KONSELOR

A comparison of accountability models in school counseling programs

Mujiyati Mujiyati[1*)], Shinta Mayasari[2], Sofwan Adiputra[3]
[12]Universitas Lampung, Indonesia
[3] Universitas Muhammadiyah Pringsewu, Indonesia
*Corresponding author, e-mail: mujiyati@fkip.unila.ac.id

Abstract
The purpose of this study is to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of each accountability evaluation model, in order to make counseling programs easier for counselors to carry out. The method used was qualitative research, which focuses on meanings, definitions, characteristics, symbols and explanations of the concepts learned. The research data was collected through literature reviews and document analysis. In this study, descriptive document analysis methods were also used in data measurement. Descriptive analysis method aims to test the facts and meanings of a research systematically. This model was formed based on different initial goals in the implementation of counseling services. Moreover, Accountability Evaluation Models of School Counseling Program has each of its advantages and disadvantages. The counselor should choose part of the models which is appropriate to the situation and easy to implement in the school, in order for the implementation processes of the institution counseling program to be measured and planned in the future.

Keywords: Accountability model, evaluation counseling, programs counseling, professional counselor.

How to Cite: Mujiyati, M., Mayasari, S., & Adiputra, S. (2020). A comparison of accountability models in school counseling programs. *Konselor, 9*(3), 117-124. DOI:https://doi.org/10.24036/0202093110561-0-00

Introduction

Ever since the counselor profession began in the 1900s, there has been a difference in the roles and responsibilities of those in the school, responsible for reflecting changes in the society. This change has generated hope that school counselors are likely to demonstrate the effectiveness of institutional counseling and intervention programs, which are used to improve student academic performances (Myrick, 2003). The school counseling program is likely to achieve its objectives, which are related to improving student academic performances, though there is no evidence that this is true (Loesch& Ritchie, 2005). The effectiveness of counseling and school intervention programs used by counselors to fulfill objectives, should be documented through systematic and sustainable accountability practices.

Furthermore, program evaluation and accountability are discovered be interrelated terms. Isaacs (2003) views program evaluation as part of accountability, which focuses primarily on the improvements and effectiveness of programs. However, from a different perspective, evaluation of counseling programs precedes accountability. As defined by Loesch (2005), the evaluation of a counseling program helps practitioners to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of institutional services, through the careful and systematic examination of components, methodologies, and results. Therefore, evaluation of counseling programs has inherent value in helping practitioners plan, implement, and improve guidance practices, regardless of the need to demonstrate accountability. When school counselors are asked to provide evidence of the effectiveness of counseling services and their effects, they effectively utilize the information obtained from program evaluations. Therefore, conceptualizing counseling accountability as a specific information provider to stakeholders and other authorities, is very much required (Studer & Sommers, 2000).

Despite much discussions about the importance of school counseling accountability, the extent to which contemporary institution counselors participate in these practices remains unclear. The definition of accountability has also been observed to have changed since 1990. In 1990, school counselors were of the thoughts that enumeration data, and counting the number of counseling service activity sessions, showed accountability. Presently, in addition to activities counselors carry out daily, they also show how these routines produce changes for students. Therefore, performance responsibility, program implementation, and results, are all definitions of accountability (ASCA, 2005).

Furthermore, several studies in Indonesia showed the urgency of applying the accountability model in the country. The results of the research conducted by Suastini, Suhandana, & Yudana (2013) on the professional competence of counseling, implied the urgency of coaching, for counselors in schools to improve their expert performances. Also, the study showed that assessment of activities falls into the low category, which is less than 20%. The results of a similar study conducted by Fauziyah (2016), also showed that the comprehension level of school counselors on the concept and assessment praxis, was in a low category (28%).

Moreover, the program evaluation is still a weak component in the implementation of school counseling services in Indonesia (Badrujaman et al., 2015). This is very evident, regarding the lack of counselors in schools. The research conducted by Rachmalia (2006) regarding the implementation of the main tasks of school counselors, showed that some aspects of the institutional counseling program evaluation have not been widely carried out, due to the lack of knowledge related to assessment. Another study by Lindah (2011) showed that the quality of the implementation of evaluations in high schools in West Jakarta was 21.01%, which further explained that the implementation of the practice was still very low.

