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School counselors are expected to serve as site supervisors for school counseling practicum and internship students, but often times do so without any training in supervision. The following dissertation study will explore the training needs of school counselors in supervision. The purpose of this study is to determine if site supervisors who have had formal training in supervision, as indicated by graduate coursework, report higher self-efficacy and receive higher ratings on evaluations from school counseling internship students. School counseling internship students and their current site supervisors were surveyed using the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor from and the Site Supervisor Self-efficacy Survey.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Chapter 1 will include an overview of the role of supervision in counseling, the professional responsibility for practicing counselors to serve as site supervisors and the current status of supervision training for professional counselors. Specifically, the population of interest for this study includes school counseling site supervisors and focuses on a deficit in training requirements that leaves school counselors with few training opportunities that are applicable to the school setting. Chapter 1 will then address the research problem being investigated, the purpose of the study, the research hypotheses, and an overview of the research design. Lastly, the chapter will close with an outline of the organization of this dissertation.

Supervision in Counseling

Practicing counselors are charged with an important responsibility to serve as site supervisors for practicum and internship students enrolled in master’s level counseling programs. The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) requires that counseling students receive weekly supervision throughout practicum and internship for the duration of one hour by qualified site supervisors (2009). Supervision is critical to the practicum and internship experience in that it provides counselors-in-training with a safe environment to process counseling experiences, ethical dilemmas and case conceptualizations. It also affords students an opportunity to draw connections between what they’ve learned in the classroom and how it should be implemented in the field (Studer & Diambra, 2010). Bernard and Goodyear (2014) defined supervision as:
an intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior colleague or colleagues who typically (but not always) are members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative and hierarchical, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s); monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients that she, he or they see; and serving as a gatekeeper for the particular profession the supervisee seeks to enter (p.9)

Clinical supervision, which is typically used when referring to supervision provided to mental health professionals (Bernard & Goodyear), enhances counselor development and increases professional competency (Sutton & Page, 1994). Site supervisors in both the school and clinical setting are responsible for the services that practicum and internship students provide, and the overall protection of student/client welfare.

The impact of clinical supervision on counselor performance is difficult to measure, but recent studies have shown that supervision has a positive correlation with increased self-awareness, self-efficacy and a strong working alliance (Borders, 1990; Cashwell & Dooley, 2001; Leherman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001); all of which have a direct impact on counselor development. Supervision is also instrumental in helping beginning professionals develop their professional identity as counselors and how they define their role in the various settings (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006).

Experienced counselors have a professional responsibility to provide supervision to novice professionals, but they also have an ethical responsibility to ensure they have reached some level of competency in supervision before serving as supervisors. Competency in supervision includes an understanding of counselor development,
supervision theories, and methods and techniques (Dye & Borders, 1990). The American Counseling Association (ACA) requires that all counseling supervisors are “trained in supervision methods and techniques” (2014), yet, there are currently no uniform training requirements for clinical supervisors. Many state mental health counseling boards have developed their own training requirements for counselors who wish to serve as clinical supervisors for licensure candidates, but there are currently no training requirements for school counselors who serve as site supervisors for practicum and internship students.

The 2009 CACREP standards require that all site supervisors who supervise practicum and internship students have “relevant training in counseling supervision,” (p. 15) but do not provide any explanation on what constitutes as “relevant training” or adequate training to meet this standard. Unlike clinical mental health counselors, school counseling site supervisors are not held to the same expectation in regard to supervision training.

Recent studies have focused on how to provide effective supervision and what to include in supervision training curriculum, but the research has yet to address how supervisors should be trained (Borders, 2014). Graduate coursework in supervision is a requirement in CACREP accredited doctoral programs, but not required for master’s level clinical or school counseling students (CACREP, 2009). Master’s level clinicians may opt to take a graduate class in supervision in order to meet supervision training requirements issued by state boards, or they can obtain supervision training through a number of continuing education sessions. Although school counselors are not required to meet any training requirement issued by state departments of education, school counselors may obtain supervision training at conferences and through various professional organizations (Dekruyf & Pehrrsson, 2011). Bernard and Goodyear (2014)
noted that supervision trainings received by way of workshops and trainings are useful, but limited in that they are unable to thoroughly cover all aspects of supervision and don’t provide a means for practical application. The *Best Practices for Clinical Supervisor* (2011) published by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) recommends that supervision training include both didactic instruction and experiential training through supervised supervision. Graduate classes in supervision are capable of providing this type of training experience.

