Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, Issue #174, December 21, 2015.

ESTABLISHING BEST PRACTICE IN SCHOOL COUNSELLING VIA COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP IN THE COUNSELLOR–SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR DYAD

Michael S. Reavie

School counselling services in Canada are inconsistent due to differing provincial guidelines. The lack of a national school counselling model and inconsistent provincial guidelines results in limited awareness of best practice and inconsistent services for students. Administrators and school counsellors have differing perspectives related to the counsellors' appropriate work role, service delivery, and priority duties. This discrepancy results in challenges with inter-professional collaboration, shared leadership, and counsellor supervision. Recommendations for establishment of a school-counselling model, improved administrator–counsellor professional development, appropriate supervision, and increased administrator–counsellor collaboration are provided.

In order for effective school counselling programs to exist in Canada, it is essential that in-school administrators and school counsellors work collaboratively to change current practice. This article opens with an examination of the current status of school counselling in Canada: specifically, current provincial and territorial guidelines, the school counsellor role, and professional association supports. The data presented exposes inconsistencies in guidelines for school counselling, both between and within provinces/territories. The second section identifies the challenges in the working relationship between in-school administrators and school counsellors. Researchers indicate that the primary reasons for these challenges are differing perceptions regarding the counsellor role, the appropriate service delivery model, and the value of shared leadership (Monteiro-Leitner, Asner-Self, Milde, Leitner, & Skelton, 2006). Finally,

this article concludes with specific recommendations to support in-school administrators and counsellors so they are able to collaboratively improve school counselling services. For effective school counselling programs to exist in Canada, in the absence of consistent inter-provincial regulations or guidelines, it is critical that school counsellors and in-school administrators co-develop a shared vision for school counselling and revise school counselling programming based on best-practice research.

Current Status of School Counselling in Canada

To ensure a comprehensive understanding of the challenges in the inter-professional relationship between school counsellors and in-school administrators, it is essential to be aware of the current status of school counselling services in Canada. Present challenges are associated with underdeveloped provincial regulations, inconsistent role expectations, and lack of support from professional associations.

Provincial/Territorial Guidelines

Based on the data provided by the Canadian Counselling and Psychotherapy Association (CCPA, 2006), it is evident that there are inconsistencies between provinces/territories regarding the guidelines for school-based counselling services in Canada. The CCPA (2006) data indicated differences in both the provincial guidelines related to the minimum education requirements for school counsellors and the requirement for school counsellors to hold teacher certification. Only Saskatchewan and Quebec do not require school counsellors to be certified teachers. Further to this, Saskatchewan is the only province that does not require school counsellors to maintain certification with a professional regulatory body. The

CCPA data also revealed that, as of 2006, only Saskatchewan and Manitoba did not require master's level, or specialized post-graduate, training for school counsellors. However, according to the Government of Manitoba (2009), counsellors in Manitoba schools are now required to have a minimum of 30 credit hours of post-graduate studies in counselling. This leaves Saskatchewan as the only province not requiring school counsellors to be trained in education or graduate level counselling.

According to Shelley Adams, superintendent of sector support with the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, the ministry currently does not publish guidelines defining required qualifications, role definition, or professional registration for school counsellors in Saskatchewan (personal communication, March 2014). Determining these guidelines is the responsibility of the employing school divisions. This is concerning, as researchers indicate that the lack of standardization related to minimum education, professional regulation, and service standards for school counselling may result in considerable inconsistencies in the type and quality of services provided (Keats & Laitsch, 2010).

In addition to qualification inconsistencies, there are also limited provincial/territorial guidelines to standardize school counselling services. According to the CCPA (2006), select provinces are in the process of developing regulations for school counselling, with only Quebec having completed the process. The CCPA (2015) also noted that all mental health professionals, not specifically school counsellors, are only regulated in Quebec, Ontario, and Nova Scotia. This data also revealed that British Columbia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island have working groups established to develop provincial regulations for counsellors, with each group being at a different stage in the process (CCPA, 2015). This lack of provincial/territorial regulation permits individuals without graduate training to provide mental health counselling in a

variety of settings including private practice, schools, colleges, universities, employment and career development centres, health systems, community services, business, industry, and government. The CCPA (2007) is concerned with the protection of the public from individuals without graduate level training who attempt to provide mental health services, citing that these individuals do not possess the clinical skillset to assess or apply therapeutic interventions. The CCPA (2007) noted that, in regions without regulations for counselling, select regulated professionals, such as social workers with undergraduate-level training, are attempting to provide mental health services without adequate training in the area of psychotherapy.