The implementation of the program evaluation, especially low basic services in institutions, resulted in little stakeholder trust in the school counseling practices (Badrujaman et al., 2015). Also, school counselors have not been able to give confidence to their students, as regards the importance of the counseling program (Husna, 2002; Pancanita, 2008). According to Buchori, counselors in most institutions are shunned by their students, because of being portrayed as "school police." Low trust in school counseling also occurs with subject teachers that often have poor perceptions about the practitioners, and the program itself. Furthermore, Buchori noted that it is not uncommon for counseling programs to only be a complementary component, as a school administration requirement (Buchori, 2001). Also, researchers try to analyze the advantages and disadvantages of each accountability evaluation model, in order to make it easier for counselors to understand.

Accountability as it is, has been defined in different varieties by experts. According to ASCA (2005), it is the ability to demonstrate the effectiveness of school counseling programs in a measurable manner. Professional school counselors use data to demonstrate the impact of counseling programs on institution improvement and student learning achievement, while also guiding actions and enhancing the future outcomes for all wards. Also, Dahir & Stone (2003) asserted that accountability is a systematic collection of data, analyzing, and using important information elements to understand the achievement, strategies, impact, and document school guidance and counseling services, which contributes to supporting student success. However, Myrick (2003) defined accountability as an answer to an individual's actions, especially in terms of setting goals, implementing procedures, and using results for program improvement. Furthermore, Brott (2006) emphasized the importance of sharing/socializing the results of school counseling services to stakeholders.

Accountability means being responsible for the counselor's actions, especially for the goals, procedures, and results from the counseling program. This involves an explanation of activities, which have been carried out, including information and data to support any claims made. According to Myrick (2011), the basic principles of accountability showed that there are still some evidence, which enables decision-making to be carried out. Moreover, the term evaluation, is often associated with accountability. Evaluation refers to the assessment of certain entities, which are of great value or significance. Also, evaluation focuses on a more specific assessment area, as it is known to be a core component of accountability (Dimmitt, 2010).

Accountability is also observed a matter of responsibility towards oneself or others. Both aspects are discovered to be relevant to the school counseling programs, with the professional counselors being responsible for a well-designed system of accountability. Also, school counselors always demand feedback on their work, in order to be able to make modifications or maintain actions that prove successful when needed.

Furthermore, school counselors gain skills in their professional development, as credible accountability measures also benefits from advocating for positions and counseling programs (Stone & Dahir, 2007). Also, accountability supports the counselor's efforts to develop a comprehensive school counseling program. An important component of accountability is data collection and analysis.

Accountability data also provides evidence to stakeholders, as regards school counseling programs making a difference in student learning achievement. When school counselors produce reports that describe the direct impact of counseling programs on student achievement, they strengthen their position as an integral part of the overall institutional goals. Therefore, school counselors need to implement credible accountability in the implementation of counseling programs in institutions, in order to become accountable practitioners.

Method

The method for use is a qualitative research, which focuses on meanings, definitions, characteristics, symbols, and explanations of the concepts learned (Berg, 2001). By contributing to realistic and holistic data collection in the natural environment (Merriam, 2009), it gives researchers detailed analysis and essential explanations, with qualities of human experience (Marvasti, 2004). Research data was collected through literature reviews and document analysis. The purpose of the literature review was to develop new research problems regarding all written information, so as to is have previous knowledge about a topic (Sapsford & Jupp, 2006). However, document analysis is a systematic review of available resources, to obtain verifiable data and information (Watkins, Meiers &Visser, 2012). Documents are ready-to-use data sources, which enable researchers to obtain unachievable information, through interviews and observations (Mason, 2002, Merriam, 2009). Therefore, the opinions about model constructs were developed with literature review and document analysis, with three judgment experts in the field of guidance and counseling. In this study, descriptive document analysis methods were used to analyze data. The descriptive analysis method aims to test the facts and meanings of research systematically (Bryman, 1988, Lankshear & Knobel, 2004).

Results and Discussion

In this study, results of the analysis discovered five evaluation models of the guidance and counseling program which were used to increase the accountability of school counselors, namely CIPP (Context, Input, Process, and Product), MEASURE (Mission, Elements, Analyze, Stakeholders Unite, Results, and Educate), SCARS (School Counselor Rating Scale), TISC (Transformative Individual School Counseling Model), and ABM (Accountability Bridge Model).

