require special accommodations, please contact the Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) Office (1520 WSC, 422-2767, 422-8984 TTY). Reasonable academic accommodations are reviewed for all students who have qualified, documented disabilities. Services are coordinated with the student and instructor by the SSD Office. If you feel you have been unlawfully discriminated against on the basis of disability, you may seek resolution through established grievance policy and procedures (see Handbook section on Academic Grievances). You may also contact the SSD Office or the Equal Employment Opportunity Office (D-282 ASB, 422-5859).

THE FACULTY

Full-time Core Faculty (Full time in the CPSE Department)

Allen, Melissa A., Ph.D., Texas A&M University, 1996. *Assistant Professor*. Conflict and Violence, Crisis Management, Parent Training. (melissa_allen@byu.edu)

Crook, Rachel E., Ph.D., The University of Maryland, College Park, 2002. *Assistant Professor*. Psychotherapy process and outcome; dream interpretation; therapeutic alliance; training and supervision.

Fischer, Lane, Ph.D., University of Minnesota, 1991. *Associate Professor*. Adoption and Foster Care, School Psychology, Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy, Ethics in Counseling Psychology. (lane_fischer@byu.edu)

Jackson, Aaron P., Ph.D. University of Missouri Columbia, 1993. *Assistant Professor*. Career Development of Native Americans, Counseling Outcomes. (aaron_jackson@byu.edu)

Richards, P. Scott, Ph.D., University of Minnesota, 1988. *Professor*. Religious and Spiritual Values in Counseling and Mental Health, Research Methodology. (scott_richards@byu.edu)

Smith, Timothy B., Ph.D., Utah State University, 1997. *Assistant Professor*. Consultation, Multicultural Psychology, Spirituality, Identity Development, Quality Relationships. (tim_smith@byu.edu)

Young, Ellie L., Ph.D., University of South Florida, 2001. *Assistant Professor*. Gender Issues in Education, Self-concept, Middle School Education. (ellie_young@byu.edu).

Joint Appointment Core Clinical Faculty (CPSE Department and CCC)

Gleave, Robert L., Ph.D., Brigham Young University, 1981. *Clinical Professor and Student Evaluation Coordinator*. Post-modern Thought, Group Work and Research, Practicum, Counseling Theory, Philosophy of Counseling. (robert_gleave@byu.edu)

Heaps, Richard A., Ph.D., ABPP, University of Utah, 1970. *Professor*. Crisis Intervention, Trauma and Disaster Psychology, Conflict Response, Eating Disorders, Adult Development, Individual and Group Counseling. (richard_heaps@byu.edu)

Okiishi, John, Ph.D., Brigham Young University, 2000. *Assistant Clinical Professor*. Multicultural Counseling and Training, Forensic Populations, Outcome Assessment, Individual and Group Psychotherapy. (jco@email.byu.edu)

Smith, Steven A., Ph.D., University of Minnesota, 1988. *Associate Clinical Professor*. Individual and Group Counseling, Counseling and Psychotherapy with Adolescents and Adults. (steven_smith@byu.edu)

Williams, Marleen S., Ph.D., Brigham Young University, 1993. *Associate Clinical Professor and Recruitment Coordinator*. Diagnosis and Treatment of Dysfunctional Behavior, Women's Issues in Mental Health and Counseling Psychology, Religious Issues in Counseling. (marleen_williams@byu.edu)

Affiliate Faculty (BYU faculty assigned elsewhere who teach and supervise in CPSE)

Byrd, Paul B., Ph.D., ABPP, Brigham Young University, 1985. *Associate Clinical Professor and Director, University Accessibility Center*. Learning Disability Issues, Psychological Assessment, Trauma and Disaster Psychology, Adolescent Substance Abuse. (paul_byrd@byu.edu)

Isakson, Richard L., Ph.D., Cornell University, 1975. *Clinical Professor and Psychologist, CCC*. Counseling, Learning and Cognition, Counselor Training. (richard_isakson@byu.edu)

Kramer, Gary L., Ph.D., Oregon State University, 1977. *Professor, Associate Dean, Admissions and Records*. Career Guidance and Development. (gary_l_kramer@byu.edu)

Morrell, Barbara, Ph.D., Brigham Young University, 1997. *Assistant Clinical Professor and Psychologist, CCC*. Sexual Assault and Abuse, Eating Disorders, Career Counseling. (barbara-morrell@byu.edu)

Scharman, Janet S., Ph.D., University of Utah, 1992. *Associate Clinical Professor and Student Life Vice President*. School Counseling, Individual and Group Counseling, Qualitative Research Methods, Student development. (jan_scharman@byu.edu)

Ward, G. Robert, Ph.D., Michigan State University, 1965. *Professor and Honor Code Office. Counseling, Moral Development.* (bob_ward@byu.edu)

Woolley, Bruce H., PharmD, U. of Southern California, 1972. *Professor and Counselor, Food Science and Nutrition.* Nutritional Pharmacology. (bruce_wooley@byu.edu)

Worthen, Vaughn E., Ph.D., University of Kansas, 1993. *Assistant Clinical Professor and Psychologist, CCC.* Career Counseling, Counseling Supervision. (vaughan_worthen@byu.edu)

Adjunct Faculty (Community Professionals who teach and supervise in CPSE)

Christiensen, Jana, Ph.D., Brigham Young University, 1989. *Psychologist in Private Practice and School Psychologist.* Counseling and School Psychology.

AFFILIATED PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

National Association of School Psychologists

The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) was founded 1969 and has become the largest non-profit association for school psychologists in the world with over 21,000 members. "The mission of ...NASP is to promote educationally and psychologically healthy environments for all children and youth by implementing research-based, effective programs that prevent problems, enhance independence, and promote optimal learning. This is accomplished through state-of-the-art research and training, advocacy, ongoing program evaluation, and caring professional service." www.nasponline.org

American Counseling Association

The American Counseling Association (ACA) is a nonprofit educational and professional organization that was founded in 1952. ACA is committed to improving and promoting the counseling profession and currently represents nearly 55,000 counselors across a variety of practice settings. ACA helps counseling professionals and students expand and develop their knowledge and skills by providing educational opportunities (conferences and workshops), publications (books, journals, newsletters, and other resources), advocacy services (insurance plans, legislation, and etc.), and leadership training. The ACA has set professional and ethical standards, and made noteworthy strides in accreditation, licensure, and national certification for the counseling profession. It strives to promote recognition of professional counselors to the public and media. ACA is comprised of 17 divisions that provide specialized support, resources, and educational opportunities for its members and other professionals. www.counseling.org

Student Membership in ACA and NASP

All students are encouraged to learn more about ACA and NASP and become affiliated as student members of both organizations. Early involvement with these organizations allows you to become familiar with the professional services and support that will become especially valuable to you after you complete your internship and prepare for licensure and fulltime employment as a school counseling psychologist. This early involvement also facilitates the development of a richer professional orientation by exposing you to the critical issues relevant to a broadly trained professional.

BYU Student Organization

The program sponsors a student organization (School Counseling Psychology Association) that is affiliated with the more general BYU Student Association. A faculty member is designated annually to serve as advisor to this organization. Leaders in the organization are elected by student members annually and include a president and two vice-presidents with specific duties in the academic and social areas and joint responsibility for all other areas. The purposes include professional, academic, social, recreational, and service areas. Faculty members are often invited to association activities.

The president or his/her delegate is responsible for attending faculty meetings and representing students in decision-making for the program. The president also is expected to bring to the attention of the faculty advisor any issues of general concern to the students.

Some typical activities of the association include, parties at faculty members' homes or in a park, semi-annual golf scramble, brown bag lunch presentations by faculty or guest presenters, trips to nearby professional organization conferences, and assisting the faculty with the admission seminar, etc. The organization attempts to create a feeling of community and relieve some of the stress associated with a rigorous degree program.