The American School Counseling Association (ASCA) Ethical Standards for School Counselors (2010) states that school counselors have a responsibility to serve as site supervisors for school counseling practicum and internship students; however, there is currently no mention of supervisory competence or training requirements for school counselors to serve as site supervisors. This leaves school counselors with no direction on how to prepare for this important role and fails to acknowledge the importance of supervision training for the school counseling profession. For this reason, Herlihy, Gray & McCollum (2002) claim that many school counselors shy away from taking on practicum and internship students. Of the school counselors who do, many do so with little to no training. A quantitative study conducted in Washington and Oregon showed that of the school counselors who participated in the study (n=147), less than half had any formal training in counseling supervision, and of those who did have formal training, only 23% reported taking a graduate class in supervision (DeKruff & Phersson, 2011). This finding, if generalizable to other states, make the credibility of school counselors to serve as site supervisors questionable, and inevitably leaves school counseling practicum and internship students vulnerable to the effects of inadequately trained supervisors.
Magnuson, Norem & Bradley (2001) claim, “When counselors without adequate preparation assume responsibility for supervising trainees, they may inadvertently portray supervision as a superficial requirement and miss the opportunity to adequately prepare individual members of the next generation of counselors” (p.214). In order to provide school counselors with adequate supervision training, a graduate course in supervision with both didactic instruction and experiential training may be the best options for school counselor to prepare for their role as site supervisor.

**Statement of the Problem**

The problem addressed in this study is the inability to identify what constitutes as adequate training for school counselors in supervision. School counselors have a responsibility to serve as site supervisors to school counseling internship students and take a critical role in the training of future school counselors. It is known that not all school counselors who serve as site supervisors have had any training in supervision, making it difficult to ensure that internship students are getting quality supervision that enhances their development as counselors and maximizes their training experience. Without an understanding of appropriate training opportunities for school counseling site supervisors, school counselors may not be afforded appropriate training opportunities that will adequately prepare them for serving as site supervisors.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to determine if having formal training in supervision, as indicated by taking a graduate class in supervision, increases the competency of school counseling site supervisors.

**Significance of the Study**
Two studies have explored the competency of school counseling site supervisors to provide supervision to school counseling internship students (Dekruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Page, Pietrzak & Sutton, 2001; Murphy & Kaffenberg, 2007; Studer & Oberman, 2006). An exploration of site supervisor training will contribute to the supervision literature and provide counselor educators with a better understanding of the training needs of site supervisors. In addition, this study will yield data that can be used by ASCA to promote the importance of training in supervision for school counselors and CACREP to justify an increase in the training requirements for school counseling site supervisors. Lastly, this research will hopefully prompt further research on the supervision of school counselors, methods for evaluating supervisors, and the development of appropriate training courses for school counselors.

**Primary Research Questions**

The following research questions will be addressed in this study:

1) Do school counseling site supervisors who have taken a graduate class in supervision receive higher ratings from internship students on the supervisor evaluation form than school counseling site supervisors who have not taken a graduate class in supervision?

2) Do school counseling site supervisors who have taken a graduate class in supervision rate themselves higher in self-efficacy than school counseling site supervisors who have not taken a graduate class in supervision?

**Hypothesis**

The following research hypotheses will be addressed in this study:
General: School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will receive higher ratings from school counseling internship students than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

Specific RH₁: School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will receive statistically higher \((p < .05)\) ratings on the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

Specific RH₀: There will be no statistically significant difference on the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form between site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

General: School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will rate themselves higher in self-efficacy than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

Specific RH₁: School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will rate themselves statistically higher \((p < .05)\) on the Site Supervisor Self-efficacy Survey than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

Specific RH₀: There will be no statistically significant difference on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey between site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.
Research Design

The population of interest for this study is school counselors who provide site supervision for interns currently enrolled in CACREP accredited school counseling programs. Research participants will include school counseling interns from CACREP accredited school counseling programs and their current site supervisors. Using a convenience sample, the researcher will recruit participants for this study only from the state of Ohio. The researcher will use survey methods to collect quantitative data from participants. School counseling internship students will be surveyed using the Student Evaluation of Site Supervisor form (Boylan, Malley, & Reilly, 2001) which will be used to measure competence of site supervisors. Site supervisors will be surveyed using the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey (DeKruyf, 2011) which measures site supervisor self-efficacy.