With regulation lacking for counselling services, it is evident that considerable work is needed to ensure protection of the public (CCPA, 2013). The absence of both national and provincial/territorial regulations is likely to create confusion for agency heads including school district administrators, as it relates to directing services and supervising staff. In educational settings this results in tension between the school counsellor and in-school administrators when establishing the parameters for school counselling services (Bardhoshi & Duncan, 2009; Somody, Henderson, Cook, & Zambrano, 2008).

Role of the Canadian School Counsellor

As expected, based on the lack of guidelines for school counselling, there are discrepancies in the role definition of the school counsellor across the country (Keats & Laitsch, 2010). For example, currently in Saskatchewan the responsibility for determining the qualifications, role definition, and professional registration requirements for school counsellors lies solely with the employing school division (Shelley Adams, personal communication, March 2014). In contrast, the British Columbia Ministry of Education (2011) recently established

provincial guidelines for the role of school counsellor. Keats and Laitsch (2010) noted that, in British Columbia, inconsistencies in the counsellor role existed prior to the provincial guidelines, implying that a lack of guidelines is a critical barrier to establishing a consistent role definition. Unfortunately, current research does not provide any data on any other provincial/territorial jurisdictions.

The lack of a national model to clarify an appropriate role definition for school counsellors results in discrepancy between the actual roles of school counsellors and what research indicates is their preferred practice. Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) found that discrepancies in the counsellor role were often associated with requirements to engage in non-counselling activities, restricting the amount of time to engage in counselling services. Scarborough and Culbreth noted that demands to engage in non-counselling duties, such as supervision, discipline, or clerical work, were related to the organizational structure set by administrators of the school.

Professional Associations

In addition to inconsistencies in regulations and guidelines for school counsellor practice, counsellors are not required to maintain membership in a professionally relevant organization (Bauman, 2008). In all provinces, with the exception of Saskatchewan and Quebec, school counsellors are required to be certified teachers, therefore requiring membership in the professional associations for teachers (CCPA, 2006). A challenge resulting from the lack of a professional association specific to counselling is the absence of continuing education requirements related to current counselling practices (Bauman, 2008).

In the United States, there are professional bodies that work in the interest of counsellors, including the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), the American Counseling Association (ACA), as well as various state-based organizations (Bauman, 2008). In Canada, the CCPA permits school counsellors to obtain membership and national certification as a Canadian Certified Counsellor, and sponsors a specific chapter for school counsellors (CCPA, 2013). However, there is no national association specific to school counsellors. School counsellors may choose to join provincial/territorial associations, in addition to the CCPA, when available.

With the lack of a national school counselling association in Canada, challenges are likely to exist with regard to establishing a unified body to advocate for a clear description of appropriate school counselling services. At present, with membership being voluntary, school counsellors must determine the value of joining the CCPA or a provincial association (Bauman, 2008). It is interesting that, in the United States, 96% of members enrolled in the ASCA found the membership beneficial, citing increased advocacy for their role and professional credibility as the primary reasons (Bauman, 2008). Perhaps the absence of a national association in Canada, specific to school counselling, is further limiting the efforts to address the issues of inconsistency, lack of clarity, and absence of regulations related to school counselling.

Present Challenges in Collaboration Between Administrators and Counsellors

Due to the absence of guidelines for both the qualifications and role of school counsellors in Canada, in-school administrators will have differing perceptions as to the services that should be provided. These differing perceptions lead to challenges both in the in-school

administrator's direction for the school counsellor and in the development of a shared vision for services (Henderson & Gysbers, 2006).

Role Expectations

According to Keats and Laitsch's (2010) Canadian study on school counselling, in-school administrators often demand that the school counsellor work to support the general needs of the school rather than focus specifically on his or her counselling role. When school counsellors are required to perform non-counselling duties it causes confusion in role definition for the members of the school team, which subsequently limits effectiveness of team collaboration. Keats and Laitsch also indicated that in-school administrators may struggle to define the role of the school counsellor due to limited guidelines; therefore, school counsellors are likely to experience inconsistent and unclear workplace expectations.