ORIENTATION and THE ADVISORY SYSTEM

Your Advisory Chair and Committee

Upon acceptance to the masters program, you are assigned an advisor. The faculty advisor is the link between you and the program in matters of conveying information and feedback regarding evaluation, progress, and remediation of deficiencies.

Advisory assignments are made so that the advisory load is shared equally among faculty members. Consideration is also given to your experience and stated interests. You are notified of the name of your advisor so questions or concerns can be addressed to the advisor prior to arriving on campus or at any time there is a need for consultation regarding the program. This person will assist you in getting registered for your first semester, answering questions you may have about the program, and generally helping orient you to the program, the university and

graduate study. Your advisor will also help you develop your “Study List” during the first semester.

Typically your advisor will serve you throughout your program. Change of advisors after you have become familiar with the faculty may be possible upon your request and with approval of the faculty involved and the department chair. While you are assigned a committee chair, all faculty members are available and willing to assist you in your work and progress.

In summary, the role of the advisor and advisory committee includes assisting you in various aspects of your program, including:

- Registering for appropriate courses for the first semester
- Becoming oriented to the program and answering questions
- Completing a “study list” which provides a blueprint for course work needed to complete the program
- Resolving issues and problems that interfere with your progress
- Helping you obtain financial assistance or a graduate assistantship as needed
- Obtaining appropriate experiences and opportunities in practica and internship
- Preparing for the comprehensive and credentialing examinations
- Preparing for graduation, and
- Assisting in your search for a position after graduation.

Orientation

During your first semester, you will receive an orientation to the program, the faculty, the university, graduate study, and the helping profession. This orientation is an important part of the CPSE 605 course. As part of this course, the “study list” is introduced (see attached study list form below). During the first semester, you will prepare your study list for submission no later than the last day of the semester. The 605 instructor, the department secretary and your advisor are prepared to assist you in this process. You will select an advisory committee comprised of three faculty members. You should plan to continue with your initial advisor as chair of this committee unless you have a specific preference for a change. Following approval from your advisory committee, the study list is submitted to the Department Secretary who will review it for completeness and adherence to program requirements and university policy. You must have submitted an official transcript (with your bachelor’s degree posted on it) to the BYU Office of Graduate Studies before any of your bachelors-level classes can be accepted toward M.S. program requirements.

If any exceptions to required course work are requested, your advisor will present your study list proposal to the total faculty. Any questions or concerns are discussed until a decision is made by the vote of the faculty. The study list will then receive a final review for approval by the Graduate Coordinator. Following this approval, the Department Secretary will enter the study list into the Office of Graduate Studies computer system. The information contained on your study list will then be used by the Office of Graduate Studies to generate your “Graduate Progress Report”. A copy of this report will be mailed to you three times a year, summarizing your

current status. Any future changes in courses or committee must be submitted on a “Study List Change” form through your advisory committee and the Graduate Coordinator.

Study List for Master's Degree Students
(See back for instructions)

Name: _____ BYU ID: _____ Date: _____

Local Address: _____

Street address _____ City, state _____ Zip code _____
 Major: School Counseling Psychology Degree sought: MS
 Program Type (THS, PRJ, NON): NON Minimum hours required: 64

COURSEWORK

Req't type	Dept	Course Number	Hours	Pre-program type	Course Description	*Substitute Course #, Title
MAJ	CPSE	606	3		Psv Ed Fdn Couns	
MAJ	CPSE	605	1		Prof Roles & Standards	
MAJ	CPSE	646	3		Coun Thrv/Intern	
MAJ	CPSE	649	3		Hum Grth & Dev	
MAJ	CPSE	614	3		Applied Behav Analysis	
MAJ	CPSE	647	3		Psv Fnd Assmnt Intl	
MAJ	CPSE	678R	3		Pret Coun/Sch Psv	
MAJ	CPSE	710	3		Ethic/Legal Stndrd	
MAJ	CPSE	610	3		Consult w/ Sch & Fam	
MAJ	CPSE	644	3		Career Dev/Assess	
MAJ	CPSE	609	3		Assmt Dia & Evl MM	
MAJ	CPSE	648	3		Grp Couns & Intrvns	
MAJ	CPSE	679R	3		Adv Pract Coun/Sch Psv	
MAJ	CPSE	602	3		Chd/Adol Psv Diag Intrvns	
MAJ	CPSE	654	3		Comp Develop Guide	
MAJ	CPSE	622	3		Theories Lrng Cogn	
MAJ	CPSE	655	3		Crisis Intervn Sch & Fam Svs	
MAJ	CPSE	672	3		Empirical Inquirv	
MAJ	CPSE	680R	6		Intern Coun Sch Psv	
MAJ	CPSE	751	3		Coun Mult Divr Pop	
MAJ	CPSE	790R	3		Seminar in Pschopharm	

*As approved by Advisory Committee; evidenced by equivalent class.

Signature of Student: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Committee Chair: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Member: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Member: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Department Chair/Graduate Coordinator: _____ Date: _____



Registering for Classes

Registration requirements, procedures, and information about the registration process are outlined in the *BYU Bulletin: Graduate Catalog* and the *BYU Bulletin: Class Schedule* for the appropriate semester and year. Essentially, you may register by phone or by using AIM Computer Terminals at several locations on campus. A Registration Notice is mailed to all eligible students prior to the beginning of the registration period. Registration for the fall semester begins in April, for winter in October, for spring/summer in February.

Full Time Status

The program is a full-time, day school program. Students progress through the program as a cohort. You must be available to attend day school classes full-time. Because of heavy academic demands, you are not permitted to enroll in more than 15 academic credits per semester without written permission from your advisory committee. To ensure success in your academic course work, it is also recommended that you restrict employment commitments to no more than 10 hours per week.

The minimal University enrollment standards include (1) register for at least two semester hours each semester or term in which you are using university resources, and (2) register for a minimum of six semester hours during each academic year. While these requirements are minimal university standards, the program schedule requires at least 10.5 hours each semester. Refer to the *Graduate Catalog* for more specific information including different requirements for international students.

Bachelors Degree Requirement

A bachelor's degree is required for acceptance to the masters program in School Counseling Psychology. A bachelor's degree in education, family sciences, philosophy, psychology, sociology, social work, or the social sciences is preferred. A student may be admitted with a master's degree in a less relevant program (such as English or Business), but may be encouraged to complete appropriate prerequisite courses as part of the masters program.

Financial Aid

Financial assistance is available to students as described below and is dependent upon availability of funds and satisfactory progress in the program. Application forms and additional information are available at the Department office.

Partial Tuition Scholarships (PTS)

Students may apply for partial tuition scholarships on the basis of either financial need or academic merit. PTS awards are available for three years.

Graduate Assistantships

Graduate Assistantships include working with faculty members on research projects, curriculum development, teaching, and other assignments for 5 to 20 hours per week. Several other agencies on campus, such as the Counseling and Career Center, often request masters students to serve as graduate assistants.

Other Sources of Financial Aid

Other sources of financial aid are available to students through the Financial Aid Office, A-41 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602-1009.

Outside Employment

Most students desire to earn money to help offset educational expenses and to provide for their families. Outside employment is possible, but discouraged unless it is closely related to the program by offering clinical experience. Working more than 10 hours per week is discouraged. If you choose or are required to work, accepting a graduate assistantship in the department allows you to work with faculty in a variety of options leading to additional professional experience. Related options, such as at the Counseling and Career Center may also provide valuable experience. Some students have benefited from part-time employment in school programs such as those designed to assist students with disabilities. Such positions provide opportunities for professional development.