This study will compare the mean scores of two pre-defined groups on each continuous variable. The two continuous variables in this study are competence and self-efficacy. The pre-defined groups in this study are school counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate class in supervision and school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate class in supervision. To address the first research question in this study, the researcher will use an independent t-test to examine the difference between the mean scores of site supervisors who have had a graduate class in supervision and the mean scores of site supervisors who have not had a graduate class in supervision from the Student Evaluation of Site Supervisor form. To address the second research question in this study the researcher will use an independent t-test to examine the difference between the mean scores of site supervisors who have had a graduate class in supervision and the
mean scores of site supervisors who have not had a graduate class in supervision form the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey.

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions are offered to help the reader frame the context from which the author uses terms throughout this dissertation.

Clinical supervision: “an intensive interpersonal focused relationship, usually one-to-one, or small group, in which the supervisor helps the counselor as he or she learns to apply a wider variety of assessment and counseling methods to increasingly complex cases” (Page, Pietrzak, Sutton, 2011, p.144)

Formal training: graduate course

Supervision: “a process in which an experienced professional holding appropriate preparation, degree, licensure, and/or certification provides consistent support, instruction, and feedback to an inexperienced counselor, fostering his or her psychological, professional, and skill development while evaluating his or her delivery of ethical services” (Lambie & Sias, 2009 p.359).

Self-efficacy: “the degree to which individuals considers themselves capable of performing a particular activity” (Larson & Daniels, 1998, p.180)
Summary

Supervision is an important component of the internship experience and counselor educators have a responsibility to ensure that competent site supervisors are supervising school counseling practicum and internship students. ASCA has provided school counselors with no direction on obtaining appropriate training prior to serving as site supervisors, and CACREP has only required that site supervisors have “relevant training” (2009). ACA has specified that counseling supervisors receive training in methods and techniques (2014), but even that requirement is minimal in comparison to the supervision training requirements recommended by ACES in the Best Practices in Clinical Supervision (2011). To this end, many school counseling site supervisors are currently providing supervision to school counseling internship students without any formal training in supervision. With few studies that have explored this issue, there is definitely a lack of research to provide a thorough understanding of the training needs of school counselors in supervision.

This dissertation study will explore if school counseling site supervisors who have had formal training in supervision are more competent than school counseling site supervisors who have not had formal training in supervision. School counseling site supervisor competency will be assessed via the constructs of student intern evaluation and site supervisor self-efficacy. Chapter 1 introduced the problem addressed in this study, the significance of the research and a brief overview of the design. Chapter 2 will provide a review of the current literature relevant to school counseling site supervisor training and Chapter 3 will detail the methodology employed. Chapter 4 will review the statistical analysis performed and present the study’s results. Chapter 5 will conclude this
dissertation with an interpretation of the findings and implications for the profession and future research.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

The counseling profession has long valued the master-apprentice training model. This training model, in which counseling field experiences are treated as apprenticeships, counselors-in-training learn the craft through observing and working alongside an experienced professional (Miller, 2009). Field placements in the form of practica and internships have been a part of the academic training of all counseling disciplines, including school counseling. At present, the academic training standards for school counselors are clear in their direction that field-placement training must be conducted under the supervision of someone qualified, by experience and licensure, as a school counselor (CACREP, 2009). To date, however, there is little uniformity about the type of supervision required or provided among school counselors following graduation. This chapter reviews the literature on supervision and is organized using the following headings: Supervision in the school setting, Clinical supervision, Supervision for practicum and internship students, Standards for supervision, Training in supervision, the role of ACES, Supervision in other disciplines and Measures of Evaluation. Further, Chapter 2 sets the stage for a study that seeks to better understand the role that formalized, academic-based supervision plays in counselor-in-training students’ perceptions of their school counseling supervisors’ competence and the supervision school counselors’ competency self-ratings.