Perera-Diltz and Manson (2008) surveyed American school counsellors to determine what responsibilities they perceived to be most appropriate. This study showed that five duties were consistently supported by 75% of counsellors, including individual counselling, group counselling, consultation, collaboration, and record keeping. Unfortunately, researchers also indicate that it is not uncommon for in-school administrators to request engagement in non-counselling duties, including student supervision, clerical work, academic assessment, discipline, and support of special education programming (Bardhoshi & Duncan, 2009; Keats & Laitsch, 2008; Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Monteiro-Leitner et al., 2006; Perera-Diltz & Manson, 2008). In rural locations, where other professional and paraprofessional supports may be less available, in-school administrator expectations of counsellors to support the school in a non-counselling role, as previously defined, are increased (Bardhoshi & Duncan, 2009). According to

Monteiro-Leitner et al. (2006) these role perception differences can lead to conflictual dynamics between in-school administrators and school counsellors, resulting in considerable stress for the school counsellor.

In-school administrators and school counsellors have differing perspectives on the priority duties that should be performed by the school counsellor. Multiple studies have revealed that in-school administrators prioritize services that are reactive in nature, including crisis response, managing student issues, dealing with peer conflict, and discipline (Bardhoshi & Duncan, 2008; Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005, & Monteiro-Leitner et al., 2006). Teachers also advocate for reactive services that include private and individualized counselling services (Reiner, Colbert, & Pérusse, 2009). In-school administrator and teacher advocacy for individualized, reactive services conceivably would frustrate a counsellor who is attempting to follow a comprehensive and developmentally focused model, as this type of model is focused on proactive planning based on student outcome data (ASCA, 2012).

It is common for in-school administrators and school counsellors to hold differing views regarding the counsellor's ability to meet the needs of students requiring mental health supports. Counsellors in a school setting often view themselves as mental health professionals to a greater extent than their in-school administrators (Brown, Dahlbeck, & Sparkman-Barnes, 2006). In-school administrators often promote the use of non-school mental health service providers to "provide such necessary and time-consuming student services" (Brown et al., 2006, p.5). School counsellors find it disconcerting, and perhaps even demeaning, when in-school administrators request that referrals be made to outside agencies. This frustration is expected as school counsellors typically have similar education to other mental health practitioners (Brown et al., 2006). As a coordinator of school division student services, with training in both education

and counselling, I agree that trained school counsellors are competent in meeting the needs of students with mental health needs. However, I struggle with school divisions providing mental health services that should be the responsibility of provincial healthcare services. Perhaps increased clarity regarding the scope of school counselling versus the scope of clinical mental health services would permit improved collaboration between school counsellors and mental health service providers.

Standards and guidelines need to be developed so that in-school administrators are aware of the appropriate scope of practice and role of the school counsellor. In-school administrators likely request non-endorsed duties or outside supports to ensure that the needs of the school are met, without the intention of causing stress for the school counsellor. Bardhoshi and Duncan's (2010) study supports this notion, revealing that non-counselling duties are typically requested with greater frequency and in greater volume in underserviced rural settings.

Prioritization of Service Type

As noted above, there are inconsistent perceptions between school counsellors and supervising in-school administrators as to the priority tasks for the school counsellor. One of the key challenges is that in-school administrators are typically responsible for directing the services delivered within the school setting; however, they are unlikely to have the training in school counselling required to set an appropriate direction for services (Dollarhide, Smith, & Lemberger, 2007).

Clemens, Milsom, and Cashwell (2009) revealed that in-school administrators typically choose one of two service models. The first, the quasi-administrator, requires the counsellor to be responsible for engaging in disciplinary and primarily reactive services to aid the in-school

administrator in meeting the behavioural needs of the school. In contrast, best practice research (ASCA, 2012) would support a developmentally focused counselling program, allowing for counsellors to be key members of the leadership team, spending their time supporting student academic, personal, social, and career development (Clemens et al., 2009). Additionally, the later model also focuses on implementation of programs that are both developmental and preventative in nature (Clemens et al., 2009).