Advice To The Beginning Masters Student (Helpful Hints)

Self motivation: Graduate study differs from undergraduate study in many ways. You are expected to be more responsible for your learning. You will be expected to dig deeper than you have ever done to gain insight and understanding. You will follow leads and pursue ideas without specifically being assigned to do so. You will need to take charge of your time and life to be able achieve what you need and desire.

Cohort learning: You are part of a group of experienced and capable peers who will offer you much and expect much from you in course work and practice. Commit to high involvement in sharing, asking, thinking, presenting, seeking, questioning, pursuing, writing, experimenting, and testing.

Timeliness: Whatever your past experience, now is the time to organize your time and life. Anticipate, plan, prepare, and be “on top” of your schedule. Procrastination will yield much anxiety, regret and disappointment in your course work and total program.

Meet deadlines: Many deadlines will be imposed throughout your program. We have done and will continue to do our best to make you aware of required paperwork and expectations from the Program, the Office of Graduate Studies, and the University. You will be made aware of requirements and due-dates. Please review this Handbook, the *BYU Graduate Catalog*, and the

BYU Class Schedule. Ultimately you are responsible for submitting documents by the posted dates.

Maintain balance: We know that your program is not your whole life, nor should it be. However, you must commit a large portion of your life to your studies at this specified period of time. Sacrifices must be made, priorities shuffled, and difficult decisions made. At the same time, you must not neglect your family and other important aspects of your life. Each person must determine his or her own priorities. While seeking this balance, also seek enjoyment and pleasure from this experience. It can and should be one of the most exhilarating and meaningful growing experiences you will have.

Research: This program does not require a thesis or research project. The extensive knowledge base that you must acquire and the large variety of experiences you need to acquire to become skilled as school counseling psychologists does not allow time for a thesis. You will be required to do library research and to write papers for several classes. You will also complete a research course (CPSE 672) which will prepare you to become a consumer of research. Several assessment courses require knowledge of basic statistical concepts. Further, faculty members will require your high involvement in the research literature for most classes and will incorporate current research findings in their lectures and assignments. On rare occasions a student with high interest may be approved to complete a thesis. However, additional time will likely be required for doing so.

DESCRIPTION OF FACILITIES

CPSE Department

The Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education is housed on the third floor of the McKay Building. It is one of five departments in the David O. McKay School of Education. The department is comprised of three graduate programs: Special Education (M.S.), School Counseling Psychology (M.S.), and Counseling Psychology (Ph.D.).

The faculty offices are clustered in 340 McKay Building with the Counseling Psychology faculty in the South Wing and the Special Education faculty in the North Wing. Faculty office hours are posted on their doors, and all secretaries have access to faculty schedules.

School Counseling Psychology Center (SCPC)

The School Counseling Psychology Center (SCPC) is located at the North end of the hall on the third floor of the McKay Building. Recently remodeled, the SCPC has three primary purposes: (1) to provide a facility for students to obtain clinical experience under supervision, (2) to provide a counseling and assessment service to university students, BYU faculty and staff and their families, selected public school students, and the community (3) to provide opportunity to gather data for researching various aspects of School Counseling Psychology and Special Education services.

The SCPC includes a secretary/reception area and waiting room, a conference and group supervision room with multimedia capabilities, three counseling rooms with two video cameras in each room, a group counseling room with two cameras and a two-way observation mirror, and two administrative/overflow counseling rooms with cameras and computers in each.

Graduate Student Center

The Graduate Student Center (GSC) is located at the north end of the hallway within the SCPC. This facility is designated primarily for doctoral students and doctoral and masters graduate assistants to work and study. It contains eight carrels that are assigned to graduate students (often two or three students per carrel). Each carrel has a work space, a file cabinet, and an upper storage bin. In addition, each carrel has a computer line hook-up for a computer provided by the department or a personal computer.

The Center also has a small professional library and materials used in selected courses. Career counseling resources are also housed in the Center. These include selected printed materials and several computer programs for career counseling and guidance.

Students use the Center for a combination of purposes including individual study, work as part of their graduate assistantship assignment, and paper work generated from counseling services in the SCPC. When committee or team work needs to be done, rather than disturbing others who may be working in the Center, the group counseling room in the SCPC may be used, if available.

Most masters students see little need for a carrel because so much of their time is spent in class, in the schools, or in the library. However, if you feel a need for a carrel, contact the department Executive Secretary. She will discuss with you your needs, help you select a carrel, provide policy information about the use of the GSC, and/or discuss other appropriate areas for study or social interaction.

Computer Lab

The **Teacher and Learning Support Center** the first floor of the McKay Building (Room 180), a large computer lab is available for your use in writing papers, reports, etc. This lab contains computers, scanners, and other electronic equipment. A lab supervisor is available to assist you as needed.

Counseling and Career Center (CCC) Training Facilities

The Counseling and Career Center (CCC) is located on two floors of the Wilkinson Student Center (WSC). The purpose of the CCC is to provide personal, career, and learning assistance or counseling services to students at BYU. The open major and academic advisement functions of the CCC provide assistance to undeclared majors and those seeking assistance in selecting a major. Counseling is provided by licensed professionals and doctoral level trainees (intern, extern, and practicum).

A visit to the CCC will allow you to see one of the most impressive college or university counseling centers in the nation. Another reason for visiting the CCC may be as a client. We encourage all masters students to experience counseling from a client perspective. Some students are given a stronger invitation for personal counseling if such experience is deemed particularly important. Such visits to the CCC should not be scheduled with any of the five CCC professionals who are currently part of the CPSE faculty.

Another reason for visiting the CCC may be to apply for an assistantship. A few graduate assistantships may be available in the CCC. These positions are usually in the advisement or career guidance programs offered by the CCC.

University Library

The Harold B. Lee Library (HBLL) is a first-rate facility with impressive holdings in the areas of education, counseling and psychology. The HBLL recently underwent a massive expansion and is the central library facility on the BYU campus. It is administered by a professional staff of more than 80 academic librarians, 20 administrative staff, 70 full and part-time staff, and more than 400 student part-time employees. It contains approximately 3,800,000 volumes and microforms and subscribes to numerous journals, of which more than 900 are education and social science journals. Of the more than three million holdings, approximately 310,000 are monographs (books) classed either under education or psychology.

In addition to the books, journals, and microforms, the Lee Library has a computerized information system which can be accessed via the Internet. The database, which includes Psychinfo and other psychology, education (ERIC), and medical abstract databases, provides access to more than nine million cataloged items in approximately 3,500 participating libraries. The library is a member of the Center for Research Libraries and provides interlibrary loan services to access materials that are not available in the Lee Library. It is also a member of the Utah Academic Library Consortium, which provides reciprocal-borrowing privileges for faculty, staff, and students at all institutions of higher education in Utah.

The CPSE faculty have integrated library skills training into the curriculum of the school counseling psychology master's program. While students are enrolled in CPSE 605, they spend a class period at the Lee Library where an Education Librarian introduces them to the library's resources and to the procedures of conducting research. After the library orientation session students are assigned a project that requires them to assimilate the information they received at the library and to utilize the library's resources in completing the assignment. Throughout their

program students must utilize these library resources and are advised by library staff assigned to the School of Education that they may receive assistance in all of their library-related needs.

The HBLL also has audio-taped and written self-instructional tours and guides. Audio-taped tours may be checked out in the Learning Resources Center (LRC) of the Library. An instructional booklet entitled “Library Research Skills” may be purchased at a minimal cost at the HBLL Copy Center.

PARTNERSHIPS

Collaboration with Counseling & Career Center (CCC)

For nearly three decades, the CPSE Department and the Counseling and Career Center have worked together for the mutual benefit of each. In 1997, a formal collaboration agreement was signed. This collaborative agreement established five joint-appointment positions from the CCC. Five CCC faculty members have been selected by the Department, and each have been given a 40% release from the CCC to serve in the CPSE Department. They teach courses, supervise students in their clinical experiences, advise students, supervise student research, and contribute as academic faculty members. Both doctoral and masters students benefit from this collaboration through the opportunity for exposure to the knowledge and research programs of additional clinical faculty.