Supervision

Supervision is a process that aspires to ensure counselors in practice are adhering to the highest standards of professional practice, as well as provides the most effective
means for the training of practicum and intern students. Lambie and Sias (2009) defined supervision as:

a process in which an experienced professional holding appropriate preparation, degree, licensure, and/or certification provides consistent support, instruction, and feedback to an inexperienced counselor, fostering his or her psychological, professional, and skill development while evaluating his or her delivery of ethical services (p. 351).

Most school counselors receive or have access to some form of supervision, but the supervision provided, usually by school administrators, typically only provides counselors with managerial support and direction (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). In a study conducted by Page, Pietrzak and Sutton (2001) in which the authors surveyed the supervisory needs of school counselors across the country (n=267), 60% of school counselors reported that they received supervision from a principal or assistant principal and only 13% of school counselors reported receiving clinical supervision from a counselor. The definition of clinical supervision that was provided to participants in the study included, “the supervisor helps the counselor as he or she learns to apply a wider variety of assessment and counseling methods to increasingly, complex cases” (Page, Pietrzak & Sutton, 2011). Program or developmental supervision, which may be provided by the chair of the counseling department in a school building or a district coordinator, focuses on the actual implementation of the school-counseling program. Although school counselors benefit from these types of supervision, neither of them focuses on the effective use of counseling skills or working through ethical dilemmas (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Henderson & Lampe, 1992). Clinical
supervision, provided by a licensed professional school counselor ensures that school counselors are providing effective interventions and practicing ethically. Many school counselors do not receive any clinical supervision beyond their practicum and internship, leaving school counselors working in the field with very little access to clinical support (DeKryf & Pehrsson, 2011). Cashwell and Dooley (2001) claimed that counselors who do not have clinical supervision are more likely to experience burn out, dissatisfaction with the job, and a decline in counseling performance.

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision mandates that clinical supervisors are responsible for “monitoring client welfare” (1993). The traditional role of the school counselor as guidance counselors has caused much debate over whether or not school counselors need clinical supervision if they are not providing clinical counseling. However, research shows that on average 25% of students have a mental health diagnosis and less than half of them will receive mental health services outside of the school setting (DeKruyf, Auger, Trice-Black, 2013; New Freedom Commission on Mental Health, 2003). This leaves school counselors with the responsibility to provide students with supportive services that address mental health issues that may not be addressed elsewhere. Although school counselors do not diagnose students or provide on going therapy, school counselors are faced with a variety of complex issues that require many of the skills that clinical counselors use on a regular basis (Lambie & Sias, 2009). School counselors are charged to be mindful of student issues that require services that are beyond their scope of practice and are ethically obligated to make appropriate referrals; however, they are still responsible for student issues that hinder student success in the academic setting. Supervision is a great place for school counselors to access the needs of
students and sort through their ethical responsibilities. School counselors may be the only professional with a mental health background students come in contact with. It is important that school counselors are able to recognize when a student has clinical mental health needs and provide students with appropriate referrals (Black, Bailey & Bergin, 2011). Supervision grants school counselors the opportunity to assess the support, interventions, and consultations being implemented in order to ensure student needs are being addressed.

The transformational role of the school counselors goes beyond serving as educator leaders but also recognizes the competence and responsibility of school counselors to also serve as the mental health providers in the building (DeKruyf, Auger & Trice-Black, 2013). School counselors who have incorporated this dual role into their professional identity recognize the importance of ongoing supervision to meeting student needs.