One of the key reasons that in-school administrators, and by association school division administrators, advocate for a reactive, quasi-administrative counselling role is the lack of awareness of an alternative model (Dollarhide et al., 2007; Leuwerke, Walker, & Qi, 2009). Requests for counsellors to support the in-school administrator through a quasi-administrative counsellor role may be a direct symptom of overwhelmed in-school administrators trying to meet the needs of the school where other necessary supports are limited (Bardhoshi & Duncan, 2009).

Researchers agree that the counsellor skillset is strongly suited for establishing a sense of community and inter-professional collaboration in the school environment, which is shown to positively impact student learning. Unfortunately, the same researchers also indicate that in-school administrators are typically not cognisant of the counsellor's potential role in this initiative (Foster Johnson & Wellman Perkins, 2009; Jonson, Milltello, & Kosine, 2008). If school counsellors are empowered to be leaders in collaboration with staff, families, and community partners, the school will become more effective in meeting the needs of typically underserved learners due to the increased collaboration between available resource personnel (Epstein & Voorhis, 2010; Jonson et al., 2008; Walsh, Barrett, & DePaul, 2007). If in-school administrators are uncertain whether to capitalize on the counsellor strengths in this capacity, counsellors may feel underutilized and underappreciated (Jonson et al., 2008).

Many in-school administrators are unaware of comprehensive, developmentally focused school-counselling models. In the United States, where the ASCA (2012) established this type of model for school counselling, 70% of in-school administrators report little or no awareness of this type of model (Leuwerke et al., 2009). This is very concerning given that counsellor job satisfaction is influenced by the level of support for appropriate counselling services from their in-school administrator (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; Clemens, Milsom, & Cashwell, 2009). It is possible that in-school administrators in Canada would struggle even more with awareness of an appropriate, developmentally-focused, counselling model because standardization and research are limited.

Shared Leadership

School administrators who perceive that they are the sole leader of the school disempower other professionals who are in potential school leadership positions (Jonson et al, 2008). With recommendations for school counsellors to be part of the leadership team in schools (Dollarhide, Gibson, & Saginak, 2008; Janson, Stone, & Clark, 2009; Mason & McMahon, 2009) it is essential for in-school administrators and counsellors to develop a strong working relationship that supports the development of shared leadership practices (Jonson et al., 2008). In a shared leadership model for counselling services, in-school administrators and school counsellors jointly lead the school team by making recommendations for services that focus on prevention, advocacy, and intervention (Walsh et al., 2007). It is noted by Walsh et al. (2007) that when in-school administrators encourage school counsellors to engage in leadership functions, the counsellor's role shifts from an isolated position to one that impacts the academic outcomes of students.

In order to actualize a strong, shared leadership structure, it is essential that administrators involve school counsellors in relevant decision-making efforts. This shared decision making process is shown to motivate, support, and retain school counsellors, as well as strengthen the in-school administrator and counsellor relationship (Clemens et al., 2009). However, shared leadership efforts can only be effective in schools if school counsellors and supervising in-school administrators hold a common vision for services.

Supervision

Supervision of the school counsellor, typically conducted by in-school administrators as supervisors of school services at the site level, must be based on a common understanding of the role. Unfortunately, in-school administrators are typically unaware of best practices for school counsellors, which may cause frustration during the supervision process (Henderson & Gysbers, 2006). If in-school administrators are to provide quality supervision, evaluation, and direction to school counsellors, it is essential that they understand the role and current best practice recommendations for school counselling services (Somody et al., 2008).

Counsellors identify the need for, and welcome the prospect of, increased supervision (Somody et al., 2008). In fact, counsellors have identified numerous supervision priorities, which include increased professional development, skill development, and collaboration to assist in learning methods to meet the increasing needs of students (Henderson & Gysbers, 2006; Somody et al., 2008). It may be challenging for in-school administrators to effectively fulfill this role, as it is assumed that most in-school administrators would have training in educational administration, leaving them at a disadvantage in providing proper counsellor supervision.

Recommendations for Improved Services

In the absence of the clarity that would be afforded by provincial guidelines and regulations for school counselling, recommendations are provided here to begin the process of developing a researched-based comprehensive counselling program. These recommendations, based on the ASCA (2012) model, are focused on the following areas: use of a research-based model, in-school administrators' professional development related to school counselling, increased advocacy by school counsellors for role clarification and improved services, and provisions for appropriate counsellor supervision that includes clinical as well as administrative supervision.