Brigham Young University/Public School Partnership

In 1983 The BYU/Public School Partnership was formed to benefit the school districts and the University and its programs and students. In collaboration with Dr. John Goodlad, this partnership is a member of the National Network for Educational Renewal.

The Partnership is comprised of five nearby school districts and the University. The Governing Board consists of the Dean of the School of Education, the Superintendents of the five school districts, and the Partnership Director.

This partnership is of great benefit to our program and students. As part of the partnership, a School Counseling Psychology Task Force functions to serve as a liaison between the districts and the program. This task force serves as our advisory committee and provides input for program development and suggestions for program refinement.

Through this Task Force, our Director of Clinical Training has access to Student Services Directors and mentors/supervisors. Thus, placement of our students for practica and internships is orchestrated smoothly. Site supervisors are selected and provided the information and training needed for effectiveness in their mentor roles. The program faculty provide inservice for district personnel. District personnel are invited to participate in program development activities at the university. General sharing of needs, student progress, and future program directions is accomplished to the advantage of students.

CURRICULUM AND SCHEDULING

You must complete a minimum of 64 semester hours of credit—52 hours of academic course work and 12 hours in practica/internship. The required course areas deal with counseling (individual and group); responsive services; consultation with parents, teachers, administrators, and other professionals; child and adolescent psychopathology; learning theory; career development; comprehensive guidance programming; promotion of healthy growth and development; prevention of problems; assessment leading to intervention with educational, personal/social, career, and mental health issues; multicultural counseling; professional roles and expectations; ethics; family and institutional systems; and research and evaluation.

Twelve semester hours of field experience (6 hours of practicum and 6 hours of internship) is also required. Every effort is made to enhance skill development through practical experience in schools in conjunction with the academic courses. For example, as you are taking a testing course, you will practice testing students in the schools where you are placed for practicum. As you take the group counseling course, you will participate in group counseling in a school setting. These field experiences are an essential component in your preparation. They provide opportunities under supervision to observe, practice, apply and master specific competencies.

Summer 1 courses provide an orientation to the profession and program. They also prepare you for your first practicum in fall semester. As you begin your practicum experiences in the schools, you may feel that you are not prepared sufficiently to see your first clients. However, the program is developmental. Your first practicum experiences are primarily observational and intended to allow you to grow into the experience. Likewise, you may feel under-prepared to enter your internship. However, the previous courses and experiences will prepare you to begin work as a counseling school psychologist under supervision.

Recommended Course Sequencing **

Below is a list of all required courses and the sequence in which the courses are offered. Most courses build on previous courses and prepare you for increasingly involved roles in your field experiences. If you do not register for the courses in the sequence listed below, you may find difficulty in later attempts to schedule courses in a timely manner.

***Course offerings may vary slightly for specific semesters. You should check with the department secretary for current schedules before registering.*

FIRST YEAR

First Year – Summer Term

- 605 Professional Roles and Standards (1)
- 606 Psychoeducational Foundations (3)
- 646 Counseling Theory and Interventions (3)

First Year – Fall Semester

- 647 Psychometric Foundations and Assessment of Intelligence (3)
- 649 Human Growth and Development (3)
- 710 Ethical/Legal Standards and Issues (3)
- 678R Practicum: Counseling and School Psychology (1.5)

First Year – Winter Semester

- 609 Advanced Educational Assessment (3)
- 654 Comprehensive Developmental Guidance (3)
- 672 Empirical Inquiry (3)
- 678R Practicum: Counseling and School Psychology (1.5)

First Year – Spring Term

- 622 Learning and Cognition (3)
- 644 Career Development and Assessment (3)
- 790R Psychopharmacology* (every other year spring) (3)

SECOND YEAR

Second Year – Fall Semester

- 610 Consultation with School and Family (3)
- 614 Applied Behavioral Analysis (3)
- 655 Crisis Intervention (3)
- 679R Advanced Practicum: Counseling and School Psychology (1.5)
- 715 Diagnosis and Treatment of Mental Disorders (**optional**) (3)

Second Year – Winter Semester

- 602 Child/Adolescent Psychopathology: Diagnosis and Intervention (3)
- 648 Group Counseling and Intervention (3)
- 679R Advanced Practicum: Counseling and School Psychology (1.5)
- 751 Counseling Multicultural and Diverse Populations (3)
- 725 Objective and Projective Personality Assessment (**optional**) (3)

Second Year – Spring Term

- 790R Psychopharmacology* (every other spring) (3)

Third Year – Summer Term

- 680R Internship: Counseling and School Psychology (2)

Third Year – Fall Semester

- 680R Internship: Counseling and School Psychology (2)

Third Year – Winter Semester

680R Internship: Counseling and School Psychology (2)

Third Year – Spring Term

680R Internship: Counseling and School Psychology (2)

*This course meets the *Biological Basis of Behavior* requirement. However, with advisor approval, other courses may be substituted (i.e. Psychology 585, *Human Neurobiology*)

Academic Items

Transfer Credit

The minimum standard for transferring credit from another university is a “B” and content comparable to the equivalent BYU course. Application for transfer credit, including a transcript and course syllabus, must accompany the required “Study List” proposal form before obtaining signatures. An official transcript must accompany requests for transfer credit. In most cases, the Office of Graduate Studies will have the official transcript as part of the application process.

GPA Requirements

The *BYU Graduate Catalog* specifies that a grade point average (GPA) at or above 3.0 in classes that are part of a student’s “graduate program of study” is required for graduation. This GPA is also required for continuation in the School Counseling Psychology Program. Grades below B will be reviewed during end-of-semester evaluations. No D credit may apply toward a graduate degree.

ACADEMIC GRIEVANCES

The university has an established procedure for handling student academic grievances. If consulting with the instructor or the graduate committee chair does not resolve a grievance, you should describe the problem to the department graduate coordinator and/or the department chair. If difficulties persist, you may ask the college dean and finally the dean of graduate studies for assistance.

Source: *BYU 2002-03 Graduate Catalog*, pg. 25 or see *Graduate Studies Catalog* at www.byu.edu/gradstudies/resources/.

Graduate Student Termination, Appeals, Grievances

The School Counseling Psychology Masters Program follows the policies and procedures for graduate student termination, appeals and grievances outlined in the *BYU 2002-2003 Graduate Catalog*.

Source: *BYU 2002-03 Graduate Catalog*, pg. 25 or see *Graduate Studies Catalog* at www.byu.edu/gradstudies/resources/.

Termination of Graduate Status

Termination of graduate status may result if you:

1. Fail to satisfactorily complete the conditions of acceptance.
2. Fail to fulfill the university's minimum registration requirement.
3. Make a request to withdraw (with the intent to pursue a degree at another university, for personal reasons, or in response to department recommendation).
4. Receive a marginal or unsatisfactory rating in a periodic review by the academic department and are unable or unwilling to comply with conditions for continuance outlined by the department.
5. Fail to make what the department or the university deems to be satisfactory progress toward a graduate degree.
6. Fail the departmental comprehensive examination[s].
7. Violate the university's standards of conduct or Honor Code.
8. Exceed the time limit (six years for masters degree).

Appeal of Termination

If you are dismissed or facing dismissal, you may respond to or appeal that termination or impending termination. Such responses or appeals should be directed, in writing, to the Department Chair. If you wish further consideration, you may appeal to the Dean of the School of Education. Ultimately, a final appeal may be made to the Dean of Graduate Studies, who, if circumstances warrant, may appoint a committee of impartial faculty members to review the matter.