**Clinical Supervision**

The term clinical supervision has been used as a uniform term to classify supervision across the mental health disciplines (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014); however the absence of any differentiation between administrative and clinical supervision, a broad conceptualization of its role exists in the various counseling disciplines. Clinical supervision has been the term most commonly used in the counseling literature when referring to the supervision of mental health counselors, but is typically not used when referring to school counselors. School counselors do not provide clinical counseling but clinical supervision provides the same support for professionals working with in the
school setting as it does in the clinical. Bernard and Goodyear (2014) defined supervision as:

Supervision is an intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more senior member of a profession to a more junior colleague or colleagues who typically (but not always) are members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative and hierarchical, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s); monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients that she, he or they see; and serving as a gatekeeper for the particular profession the supervisee seeks to enter (p.9)

Supervision is a process used to enhance counselor development and protect client welfare. Supervision is facilitated through the use of role plays, recordings, observations, modeling and reflection, and ideally happens within the realms of a clearly defined professional relationship. Although it shares many of the interventions used in counseling, consultation and teaching, due to its evaluative and hierarchical nature and the absence of a set curriculum, the process of supervision differs (Bernard & Goodyear 2014).

Responsibilities of counseling supervisors outlined in the 2014 ACA Code of Ethics include monitoring the work of supervisees in order to protect client welfare (F.1.), maintaining professional boundaries within the supervisory relationship (F.3.), evaluating supervisees’ performance and serving as gatekeepers to the profession (F.6.). Student counselors obtain the knowledge necessary for working as counselors in counseling programs, but it is through supervised field experiences, they have the opportunity to
apply the skills learned (Studer & Diambra, 2010). Supervisors help students increase professional competency and develop counseling skills. They not only provide supervisees with ongoing informal and formal evaluations, but as gatekeepers are responsible for verifying that students have met requirements for program completion. Clinical site supervisors are also responsible for endorsing counselors-in-training for state licensure (ACA, 2014).

The actual impact supervision has on counselor development is difficult to assess due to the numerous factors that impact the supervisory relationship, the counselor-client relationship and the overall experience. However, three studies have showed a positive relationship between supervision and increased self-awareness, self-efficacy and the working alliance. Borders (1991) explored the developmental changes of supervisees before and after practicum using the Supervisee Levels Questionnaire (McNeil, Stoltenberg & Pierce, 1985) and found that supervisees reported increased self-awareness and consistent application of skills at the end of the supervised practicum than at the end. Cashwell and Dooley (2001) examined the impact of supervision on counselor self-efficacy using the Counseling Self Estimate Inventory (Larson et al., 1992) and found that doctoral interns who received supervision reported higher self-efficacy than the doctoral students that did not receive supervision. Similarly, Leherman-Waterman and Ladany (2001) looked at evaluation practices in supervision and the impact on the working alliance and self-efficacy and reported that self-efficacy was higher, and the working alliance between supervisee and supervisor were stronger when supervisors used effective evaluation. Future research should explore the impact of supervision on
counselor development and client outcomes; however, supervised field experiences still remain an essential component of counselor training programs.

Having an understanding of counselor development, theoretical models of supervision and multicultural issues as they relate to supervision is important to providing supervision to master’s students and/or practicing counselors. Dye and Borders (1990) wrote, “In essence, competent supervisors are not only competent counselors but are also able to convey their counseling knowledge and skills (i.e., create learning environments) in ways that promote a supervisee’s effectiveness and professional identity” (p.27)

Counseling supervisors are responsible for protecting client welfare and counselor development; at minimum this can be supported through ensuring their own competency as a supervisor. It has been suggested that clinical supervision in the counseling field focus solely on counseling skills and interventions, but the differentiation has only been addressed in regards to the type of supervision necessary for school counselors-in-training (Dekryf & Pehrsson, 2011). Regardless of the nomenclature, supervision is a requirement for all counselors in training and should be employed regularly by practicing clinicians (Borders, 2005).

**Supervision for Practicum and Internship Students**

CACREP mandates that school counselors-in-training have both individual and group supervision by a faculty member and/or the practicum site supervisor (2009). During this supervision time students are required to complete audio and/or video recordings, conduct role-plays, and discuss relevant student issues through case conceptualizations. Professional identity, ethical dilemmas, the supervisory relationship,
and the implementation of a comprehensive school-counseling program are additional topics that should be addressed during supervision (Studer & Diambra, 2010).

During the practicum and internship experience, school counseling site supervisors are just as responsible for student welfare as clinical site supervisors are for client welfare. Regardless of setting, beneficence is a critical component of the work that counselors do. Supervision bridges the gap between the counseling competence developed in counselor education programs and the advanced skills necessary for complex or acute cases encountered in the reality of the work setting. The process of supervision enables the counselor to apply his or her counseling and consultation skills to a wide variety of issues. It eases the acquisition of new skills and their application to more complex cases. Through this process, the counselor’s ability to function autonomously grows (Sutton & Page, 1994, p.33).