ASCA Model as a Sample Model

The ASCA (2012) has recently published a revised edition of the national model, intended to be a framework for American school counselling programs. The initial model was published by the ASCA in 2003 in recognition of the need for direction for school counselling services (ASCA, 2012). The revised version of the model is targeted at improving the learning and developmental outcomes of all students, not just those who may be considered low performing students or those experiencing crisis. The model is focused on enabling school counsellors to "help every student improve academic achievement, navigate personal and social development and plan for successful careers after graduation" (ASCA, 2012, p.10). The comprehensive, developmentally focused school counselling program is a shift from what would be previously described as a separate service, functioning in isolation from the mainstream programming. The transition to a focus on a comprehensive, developmentally focused program requires school counsellors to be active members of the school team, and entails reviewing

student progress data, behavioural data, and attendance. In this model, the school counsellor and the in-school administrator work together with the rest of the staff to determine the support needs for students, with efforts specifically focused on improving student outcomes.

The revised ASCA model is based on four distinct themes for the counsellor's efforts in counselling reform: leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change. With all of these foundational underpinnings of the service focused on student outcomes, counsellors are required to become strong leaders, empowering the school team to implement programming that will improve student achievement.

School divisions in North America are actively implementing the Response to Intervention (RtI) framework for delivering student supports. RtI is "an effective, efficient, data-driven, and highly collaborative process that takes advantage of the collective expertise and experiences of the school counsellor, parent, RtI team, and the student" (ASCA, 2012, p.73). The revised ASCA model is developed to be consistent with the RtI model, emphasizing ongoing team collaboration to review student progress data, tailor preventative and intervention-based programing, and review the effectiveness of intervention. The ASCA recommends that school counsellors should spend 80% of their time providing direct service to students and 20% of their time in collaboration and program management. The 80% direct service provision is to be comprised of instructing a school counselling core curriculum that is preventative and developmental in nature, offering individual planning sessions to assist students in establishing personal goals and future plans, facilitating individual and group counselling, and leading crisis response services (ASCA, 2012). Researchers indicate that, even prior to revision in 2012, the ASCA model was the most comprehensive choice for school counselling reform (Jonson et al., 2008; Leuwerke et al., 2009).

In-School Administrator Professional Development

With the lack of in-school administrator awareness of best practice research related to both the school counsellor role and service delivery models for school counselling (Leuwerke et al., 2009), it is evident that in-school administrators would benefit from increased professional development. With in-school administrators being the key leaders and supervisors of student programming within their schools, it is important for them to have the information regarding school counselling best practice. Knowledge regarding current counselling research and a comprehensive counselling model will assist in-school administrators in working collaboratively with school counsellors towards school counselling reform (Jonson et al., 2008; Leuwerke et al., 2009). A key way that in-school administrators can learn about this research is through collaborative learning and engaging in counselling reform with the school counsellor.

Counsellor Self-Advocacy

As in-school administrators and school counsellors begin the process of reform of school counselling programs, it is important that school counsellors take the initiative to self-advocate for necessary changes (Chata & Loesch, 2007; Clemens et al., 2009; Jonson et al., 2008; Leuwerke et al., 2009). It is probable that in most cases school counsellors will have a clearer understanding of the appropriate model for school counselling because of their training and professional development. This increased understanding places school counsellors in a potential leadership position during reform. It is also noted, however, that for self-advocacy to be effective, the working relationships of school counsellors and in-school administrators must be supportive of such efforts (Clemens et al., 2009). This section focuses on four specific areas that in-school administrators and school counsellors can discuss to develop a shared understanding:

service delivery model awareness, appropriate counsellor role descriptors, shared leadership, and the importance of accountability data.