STUDENT EVALUATION

The student evaluation procedures are founded on the Conceptual Framework of the David O. McKay School of Education. In this framework, three intended student outcomes are identified: knowledge, performance, and dispositions (or attitudes). These outcomes also form the general goals and objectives of the School Counseling Psychology Masters Program.

General Expected Student Outcomes or Competencies

Knowledge

In your program you will acquire the knowledge from which the disciplines of Counseling and School Psychology have grown. You will learn historical, philosophical, social, psychological, and research foundations. You will understand the principles that make possible the practice of school counseling psychology. Your knowledge will be demonstrated by grades in required courses, evaluation of the application of your knowledge in clinical practice, and written comprehensive examinations.

Performance

You will acquire essential skills as you complete your practica and internship experiences. You will practice these skills in a supervised setting. You will demonstrate, in a planned, structured, and sequenced manner, that these competencies have been acquired at an acceptable level. You will use these skills as you work with individuals and groups from diverse populations. These skills will be demonstrated and evaluated through performance in supervised experiences, videotapes, performance evaluations, and the comprehensive examination.

Dispositions

You were selected for the program on the basis of a set of dispositions or personal qualities required for effective service as a school counseling psychologist. The ability to care for others and develop empathy are key elements of the desired personal qualities. You will demonstrate honesty, integrity, emotional stability, mature judgment, effective communication, ethical conduct, and the ability to foster a helping relationship. You must value and exhibit the professional and ethical standards of the American Counseling Association and the National Association of School Psychologists. Being open and willing to make use of supervision and feedback from faculty and supervisors is another important disposition. You should be cooperative, reliable, responsible, and be found in compliance with school, agency and University policies and codes when on placement for supervised experience. Program faculty members, on a regular basis as part of the evaluation process, assess these dispositions at the end of fall and winter semesters. Students often find that training in counseling psychology makes them aware of their own personal unresolved issues for which psychotherapy may be helpful. A list of providers is included on page 39 of this handbook for your reference.

Student Evaluation Methods

All students are evaluated on the three domains (knowledge, performance, and dispositions) after the end of each Fall and Winter Semester. This evaluation is intended to identify and facilitate remediation of any deficiencies in a timely manner and to convey your progress and standing in the program to you as students at the end of each semester (as well as to the Office of Graduate Studies, annually). Included with the three domains of knowledge, performance, and dispositions is an assessment of your progress in meeting time lines and all program requirements.

Student evaluation in the program requires coordination of the evaluation process in order to be thorough and consistent. A faculty member is assigned the role of Evaluation Coordinator, and adequate support staff assistance is devoted to the evaluation program.

Knowledge Evaluations

Evaluation of your progress in the knowledge domain is based primarily upon grades in courses and your instructors' perceptions of your work. An additional component of your knowledge is also reflected in the effectiveness of your progressing clinical work. Ultimately, your success in your practica and internship experiences may be the more revealing aspect of your theoretical and knowledge basis. An assessment of your developing knowledge on a progressive basis (at least at the end of each semester) is important for you in determining any needed changes in your study habits or commitment to learning.

Toward the end of your program, your credentialing and comprehensive examinations provide a final assessment of your knowledge of counseling and school psychology concepts. These examinations include both knowledge and application of that knowledge.

Performance Evaluations

Evaluation of your performance is based primarily on the evidence of your skill development in the areas of competence expected for the practica and internship experiences. The competencies are outlined rather specifically in the practicum/internship handbook, and are developed through the blending of knowledge and experience. Your school experiences are geared toward the acquisition of these specific skills as well as general professional and personal competencies. Individual and group counseling and consultation skills and other areas of performance are evaluated continuously.

Field supervisors are provided evaluation forms and are given in-service training by university faculty members on all aspects of the supervision process. Frequent formal and informal assessments are made by your site and university supervisors who consult frequently regarding your progress. You also have opportunity to observe the work of your peers in group supervision as you share and learn from each other. The results of student evaluations are incorporated in the discussion held at each end-of-semester evaluation meeting.

The Director of Clinical Training has overall responsibility for the clinical evaluation process to ensure that the evaluations are conducted in a timely and effective manner. A copy of each of the respective evaluation forms is provided in the Practicum/Internship Manual.

Dispositions Evaluations

Evaluation of your dispositional domain results from faculty and supervisor interactions with you in a variety of settings, including the class room, the clinic, the school, and other formal and informal associations. The planned frequency of our mentoring process through your advisor and committee, your supervisors and your peers allows considerable opportunity for giving and receiving feedback regarding all aspects of your progress. Hopefully, you will seek opportunity for this input. Your progress is dependent, in part, upon the amount and frequency of specific feedback about your strengths and limitations as you move through this developmental process. While seeking feedback may appear threatening, and while observing your own video counseling

sessions in the presence of peers and supervisors may produce some anxiety, your openness to such experiences will greatly enhance your learning and developing of counseling and psychological competencies and dispositions.

End of Semester Evaluations

At the end of each semester, the total faculty meets to evaluate each student's progress. Evaluation forms (see below) are prepared initially by the department Executive Secretary. This preparation includes listing any deficiencies with respect to forms, time-lines, etc.

These progress reviews yield a rating of each student as either satisfactory, below expectations, or unsatisfactory in each of the three domains and an overall rating. A below expectations rating may be used when study lists or other program requirements are initially past due or initial questions are being raised about your knowledge, performance, or dispositions. An unsatisfactory rating may be given when your study list or other program requirements are well past due, or if you receive an unsatisfactory rating in the areas of knowledge, performance, or dispositions. Below expectations and unsatisfactory ratings will be discussed with you by your advisor. Unsatisfactory ratings will result in a registration "hold" until relevant issues or requirements are satisfied. A letter is sent to each student indicating the rating given and the reasons for any below expectations or unsatisfactory ratings. Students with these ratings are asked to make an appointment with their advisors to discuss the evaluation personally. Hopefully faculty members who have concerns about your progress and performance will have discussed their concerns before you receive a written notice of your end-of-semester evaluation.

In order to clarify the "Student Evaluation Sequence" chart has been provided to review each major step of our evaluation process.

Internship Placement Prerequisite

Internship placement is a three-way agreement among the student, training program, and school district.



School Districts:

1. Hire students as employees and have statutory responsibility to supervise, and authority to direct student's work.
1. Collaborate with the training program to provide necessary training experiences for students to fulfill the requirements of the internship.
2. Provide formative and summative evaluation to the student and the training program to enhance student development.

Students:

1. Contract with the district to provide school counseling psychology services in a professional manner.
2. Engage in individual supervision with district (site) supervisors and group supervision with program supervisors (faculty).
3. Fulfill the program's requirements for internship grade and credit.

The Program:

1. Provide regular group supervision and instruction throughout the internship.
2. Consultation with the district supervisors regarding student development and performance.
3. Award grade and credit for internship hours as requirements are satisfactorily completed.

Several prerequisite conditions must be met before a student is placed on internship for grade and credit by the program.

4. Students must complete all coursework sequenced before the internship (according to the current handbook) with a grade of B- or better.
5. Student must complete a minimum of 300 hours of practicum experience.
6. Students must receive a satisfactory rating in knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the winter semester student evaluation meeting.
7. Districts must agree to accept the student as an intern.

The interview and application process is typically conducted toward the end of winter semester during the second year, before final grades and credits have been awarded. Students engage in the application process but will only be placed on internship by approval of the faculty committee in the winter semester student evaluation meeting. Students whose grades are below the standard, have not completed the minimum practicum hours, or who receive a marginal or unsatisfactory rating in knowledge, skills, dispositions, or program requirements will not be placed on internship. Students with a marginal or unsatisfactory rating must construct growth plans to address deficiencies with the program advisor. The faculty executive committee must

approve the growth plan. Students must fulfill all criteria to the satisfaction of the faculty executive committee before being placed on internship.