School counselors who supervise interns have a unique responsibility in that they are not only responsible for helping students develop counseling skills, but also with planning and implementing a comprehensive school counseling program, ideally consistent with the ASCA National Model. School counseling interns must learn to consult with other professionals both inside and outside the building, assist with behavior intervention plans, create and deliver age appropriate classroom guidance lessons, assist with both academic and career planning, provide prevention programming and be prepared to tend to the needs of all students in the instance of a crisis. These are skills school counseling interns are expected to develop throughout the course of the internship experience (Studer & Diambra, 2010). Supervision of these skills in the school setting is the responsibility of the site supervisor.
Supervision is critical to ensuring that school counselors in training are practicing responsibly and protecting the rights and welfare of the students they serve. In addition to skill development and the evaluation of ethical decision-making, supervision also allows counselors and counselors-in-training to process their experiences, consult on matters that may be difficult, and fosters a sense of professionalism. Counselors who do not receive supervision have no means of ensuring professional issues are addressed appropriately and that they are performing at the best of their abilities (Barret & Scmidt, 1986; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; McMahon & Patton, 2000). One professional issue that school counselors often struggle with is the lack of a strong professional identity. This identity crisis gives school counselors little voice in advocating for the profession as well as advocating for positions within their respective districts (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Professional identity development is facilitated during practicum and internship, where counselors-in-training have the opportunity to work alongside competent professionals in the field. Site supervisors are responsible for addressing professional identity during supervision, and helping practicum and internship students understand the importance of the work they do as counselors. When school counselors do not have a clear understanding of the what it is they are trained and called to do as counselors, they find themselves performing tasks that are inconsistent with the ASCA National Standards, and time is spent inappropriately (Pyne, 2011). Dollarhide & Miller (2006) advocated that providing school counselors-in-training with clinical supervision will improve professional identity and strengthen how school counselors define their roles and responsibilities across the country.

**Standards for Supervision**
The American Counseling Association (ACA) recognizes the responsibility of professional counselors to seek supervision and receive adequate training in supervision before becoming a supervisor. This is evidenced in the ACA Code of Ethics (2014). ASCA, on the other hand, does not explicitly mandate the use of supervision for school counselors in practice, but does encourage school counselors to seek supervision as needed. The Ethical Standards for School Counselors (ASCA, 2010) states that school counselors, “Enhance personal self-awareness, professional effectiveness and ethical practice by regularly attending presentations on ethical decision-making. Effective school counselors will seek supervision when ethical or professional questions arise in their practice” (Section E.1.d). Although the standards acknowledge supervision as an important tool for addressing professional issues and ethical dilemmas, the need for ongoing supervision to increase competency and monitor student welfare is not mentioned in the ethical standards (ASCA, 2010).

Studies assessing the needs of school counselors and their desire to receive clinical supervision have consistently provided data that indicate that no more than a fourth of school counselors surveyed were actually receiving clinical supervision, but more than half have reported the desire to have more opportunity to receive supervision. In a study conducted by Black, Bailey and Bergin (2011) in which they surveyed the needs of school counselors (n=129) in the state of Georgia in regard to clinical supervision, 8% of respondents reported, “the American School Counseling Association does not endorse supervision” (p.16), 5% of respondents reported receiving supervision and 71% reported they would seek supervision if it was available. Sutton and Page (1994) conducted a similar study in the state of Maine (n=493) and found that 20% of
respondents reported receiving supervision, but 63% of respondents reported that they could benefit from supervision. The same year, Roberts and Borders (1994) surveyed school counselors (n=168) in North Carolina and reported that 37% of respondents were receiving supervision, but 79% of respondents reported that they desired to have supervision. Page, Pietrzak and Sutton (2001) conducted the first national study surveying the supervisory needs of school counselors (n=267) who belonged to the American School Counseling Association and found that only 13% of respondents were receiving supervision and 67% of respondents reported that they would like to receive or continue receiving supervision. Even in the absence of providing clinical counseling services, school counselors, like clinical counselors can benefit from increasing their competency and skill development in active listening, case conceptualization and the application of theoretical models in practice (Lambie & Sias, 2009).