Awareness of school counselling models. Researchers indicate that the ASCA (2012) model, presented earlier, is the key model for school counsellors and school administrators to explore for school counselling reform (Jonson et al., 2008; Leuwerke, et al., 2009). Focusing on a comprehensive, developmental school counselling model will empower school counsellors to become visible members of their school team. As active members of the team, school counsellors become able to impact the academic, social, and career development of students (Chata & Loesch, 2007; Dahir, Burnham, Stone, & Cobb, 2010; Leuwerke et al., 2009). In-school administrators have the opportunity to learn both from and with school counsellors regarding the ASCA model, which will allow for opportunities to clarify perceptions, develop a shared vision for services, and to improve working relationships. This shared vision, held by both the in-school administrator and school counsellor, is critical as it correlates to school counsellor job satisfaction and program success (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; Dahir et al., 2010; Foster Johnson & Wellman Perkins, 2009).

Appropriate counsellor role descriptors. With the ASCA (2012) model as a basis for in-school administrators and school counsellors to establish a common understanding of best practice counselling services, school counsellors and in-school administrators can begin to discuss school counsellor role revision. The ASCA recommends that school counsellor duties should be focused on the delivery of a comprehensive school counselling program that incorporates both direct and indirect student services, program management, and school support. In-school administrators are advised by the ASCA to "eliminate or reassign inappropriate tasks, allowing for school counsellors to focus on the prevention and intervention needs of their

program" (2012, p.45). The ASCA defines the appropriate activities of school counsellors as individual student program planning, reviewing assessment data, and individual and group counselling for students with truancy difficulties, disciplinary problems, and identified personal counselling needs. The comprehensive focus recommended in the ASCA model requires counsellors to be involved in collaboration with in-school administrators and school teams regarding student achievement data, school counselling core curriculum, classroom management strategies, program plan meetings, and student academic, personal, social, and behavioural needs. In addition to the school-based services, there are expectations for school counsellors to liaise with families, community agencies, and community-based organizations. These liaison efforts will ensure that supportive programming and services are available to students outside of school (ASCA, 2012). If in-school administrators do not rectify the inappropriate requirement for counsellors to be quasi-administrators or school assistants, there will not be time to establish the comprehensive program, which will force the services to continue to be reactive and crisis orientated (ASCA, 2012).

Shared leadership. It is essential that in-school administrators and school counsellors work collaboratively to establish shared leadership practices in areas relevant to a comprehensive, developmental school counselling program (Walsh et al., 2007). Actualizing shared leadership in this model means collaborative review of student assessment data, truancy data, behavioural reports, and other student data to determine a comprehensive and proactive plan to support students (ASCA, 2012). Working in a shared leadership role, the in-school administrator and the school counsellor engage the staff of the school in revising current practices to meet the students' needs, thereby improving student outcomes (ASCA, 2012). Shared leadership within the RtI framework, using a comprehensive counselling model, ensures

that the in-school administrator, school counsellor, and instructional team are continually reviewing student progress in academic, behavioural, and social domains, and then tailoring interventions to meet student needs (ASCA, 2012). For this to be effective, the process requires the RtI team to engage in ongoing assessment of student progress and re-evaluation of strategies to foster continual progress toward outcomes. The shared leadership of the in-school administrator and school counsellor promotes a collaborative focus to improve student outcomes through preventative and comprehensive supports (ASCA, 2012).

Importance of accountability. Leuwerke et al. (2009) stated that school counselling outcome research has influenced school divisions to increase or, at the very least, maintain current provisions for school counselling services; however, they also identify that the research has done little to persuade in-school administrators of the effectiveness of the programming. If both in-school and school division administrators are to be convinced of the significant and valuable contributions of school counselling programs, school counsellors must function within the research-based model and provide in-school administrators and school division administrators local data regarding the effectiveness of services. At present, and more than ever before, school divisions are experiencing pressure to improve the learning outcomes of students (Dahir & Stone, 2009). Establishing positive correlations between school counselling services and student academic achievement will foster school administrator confidence in the model (Leuwerke et al., 2009). It is recommended that in-school administrators, in collaboration with school counsellors, set parameters for collecting this data to improve school counsellor accountability (Leuwerke et al., 2009).

Clinical Supervision

School counsellors identify the need for clinical supervision to support them in meeting the increasingly varied and complex needs of students (Somody et al., 2008). What is being requested are opportunities for professional dialogue related to specific counselling skills that will meet the needs of students, in addition to target setting based on professional standards, direct supervision of skill, and feedback (Somody et al., 2008). In order to provide this type of supervision it is essential that supervisors be competent in counselling supervision (Henderson & Gysbers, 2006). Henderson and Gysbers (2006) identified that the person in the supervisory role must be aware of the appropriate scope and role of the school counsellor.