Table 1. Characteristics of the guidance and counseling program evaluation model

Evaluation Model	Acronym	Developed by	Year	Foundation History
CIPP	CIPP (Context, Input, Process, and Product)	Daniel Stuffle beam	1960	An approach that focuses on decisions for evaluation and emphasizes the provision of systematic information for program management and operations.
MEASURE	MEASURE (Mission, Elements, Analyze, Stakeholders Unite, Results, and Educate)	Carol A. Dahir& Carolyn B. Stone	2003	A Hope to connect school counselors with accountability, a deliberate focus on collaborative efforts, and use results to reflect practice.
SCARS	SCARS (School Counselor Rating Scale)	Janna L. Scarborough	2005	School counselors need data from the process of implementing services to demonstrate the effectiveness and advocacy of professional school counseling.

Evaluation Model	Acronym	Developed by	Year	Foundation History
TISC	TISC (Transformative Individual School Counseling Model)	Eschenauer& Chen-Hayes	2005	The needs of schools, families, and urban students are different from rural students.
ABM	ABM (Accountability Bridge Model)	Randall L. Astramovich& J. Kelly Coker	2007	School counselors are required to be able to demonstrate the effectiveness of school counseling programs and their impact on student achievement.

Table 2. Analysis of the guidance and counseling program evaluation model.

Evaluation model	Goal	Work system	Strengths	weakness
CIPP	Developed to provide an analytical and rational basis for program decision-making, based on the planning, structuring, implementation and review cycles and revision decisions, each examined through different evaluation aspects (context, input, process, and product evaluation).	The CIPP model is an evaluation guide which allows evaluators to evaluate programs at different stages, namely before the program starts by helping evaluators to assess needs and at the end of the program to assess whether the program has influence.	The CIPP model is an effort to make evaluations that are directly relevant to the needs of decision-makers during the program phase and activities.	1). Too concerned with how the process should be than the reality in the field. 2). The impression is too top down with managerial nature in the approach. 3). It tends to focus on rational management rather than recognizing the complexity of empirical reality.
MEASURE	To identify the needs and link the work of school counselors with the aim of improving schools.	It consists of six steps, namely the Mission, Elements, Analyze; Stakeholders Unite, Results, and Educate, which proactively and deliberately encourage collaborative efforts led by counselors that focus on annual specific results and parts of each improvement plan. When data and results have important meanings and benefits for stakeholders, school counseling programs are observed as effective,	MEASURE offers a systematic and organized way for school counselors to be able to explore school-based problems, develop possible actions, monitor progress and results.	The time needed is long enough to get meaningful and useful results, when the results do not meet the standards of the model, it is necessary to review the element components and started to analyze them again to make program improvements.

(A comparison of accountability models in school counseling programs)

		contributing, and responsible for the success of students at school.		
SCARS	SCARS was developed to help school counselors in process data collection. Specifically, it aims to measure the way school counselors spend their time compared to how counselors choose the preferred activities.	Analyze the list of preferred activities, including consultation, coordination, counseling, and curriculum intervention. This chosen activity is taken from the ASCA National Model.	Data collected in research projects designed to understand the related variables are more in line with the counselor's practice.	There is an element of subjectivity in the activities chosen so that it is necessary to adjust the process to demonstrate the effectiveness of counseling.
TISC	TISC is used by school counselors to demonstrate the effectiveness of student intervention.	The model developed with four steps, namely switching from a mental health perspective to a school perspective; determine the problem; implement short-term counseling interventions; and evaluate data using a single case study design.	TISC shifts its role towards implementing a comprehensive development guidance and counseling program that focuses on systemic change to overcome school barriers.	This model focuses more on the geographical location of schools, so the programs offered will differ from each school, and it is difficult to generalize the impact of services.
ABM	ABM is designed to help individual counselors and counseling institutions plan and provide counseling services and to assess the effectiveness and impact of these services for students.	Organized into two repetitive cycles (the cycle of evaluation of counseling programs and the context of counseling) that represent continuous service improvement based on results, stakeholder feedback, and the needs of the population served.	Providing a comprehensive framework for school counselors to involve stakeholders, while also choosing a proactive attitude when demonstrating the impact on the program, and use practical evaluation and evaluation methods to analyze the results.	Many parties involved apart from school personnel, namely the school committee and parents of students so that it takes time, energy, and thought to design and communicate the results from the programs that have been implemented.