SCHOOL COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY & SPECIAL EDUCATION
End-of-semester Graduate Student Evaluation

Name of Student:

Semester: _____ *Year:* _____

Knowledge:

- Satisfactory*
- Below Expectations*
- Unsatisfactory*

Comments/Feedback:

Performance:

- Satisfactory*
- Below Expectations*
- Unsatisfactory*

Comments/Feedback:

Dispositions:

- Satisfactory*
- Below Expectations*
- Unsatisfactory*

Comments/Feedback:

Program Progress/Requirements:

- Satisfactory*
- Below Expectations*
- Unsatisfactory*

Comments/Feedback:

Overall Standing/Evaluation:

- Satisfactory*
- Below Expectations*
- Unsatisfactory*

Comments/Feedback:

Student Evaluation Sequence

Screen	Stage	Action
First	Pre-admission GPA GRE (V/Q/A) Work Experience Letters of Recommendation Statement of Intent	Invite to interview or deny application
Second	Pre-admission Seminar Interviews Group Problem Solving Extemporaneous Speaking	Admit, Deny, or Place on Alternate List
Admission		
Third (soft)	Summer I Introductory Courses (605/606/646) Interpersonal Skills Lab	Counsel out, remediate, observe, or continue
Fourth	Fall I Student Evaluation Process (mid and end of semester evaluations) Knowledge/Skills/Disposition Criteria: Satisfactory/Marginal/Unsatisfactory	Counsel out, remediate, observe, or continue
Fifth	Winter I Student Evaluation Process (mid and end of semester evaluations) Knowledge/Skills/Disposition Criteria: Satisfactory/Marginal/Unsatisfactory	Counsel out, remediate, observe, or continue
Sixth	Fall II Student Evaluation Process (mid and end of semester evaluations) Knowledge/Skills/Disposition Criteria: Satisfactory/Marginal/Unsatisfactory	Counsel out, remediate, observe, or continue
Seventh	Winter II Student Evaluation Process (mid and end of semester evaluations) Knowledge/Skills/Disposition Criteria: Satisfactory/Marginal/Unsatisfactory	Counsel out, remediate, observe, or continue

Eighth (soft)	Spring/Summer II Internship Placement (see “Internship Placement Prerequisites)	Counsel out, adapt internship, feedback, or continue
Ninth	Fall III Student Evaluation Process (mid and end of semester evaluations) Knowledge/Skills/Disposition Criteria: Satisfactory/Marginal/Unsatisfactory	Counsel out, remediate, observe, or continue
Tenth	Winter III Student Evaluation Process (mid and end of semester evaluations) Knowledge/Skills/Disposition Criteria: Satisfactory/Marginal/Unsatisfactory	Counsel out, remediate, observe, or continue
Eleventh	Spring III Comprehensive Exams CPCE SPC Case Studies School Psychology PRAXIS	Pass/Fail/Retake
Twelfth	Summer IV Utah State Office of Education Licensure	Recommend licensure or remediation and graduation or remediation

Written Comprehensive Exams

Closely associated with any degree program is the evaluation component—most typically in the form of course examinations and an end-of-program comprehensive examination. The written comprehensive examinations are required to demonstrate your knowledge of the primary content in the program. Two examinations, a comprehensive portfolio and one case study in consultation and problem solving are required to demonstrate competency. These examinations are given in February through May of the final year in the program.

The following are required examinations:

1. Praxis Series Test 0400 (administration schedule varies, usually on a Saturday, (see www.ets.org/praxis). Successful completion of this examination leads to national certification as a school psychologist. Educational Testing Service administers this examination. The cost is currently \$105.
2. The Praxis Series Test 0420 (see above) or The Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE) in mid-May (usually on a Wednesday). This examination is similar to the NCE given by the NBCC. It is specifically for programs throughout the country that prepare counselors. The results from this test are useful to us in comparing the knowledge of our students with the results of students nationally. The cost of this examination is \$30.
3. Case Study Examination This exam allows you to demonstrate knowledge and professional expertise to collaborate with families, schools, and community-based professionals. You will demonstrate your ability to design, implement and evaluate an intervention that effectively responds to the educational and mental health needs of a child or youth with whom you work during your internship.

The following is an optional examination:

National Counselor Examination (NCE) in April. This examination is a 200-item multiple choice format covering the eight major areas of content outlined by the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC). This examination is optional, but recommended. It is a very good practice experience for the later comprehensives. It is also the examination required for certification as a National Certified Counselor (NCC), a credential from NBCC showing that you have passed a national examination reflecting your knowledge base for general practice as a counselor. It is also one of the examinations required by the State of Utah and many other states for licensure as a Professional Counselor (LPC). The cost is \$200.

ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

In addition to the Brigham Young University Honor Code, the School Counseling Psychology Program adheres to the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists* (APA) and the *Code of Conduct* (ACA).

Ethical dilemmas can arise very quickly. Such dilemmas are neither simple nor benign and can have devastating consequences for both students and clients.

You are provided a copy of the ACA “Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice” and of the NASP “Professional Conduct Manual for School Psychologists” at the beginning of your program in CPSE 605. The ethical standards of all related mental health professional organizations is also included in the appendix of the Gibson and Mitchell text required for 605. You are expected to quickly become familiar with these standards, and particularly prior to any contact with clients. In-depth treatment of these issues will occur in your first semester ethics course (CPSE 710).

At a minimum, be aware of the following issues:

Informed Consent

Before beginning any School Counseling Psychology services, you should clarify specific school policies that may include: clarifying with clients the nature of your training; the nature of the setting; the limits of confidentiality; the nature of supervision; and the nature of procedures and services to be provided. You must obtain written permission to do any audio or video taping. Consider these services as a contract with your clients who need to understand both parties' rights and responsibilities.

Privacy and Confidentiality

Privacy and confidentiality are related terms. “Privacy” is a legal issue and refers to the right of an individual to not reveal or have revealed personal information to any outside party, including the therapist. “Confidentiality” is an ethical issue and refers to the responsibility of the therapist to maintain confidence regarding any information revealed by a client within the bounds of the therapeutic relationship.

You must keep all information about clients confidential. This includes names and identifying information as well as the content of any information revealed to you. You should protect all records of clients (written, audio, or video) within locked files and restrict access to only those professionals who have a right to them.

There are limits to confidentiality which you should understand and explain to your clients at the outset of services. Confidentiality should be breached under the following conditions:

1. Danger to self: If clients become suicidal and are not able or willing to take the steps necessary to protect themselves, the necessity to protect life overrides the demands of confidentiality. You should inform whatever parties

- necessary to prevent suicide. This notification may include the police, ambulance, hospital, parents, dormitory parents or others as needed.
2. **Danger to others:** If clients are threatening to harm another person and reveal such information to you, you must notify the police as well as the intended victim of the risk posed by your client. Failure to do so can have drastic effects and be an ethical and legal violation on your part.
 3. **Suspicion of abuse to children or vulnerable adults:** As a student in a school counseling psychology training program, you are a "mandated reporter" of abuse. If you observe, suspect, or receive a report of physical, emotional, or sexual abuse toward any child or vulnerable adult, you are legally required to report such abuse to law enforcement or the state division of human services immediately. Recall that you are a counselor, not an investigator. It is not in your purview to investigate or to substantiate abuse. You must report and allow the appropriate authorities to investigate, substantiate, and follow-up as necessary. Failure to report, or confusing your role, compromises your effectiveness as a therapist and jeopardizes you legally and professionally.
 4. **Supervision:** As a student, you are required to obtain supervision of your work. Your on-campus and/or off-campus supervisor(s) will be informed of your clients' issues and your interventions. This supervisory relationship should be explained to your clients at the outset of any services.
 5. **Written release of confidentiality:** You may share confidential information with outside parties when given written permission by the client. Clients may structure the release as narrowly or broadly as they wish. They may restrict content, names, dates and set any time limits they wish on the release.