Although in-school administrators are well positioned to offer administrative supervision of school counsellors, which will be enhanced by increased professional development in best practice for school counselling programs (Leuwerke et al., 2009), most are not trained as counsellors themselves. Therefore it is recommended that there be opportunities for supervision with a qualified clinical supervisor that will supplement the administrative supervision offered by in-school administrators. School counsellors indicate that supervision and peer consultation is important for professional growth (Duncan, Brown-Rice, & Bardhoshi, 2014). At present, supervision is limited for school counsellors due to time constraints and lack of qualified supervisors (Duncan, Brown-Rice, & Bardhoshi, 2014). The combination of administrative supervision, clinical supervision, and peer consultation will contribute to the continued professional learning and growth, competency development and refinement, ethical decision making, and best practices designed to promote and protect client wellbeing (Duncan, Brown-Rice, & Bardhoshi, 2014).

Additionally, when school counsellors are supervised by a division employee trained in counselling, or are provided collaborative peer consultation opportunities, they have increased career satisfaction (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; Wilkerson, 2006). It is therefore important for in-school administrators, division administrators, and school counsellors to regularly revisit plans for counsellor supervision to ensure that they are comprehensive, ethically congruent, meaningful, goal directed, and appropriately targeted on counsellor growth within a research-based model.

Limitations

Examining the current status of school counselling in Canada is challenging as there is little current Canadian research related to guidelines and regulation in school counselling, in-school administrator and school counsellor relationships, school counsellor roles, or best practice models. Due to limited Canadian research, it was necessary to supplement this article with research from the United States, which created the risk that that the data may not be completely indicative of the status of school counselling in Canada. Due to the non-existence of a Canadian national model for school counselling, the American School Counselling Association's (ASCA, 2012) was presented as best practice, with the acknowledgement that differences in our respective education systems or regulations have not been taken into account.

Future Directions

Based on this preliminary review of the current literature, recommendations for future studies and initiatives to build on the findings in this article follow. First, research needs to be conducted on the status of school counselling in Canada, focusing on the counsellor role,

relationships with in-school administrators, supervision opportunities, and job satisfaction. Second, district administrators, in-school administrators, and school counsellors need to work collaboratively to revise the current school counselling programs and services within schools in order to reflect an appropriate comprehensive and developmentally focused model. Ultimately, it is recommended that a Canadian model of school counselling consistent with Canadian research, policy, and educational system governance be developed.

Conclusion

In order for in-school administrators and school counsellors to effectively amend the current status of school counselling in Canada to meet best practice recommendations, they must embark on cooperative and concerted endeavours. In the face of the challenges that exist regarding the lack of regulation and an appropriate Canadian school counselling model, in-school administrators and school counsellors will need to engage in collaborative exploration of the current recommendations for implementation of a comprehensive developmentally focused counselling program. It is through research and joint learning that in-school administrators and school counsellors will be prepared to engage in discussion regarding school counselling program vision and direction, school counsellor role definition and scope of practice, and optimal supervision practices, allowing for movement towards the development of shared leadership practices in the school. When school counsellors and in-school administrators co-construct a vision for school counselling services that take into consideration the research-based recommendations for reform, school counselling can shift to a comprehensive service that offers the promise of positive outcomes for students.

References

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

Baggerly, J., & Osborn, D. (2006). School counselors' career satisfaction and commitment: Correlates and predictors. *Professional School Counseling*, *9*, 197–205.

Bardhoshi, G., & Duncan, K. (2009). Rural school principals' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *The Rural Educator*, *30*(3), 16–24.

Bauman, S. (2008). To join or not to join: School counselors as a case study in professional membership. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *86*, 164–177.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (2011). *Special education services: A manual of policies, procedures and guidelines*. Victoria: Author.

Brown, C., Dahlbeck, D. T., & Sparkman-Barnes, L. (2006). Collaborative relationships: School counselors and non-school mental health professionals working together to improve the mental health needs of students. *Professional School Counseling*, *9*, 332–335.