This model was formed based on different initial goals in the implementation of counseling services. The counselor chose one of the models, which was appropriate to the situation, and easy to apply in the school.

The CIPP evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, and Product) is a program evaluation technique, developed by Daniel Stufflebeam in the 1960s. The model is an approach, which focuses on evaluation decisions, and emphasizes the provision of systematic information, for program management and operations (Robinson, 2002).

The CIPP framework was developed as a means to link evaluation with program decision-making. It aimed to provide analytical and rational basis for program decision-making, based on the planning, structuring, implementation and review cycles, with revised decisions, each examined through different evaluation aspects, namely context, input, process, and product evaluation (Robinson, 2002).

Furthermore, the model was an effort to make evaluations, which were directly relevant to the needs of decision-makers during the program phase, and activities. This model is recommended as a framework for guiding the conception, design, implementation, and evaluation of learning service projects systematically, while also providing feedback and assessment of project effectiveness for continuous improvement (Robinson, 2002).

Other evaluation models were MEASURE, SCARS, TISC, and ABM. MEASURE (Mission, Elements, Analyze; Stakeholders Unite, Result, and Educate) was developed by Carol A. Dahir & Carolyn B. Stone in 2003. It is a six-step process supporting the accountability component of the Model National, ASCA (ASCA, 2003). MEASURE showed how school counselors were dedicated to overcome academic gaps in students. This accountability process showed that counselors were committed to focusing on the achievement of students, contributing to school goals and systems, while also identifying problems that interfere with the opportunities for wards to develop. However, Dahir & Stone (2003) stated that sharing responsibility for improving schools with all stakeholders, is the driving force in changing the work of institution counselors.

SCARS (School Counselor Rating Scale) was developed by Janna L. Scarborough in 2005, and used to measure the way school counselors spend their time (Scarborough, 2005). The list of preferred activities chosen by counselors include, consultation, coordination, counseling, and curriculum intervention. This chosen activities were obtained from the ASCA National Model (2003). Also, SCARS was used by counselors to collect processed data. These processed data were used for program evaluation, which illustrated the means by which school counseling services are planned, carried out, and arranged as a form of guidance and counseling practice. Therefore, school counselors need processed data, in order to demonstrate the effectiveness and advocacy of the counseling profession.

Eschenauer & Chen-Hayes (2005) also developed an evaluation model for urban school counselors, called TISC (Transformative Individual School Counseling models). This model was developed because of the beliefs that the needs of schools, families, and urban students, were different from those in the rural areas. TISC is a model developed with four steps, namely, (a) Switching from a mental health perspective to that of the school, (b) Determining the problem, (c) Applying short-term counseling interventions, (d) Evaluating data, using a single case research design. Also, this model is a tool used by school counselors, to show the effectiveness of interventions used by students, and overcome the problem of accountability.

Furthermore, the Accountability Bridge Model (ABM) was developed by Randall L. Astramovich & J. Kelly Coker in 2007. This model has two cycles, namely evaluation of counseling programs and that of a context assessment. An accountability bridge connects these two cycles, as that of the counseling program evaluation includes planning, implementation, monitoring and improvement, with assessment of results. Also, the counseling context evaluation cycle includes feedback to stakeholders, strategic planning, with the assessment of service needs and objectives. However, the bridge of accountability is the process of communicating the results of guidance and counseling programs to stakeholders, in a bid to overcome the problem of counselors responsibility. Also, the bridge model accountability provides a framework for engaging stakeholders, so as to allow counselors choose a proactive attitude when demonstrating the impact of counseling programs, while using practical evaluation and assessment methods to analyze the results.

Conclusion

Accountability Evaluation Models of School Counseling Program has each of its advantages and disadvantages. Also, the counselor should choose one model, which is appropriate for the situation, and easy to implement in the school. As a result of that, the implementation of the counseling program are measured and planned in the future.

Acknowledgment

References

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

American School Counselor Association (ASCA). (2005). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (2ⁿᵈed.).Alexandria, VA: Author.