Dual Relationships

Dual (or multiple) relationships are defined as any situation in which you have social or other non-professional contacts with clients or supervisors. When multiple relationships exist between you and a client, your objectivity can be easily impaired. Clients may be at risk because the power differential or roles in the counseling setting can be exported to the social setting. Professional practice in a small community (such as a college campus) often creates problems with dual relationships. For example, if you discover that you and a client are members of the same BYU stake and are assigned to work on a stake committee, you would be engaging in a dual relationship.

You should avoid dual relationships. When such is not avoidable, you should consult with your supervisor and discontinue one area of contact. If such is not feasible, you should clarify your different roles and relationship and keep in close contact with your supervisor. This caution will enhance ethical practice, maintain objectivity, and protect clients from undue influence outside of counseling.

Of course you will eschew any romantic or sexual relationships with clients. Be extremely careful about non-erotic touch, and consult with your supervisor regarding any sexual attractions or out of session contact which may emerge between you and clients.

Responsibility and Competence

You and your supervisors are responsible for the professional work that you do in the clinic or the schools. Be aware that you are influencing people's lives and you, in this sense, are accountable for this influence. You must operate within the bounds of your competence and only engage in those activities for which you have been trained and are receiving on-going supervision.

Counselor Impairment

The character and stability of the counselor are of paramount importance in the effectiveness of counseling. Research indicates that this profession can be very stressful, and it is not uncommon for trainees' own issues to surface in the course of their work with clients. Furthermore, graduate school, with its constant demands, is an additional source of significant stress on trainees. It is expected that you will pursue appropriate avenues of self-care and therapy as needed. Should your own issues or psychological instability jeopardize your professional role, you will be restricted from contact with clients until faculty and supervisors determine that you are no longer impaired.

Procedures for Resolving Ethical Dilemmas

1. Consult with your supervisor!
2. Consult with your supervisor!
3. In consultation,
 - a. Review your dilemma.
 - b. Review the relevant ethical guidelines.
 - c. Generate alternative solutions.
 - d. Anticipate consequences of all alternatives.
 - e. Choose your best alternatives and act ethically to resolve the dilemma in the context of the ethical guidelines and each case to obtain the best outcome for the client.
4. Document your process for future reference and learning.

Plagiarism

Read the Standards of Conduct in the *Graduate Catalog*. As indicated there, “examination papers, laboratory work, essays, theses, projects, research tools, and all other kinds of work for classes and degrees are to be prepared with no use having been made of unauthorized or undocumented materials of any kind. Students are not to give or receive aid in examinations or in class work where such is not permitted” (p. 8). This policy includes past copies of exams.

GRADUATION PROCESSES

Application for Graduation

You must apply for graduation toward the middle of your final semester.

You should obtain “***Form 8a Application for Graduation***” from either the Graduate Secretary or the Office of Graduate Studies, complete the top portion, take the form to the Cashier’s Office (D-155 ASB), pay the appropriate fee, then submit this form to the Graduate Secretary for department clearance.

During the final semester prior to graduation, you must either register or pay an equivalent registration fee to the Office of Graduate Studies for at least 2 semester hours of credit. Typically, you will earn these credits by registering for the last hours of the “School Counseling Psychology Internship” (CPSE 680R).

ENDORSEMENT POLICY

Licensure as School Counselors and School Psychologists

Students who successfully complete the program should apply for the appropriate credentials. When you successfully complete all course work, clinical expectations, and successfully complete all comprehensive examinations, you may apply for credentialing. Obtaining licensure does not happen automatically. You must initiate the process. At the completion of the program as state above, you are eligible for dual licensure in the State of Utah. Your diploma and transcript will reflect that you received a Master of Science degree with a major in “School Counseling Psychology” in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education, David O. McKay School of Education at the Brigham Young University.

The process to obtain your credentials should begin with our Department Secretary. She will provide you with the necessary application forms. Included with these materials is an endorsement form. This form provides a check-sheet which seeks confirmation of successful completion of all required courses, experiences and examinations. This form is signed by the student and three faculty members whose signature confirms that they endorse you for licensure. These initial forms are delivered to the Education Advisement Center (EAC) on the first floor of the McKay Building.

The EAC is prepared to assist you as a liaison between the University and the Utah State Office of Education (USOE). They will collect all needed materials from our office, add their own forms and verification documents, and forward all materials to the USOE. We have an arrangement with the USOE whereby you will complete one application as a school counseling psychologist. Upon receipt of your application materials, the application fee , and your final transcript (indication your graduation) they will initiate and send you one certificate—“School Counselor II/School Psychologist”. While at BYU we prefer to view our graduates as school counseling psychologists, most districts in Utah and other states recognize the traditional licensures.

Licensure as Professional Counselors

The State of Utah and most other states have passed licensure laws for the practice of “professional counseling.” Utah’s law was passed in 1994. BYU’s School Counseling Psychology Program is not intended to primarily prepare professional counselors for community mental health settings. However, the course work and experiences in our program meet all licensure requirements except for two courses--diagnosis (CPSE 715) and advanced personality assessment (CPSE 725). In addition, the law requires that at least 200 clock hours of internship be conducted in a “mental health” counseling setting. This requirement assumes that you will practice “mental health counseling” meaning “diagnosis and treatment of mental illness.”

The school setting is not typically intended to provide these mental health services. Further, most schools and school districts do not have licensed “mental health therapists” who can supervise your work in a school setting. In recent years, we have worked closely with many

schools in the Partnership Districts who support the notion that we need mental health services in the school. We promote mental health as school counseling psychologists. Further we provide interventions for those who need remediation. The schools are reflecting our more complex society with its pathology and dysfunction. The community services are not adequate to deal with all of these problems as more districts hire our recent graduates and as our graduates become licensed as professional counselor, schools offer the appropriate conditions for acquiring mental health counseling experience. The Utah Counselor Licensure Board has verified that the school setting may be approved for a mental health counseling site if these conditions exist.

Our program trains professionals who are prepared to offer, among other services, preventive and developmental guidance services, counseling and therapy (individuals and groups), assess for personal and educational strengths, provide career guidance and counseling, and consult with parents teachers and other professionals. Our graduates are the guardians of mental health in the schools.

With the addition of these two courses listed above and the accumulation of 200 clock hours of mental health therapy, our graduates possess a stronger application for licensure than most other applicants. After graduation, they will need to accumulate an additional 4,000 hours (two years full-time) of additional supervised experience as a professional counselor in order to be qualified for licensure. We encourage you to prepare for and seek licensure as a means of strengthening your credentials, professional recognition, and career options.

Credential and Practice Caution

It is important to recognize that in any of the three credentials mentioned above, we as faculty endorse you for only those credentials for which you qualify as a result of course work, supervised experience, and demonstrated competence. Further, each of these credentials stipulate that you must practice within the scope of your training. You violate legal and ethical codes and wise professional practice by taking clients and dealing with issues and problems for which you have not been prepared.

Counseling and Therapy for our Students

The counseling profession (ACA) and accreditation standards (CACREP) recommend that counselors-in-training experience the counseling process themselves as clients. We as a faculty encourage our students to obtain personal counseling for deeper self-understanding and for gaining further insight into the counseling process through the eyes of the client. Free counseling services are offered through BYU's Counseling and Career Center (CCC) in the Wilkinson Student Center (WSC). If you choose to utilize this service, we suggest strongly that you work with a counselor who is not affiliated with our department (see list of such joint-appointment faculty members in this handbook). BYU's Comprehensive Clinic also offers counseling services provided primarily by supervised graduate students in Clinical Psychology, Marriage and Family Therapy and Social Work. If you desire to seek the services of a mental health therapist from the community, you may speak with your advisor to obtain names of such providers or consult the telephone directory.