Canadian Counselling and Psychotherapy Association (CCPA). (2007). Legislative support fund. Retrieved from http://www.ccpa-accp.ca/en/theprofession/legislativesupportfund/

Canadian Counselling and Psychotherapy Association (CCPA). (2013). School counsellors chapter. Retrieved from http://www.ccpa-accp.ca/en/chapters/schoolcounsellors/#How

Canadian Counselling and Psychotherapy Association (CCPA). (2015). Regulation across Canada. Retrieved from http://www.ccpa-accp.ca/en/schoolcounsellorsprovinces/

Chata, C. C., & Loesch, L. C. (2007). Future school principals' views of the roles of professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling*, *11*, 35–41.

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

Dahir, C. A., Burnham, J. J., Stone, C. B., & Cobb, N. (2010). Principals as partners: Counselors as collaborators. *NASSP Bulletin*, *94*, 286–305.

Dahir, C. A., & Stone, C. B. (2009). School counselor accountability: The path to social justice and systemic change. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *87*, 12–20.

Dollarhide, C. T., Gibson, D. M., & Saginak, K. A. (2008). New counselors' leadership efforts in school counseling: Themes from a year-long qualitative study. *Professional School Counseling*, *11*, 262–271.

Dollarhide, C. T., Smith, A. T., & Lemberger, M. E. (2007). Critical incidents in the development of supportive in-school administrators: Facilitating school counselor-principal relationships. *Professional School Counseling*, *10*, 360–369.

Duncan, K., Brown-Rice, K., Bardhoshi, G. (2014). Perceptions of the importance and utilization of clinical supervision among certified rural school counsellors. *The Professional Counselor*, *4*, 444–454.

Epstein, J. L., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2010). School counselors' roles in developing partnerships with families and communities for student success. *Professional School Counseling*, *14*, 1–14.

Foster Johnson, A., & Wellman Perkins, G. (2009). What we know about at-risk students. *NASSP Bulletin*, *93*, 122–134.

Government of Manitoba. (2010). *School counsellor certificate guidelines*. Russell, MB: Author. Retrieved from www.edu.gov.mb.ca

Henderson, P., & Gysbers, N. C. (2006). Providing administrative and counseling supervision for counselors. *Vistas: Compelling perspectives on counselling*, 161–164.

Janson, C., Stone, C., & Clark, M. A. (2009). Stretching leadership: A distributed perspective for school counselor leaders. *Professional School Counseling*, *13*, 98–106.

Jonson, C., Milltello, M., & Kosine, N. (2008). Four views of the professional school counselor–principal relationship: A q-methodology study. *Professional School Counseling*, *11*, 353–361.

Keats, P. A., & Laitsch, D. (2010). Contemplating regulation of counsellors in Canadian schools: Current issues and concerns. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, *108*, 1–33.

Kirchner, G. L., & Setchfield, M. S. (2005). School counselors' and school principals' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Education*, *126*(1), 10–16.

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

Mason, E. C., & McMahon, H. G. (2009). Leadership practices of school counselors. *Professional School Counseling*, *13*, 107–115.

Monteiro-Leitner, J., Asner-Self, K. K., Milde, C., Leitner, D. W., & Skelton, D. (2006). The role of the rural school counselor: Counselor, counselor-in-training, and principal perceptions. *Professional School Counseling*, *9*, 248–251.

Perera-Diltz, D. M., & Manson, K. L. (2008). Factors that influence pre-service administrators' views of appropriate school counsellor duties. *Journal of School Counselling*, *8*(5), 1–28.

Reiner, S. M., Colbert, R. D., & Pérusse, R. (2009). Teacher perceptions of the professional school counselor role: A national study. *Professional School Counseling*, *12*, 324–332.

Scarborough, J. L., & Culbreth, J. R. (2008). Examining discrepancies between actual and preferred practice of school counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *86*, 446–459.

Somody, C., Henderson, P., Cook, K., & Zambrano, E. (2008). A working system of school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, *12*, 22–33.

Walsh, M. E., Barrett, J. G., & DePaul, J. (2007). Day-to-day activities of school counselors: Alignment with new directions in the field and the ASCA National Model. *Professional School Counseling*, *10*, 370–378.

Wilkerson, K. (2006). Peer supervision for the professional development of school counselors: Toward an understanding of terms and findings. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *46*, 59–67.