Astramovich, R. L., & Coker, J. K. (2007). Program evaluation: The accountability bridge model for counselors. *Journal of Counseling& Development*, *85*(2), 162-172. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2007.tb00459.x

Badrujaman, A., Furqon, F., Yusuf, S., & Suherman, S. (2015). Pengaruh Model Evaluasi Layanan Dasar Berorientasi Akuntabilitas Terhadap Peningkatan Akuntabilitas Guru BK SMP. *PARAMETER: Jurnal Pendidikan Universitas Negeri Jakarta*, *27*(II), 158-177. https://doi.org/10.21009/parameter.272.08

Berg, B. L. (2001). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. USA: Allynand Bacon.

Brott, P. (2006). Counselor education accountability: Training the effective professional school counselor. *Professional School Counseling*, *10*(2), 179-188. https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X0601000204

Bryman, A. (1988). Quantity and quality in social research. London & New York: Routledge.

Buchori, M. (2001). Dari Guidance dan Counseling ke Bimbingan dan Penyuluhan Pendidikan. *Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling*, 4(7).

Dahir, C., & Stone, C. (2003). Accountability: A M.E.A.S.U.R.E of the Impact School Counselors Have on Student Achievement. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(3), 214-221. Retrieved June 16, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/42732431

Dimmitt, Carey. (2010). Evaluation In School Counseling: Current Practices and Future Possibilities. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation*, 1 (1): 4456. https://doi.org/10.1177/2150137810361306

Eschenauer, R., & Chen-Hayes, S. (2005). The Transformative Individual School Counseling Model: An Accountability Model for Urban School Counselors. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(3), 244-248. Retrieved June 16, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/42732465

Fauziyah, E. (2016). *Tingkat Pemahaman Terhadap Konsep dan Praksis Asesmen Pada Guru Bimbingan Dan Konseling Di Sekolah Menengah Pertama Negeri Se-Kabupaten Brebes* (Doctoral disertation, Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan).

Husna, S. (2002). Peranan Layanan informasi terhadap pemahaman diri siswa program percepatan belajar di smu 8. *Skripsi*. Jurusan BK Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Negeri Jakarta.

Isaacs, M. (2003). Data-Driven Decision Making: The Engine of Accountability. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(4), 288-295. Retrieved June 16, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/42732442

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2004). *A handbook for teacher research*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Lindah. (2011). Kepuasan Siswa mengikuti Layanan Dasar di SMA 36 Jakarta. *Skripsi*. Jurusan BK Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Negeri Jakarta.

Loesch, L. C., & Ritchie, M. H. (2005). *The accountable school counselor*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Marvasti, A. B. (2004). Qualitative research in sociology. USA: Sage Publications.

Mason, J. (2002). Qualitative Researching. (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publication.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation. California: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Myrick, R. (2003). Accountability: Counselors Count. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(3), 174-179. Retrieved June 16, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/42732426

Myrick, R. D. (2011). *Developmental guidance and counseling: A practical approach*. *(Fifth Edition*). Minneapolis: Educational Media Corporation.

Pancanita, R. I. (2008). Persepsi siswa terhadap layanan BK di SMP 92. *Skripsi*. Jurusan BK Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Negeri Jakarta.

Rachmalia, N. *(*2006). Faktor-Faktor Penghambat Pelaksanaan Tugas Pokok Guru Pembimbing. *Skripsi*. Jurusan BK Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Negeri Jakarta.

Robinson, B. (2002). The CIPP approach to evaluation.COLLIT project, 4.

Sapsford, R., & Jupp, V. (2006). *Data collection and analysis*. (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publication.

Scarborough, J. (2005). The School Counselor Activity Rating Scale: An Instrument for Gathering Process Data. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(3), 274-283. Retrieved June 16, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/42732469

Stone, C. B., & Dahir, C. A. (2007). *School counselor accountability: A measure of student success*. Columbus: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Studer, J. R., & Sommers, J. A. (2000). The professional school counselor and accountability. *NASSP Bulletin*, *84*(615), 93-99. https://doi.org/10.1177/019263650008461511

Suastini, N. L. P., Suhandana, G. A., & Yudana, I. M. (2013). Analisis Kesenjangan Kompetensi Profesional Guru BK Berbasis Permendiknas No. 27 Tahun 2008 (Studi pada Para Guru BK SMA Se-Kabupaten Tabanan). *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan Indonesia*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.23887/japi.v4i1.973

Watkins, R., Meiers, M. W., & Visser, Y. L. (2012). *A guide to assessing needs.* Washington DC: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.