Appendix B
Study Introduction and Participation Letter

Date: July 12, 2004

Dear School Counseling Psychology Graduate:
Dear School Professional
Dear SCPP Program Faculty

Due to your unique affiliation with the combined School Counseling Psychology Program (SCPP), you have been selected as a potential research participant in a qualitative research study. The SCPP is administered through the Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education (CPSE) in the McKay School of Education at Brigham Young University (BYU). Daniel V. Barnes, Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Candidate at BYU, is conducting this research study under the direction of Dr. Lane Fischer in partial fulfillment of program degree requirements.

The primary purpose of this study is to obtain your perception of the strengths and limitations of the combined School Counseling Psychology Training Program. And as such, this study seeks to gather your perceptions and experience of this program as a former student, school professional, teaching/research faculty member, or public school administrator. The data for this study will be obtained through purposefully arranged focus group interviews and completed and returned information forms.

Enclosed with this letter are two copies of the Consent to be a Research Subject form, a respective information form unique to your affiliation with this program, and a postage-paid self-addressed envelop for your convenience. If you elect to participate in this research project, it is requested that you read the Consent to be a Research Subject form, sign both copies while retaining one for your personal records, complete the respective information form, and return one signed copy of the consent form and the completed information form in the provided envelop.

I'd like to thank you in advance for your willingness to participate as we seek to better understand this unique training program.

Respectfully,

Daniel V. Barnes
Counseling Psychology
Ph.D. Candidate, BYU

Appendix C

Consent to be a Research Subject**Introduction:**

This research study is being conducted by Daniel V. Barnes, who is a Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Candidate at Brigham Young University. This study is focused on the School Counseling Psychology Program administered through the Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education in the School of Education at Brigham Young University. The purpose of this study is to gather a relevant thick description of the perceptions and experiences of key persons representing the context of the combined program through focus group interviews. Due to your unique affiliation with the combined program, you have been selected to participate in this study. And as such, I desire to understand your experience and perception as a student, school professional, teaching/research faculty member, public school administrator, or standards leader for school professionals.

Procedures:

Study participants will be asked to take part in a focused-group interview and complete a brief information form. The brief information form seeks very specific information regarding education level, degree, licensure/certification, current employment status, and position title/professional role. Completion of the questionnaire will take approximately 5-10 minutes. The focus group interview will be facilitated by using a general interview guide. The guide will consist of a broad open-ended question. Follow-up questions will be asked to obtain a deeper understanding of your perspective and to follow-up with discussion points from earlier interview groups and existing topics related to prior program research and national accreditation reports. The group interview is expected to last approximately 90-120 minutes each. All focus group interviews will be audio and video recorded to facilitate the qualitative review and analysis process. Heavy hors d'oeuvres will be provided as a professional courtesy and expression of appreciation for those who are invited to participate in the group interviews. It is expected that some individuals who are invited to participate in this study will choose not to, and that others may not be selected for the group interview.

Risks/Discomforts:

Given the faculty's recent decision to change the combined school counseling psychology program to a school psychology program, there are minimal risks for participation in this study. However, the possibility still exists that you may feel emotional discomfort when answering questions about your personal experiences and/or opinions regarding the program as a former student, teaching/research faculty member, supervising school professional, or administrator overseeing credentialing and standards.

Benefits:

There are no direct benefits to research participants outside of knowing that your responses will inform future efforts to improve this specific training program and provide informative and relevant information pertaining to national student pupil reform efforts

from a regionally-based program perspective. More specifically, through your participation, it is hoped that the strengths and limitations associated with integrating the training of school counselors and school psychologists will be better understood at programmatic, regional, and national educational reform levels.

Confidentiality:

All the information provided will remain confidential and will only be reported as group data with no identifying information, unless I expressly give my written consent. All data, including the questionnaires, audio-video tape recordings from the group interviews, and the identity of all research participants will be kept in a locked storage container. The identity of research subjects will be preserved by not revealing study participants and reporting on the data as it emerges into central themes that are not specifically related to individual participants. If necessary to preserve confidentiality and/or for data analysis purposes, alpha-numeric codes representative of groups and individuals within groups may be used. However, if this becomes necessary only Daniel Barnes will have access to this coding system and the audio/video recordings. After the research is completed, the questionnaires, participant coding systems, and interview tapes will be destroyed.

Participation:

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and I understand that I have the right to withdraw at anytime or refuse to participate entirely without penalty and/or jeopardy at any level.

Questions about the Research:

If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Daniel V. Barnes at (435) 797-1012, <dbarnes@cc.usu.edu> or Dr. Lane Fischer at (801) 422-4200, <Lane_Fischer@byu.edu>.

Questions about your Rights as Research Participant:

If you have questions you do not feel comfortable asking the researchers, you may contact Dr. Renea Beckstrand, IRB Chair, (801) 422-3873, 422 SWKT, <Renea_Beckstrand@byu.edu>.

I have read, understand, and received a copy of the above consent and desire of my own free will and volition to participate in this study.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix D

Graduate Information Form

Graduate Information Form

<u>Personal Contact Information</u>			
Name			
Address			
Phone #'s	(work)	(home/cell)	
Email address			
Education			
	Major	Degree Awarded	
(undergrad)			
(undergrad)			
(graduate)			
(graduate)			
Employment History			
Current Position Title:		Service Duration:	
Other post-degree positions if applicable			
Position Title:		Service Duration:	
Position Title:		Service Duration:	
Certification/Licensure Status			
Complete information for school counseling and school psychology and list other certifications/licenses.			
Certification/License	State	Yes	No
<i>School Counseling</i>			
<i>School Psychology</i>			
Current Supervisor Contact Information			
Supervisor's Name			
Address			
Work Phone #			
Email address			

Appendix E

School Professional Information Form

School Professional Information Form

<u>Personal Contact Information</u>			
Name			
Address			
Phone #'s (work/cell)			
Email address			
Education			
	Major	Degree	Year Awarded
(undergrad)			
(undergrad)			
(graduate)			
(graduate)			
Employment History			
	Position Title <i>(list most recent first)</i>	Time in Position	Service Level
Certification/Licensure Status			
Complete information for school counseling and school psychology and list other certifications/licenses.			
<i>Certification/License</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>School Counseling</i>			
School Psychology			

Appendix F

Faculty Information Form

Faculty Information Form

<u>Personal Contact Information</u>			
Name			
Address			
Phone #'s (work/cell)			
Email address			
Program Information & Public School Experience			
Current Position Title & Rank			
Program Responsibilities			
List your specific personal public school training			
K-12 Public School Experience			
Position Title (<i>list most recent first</i>)	Time in Position	Service Level	
Certification/Licensure Status			
Complete information for school counseling and school psychology and list other certifications/licenses.			
<i>Certification/License</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>School Counseling</i>			
<i>School Psychology</i>			

Appendix G

*School Counseling Psychology Interview Guide***School Counseling Psychology Interview Guide**

Address informed consent, confidentiality, and consequences (risks and benefits)

General open-ended question:

“From your perspective, how has this program worked (functioned specifically)?”

Expected related areas of interest:

- strengths of the SCPP.
- limitations of the SCPP.
- preparation to provide traditional school counseling and school psychological services.
- systemic support for integrated services.
- effectiveness (efficaciousness) of integrating the training.
- suggestions/recommendation to improve this approach?

Follow-up questions in the fulfillment of the hermeneutic dialectic process of interpretation.