Agnew, Vaught, Getz and Fortune (2000), conducted a study in which they evaluated the effectiveness of a peer group clinical supervision program that was provided to elementary counselors (n=32) which was designed to address the lack of clinical supervision school counselors were receiving. School counselors who participated in the program reported through a qualitative program evaluation an increase in confidence and effectiveness that they attributed solely to participating in the peer group clinical supervision program. They also reported feeling more valued and having an increase in accountability for the services they provided as professional school counselors. These experiences were consistent with the goals of clinical supervision to ensure counselors are continuously improving their skills, participating in professional development and consultation and evaluation of effectiveness.
Clinical mental health counselors have a clear expectation to not only continue to receive supervision, but also to obtain appropriate training in supervision. School counselors have not received that same direction. The Ethical Standards for School Counselors (ASCA, 2010) state that school counselors have a responsibility to supervise practicum and internship students, but competency in supervision is not mentioned. The ACA Code of Ethics state “Prior to offering clinical supervision services, counselors are trained in supervision methods and techniques” (F.2.a). The ASCA School Counseling Competencies (2008) or the Ethical Standards for School Counselors (2010) both lack any directive that school counselors receive any training in supervision. The ASCA School Counselor Competencies (2008) does state that school counselors “Understand[s] how to provide supervision for school counseling interns consistent with the principles of the ASCA Model”. How school counselors are expected to develop an understanding of supervision or what would constitute as adequate training in supervision has not been specified, yet, counselor educators are charged with the responsibility to send school counseling intern and practicum students out in the field with experienced supervisors.

ASCA has not given any direction on this matter, leaving school counseling programs with the responsibility to assess those needs on their own. CACREP’s directives have also lacked clarity in regards to specific training requirements; however, they have acknowledged the need for training in supervision for site supervisors and the responsibility of counselor education programs in providing support. CACREP standards (2009) stated that site supervisors must have “Relevant training in counseling supervision” (Section 3.C.5.). The term “relevant” is subjective; leaving it up to site supervisors and counselor educators to decide what training experiences may be adequate
for the purpose of supervising interns. CACREP standards do require that “Orientation, assistance, consultation, and professional development opportunities are provided by counseling program faculty to site supervisors” (Section 3.D.). One could assume that this standard would include the responsibility for programs to provide site supervisors with training opportunities in supervision, but without any specific details, this is yet to be the expectation. Supervision training for site supervisors for clinical mental health interns is often easier to verify with state boards and ACA’s strong position on obtaining supervision training.

In a study conducted by Dekruyf and Pehrsson (2011) in the states of Oregon and Washington, in which they explored the supervision training needs of school counseling site supervisors (n=147) using the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey (Dekruyf & Pehrsson, 2011), 40% of respondents reported having no training in supervision and only 23% reported having taken a graduate level course in supervision. Supervision is not a required course for school counseling students and many opt from taking it. Although the Ethical Standards for School Counselors (2010) does not state that school counselors must receive training in supervision, it would make sense that school counselors providing supervision to school counseling practicum and internship students should be adequately prepared and knowledgeable about the supervision process.

In the Dekruyf and Pehrsson (2011) study referenced above, school counseling site supervisors indicated a need for formal training in the supervisory needs of counselors in training and providing appropriate supervision (DeKruff & Phersson). This lack of training for school counselors in supervision often leaves school counselors who are asked to take on the role as site supervisors for practicum and internship students
feeling inadequate, and less likely to agree to this responsibility (Swank, 2012). Site supervisors who received training in supervision did in fact report having a higher sense of self-efficacy (DeKruff & Pherrson). Herlihy, Gray and McCollum (2002) noted that school counselors who have not had adequate training in supervision may not fully understand the importance of setting boundaries within the supervisory relationship or feel comfortable taking on an evaluative role with supervisees. More training in these areas for school counseling site supervisors will provide supervisors with the necessary tools to adequately supervise practicum and internship students and assist in overall counselor development.

In the National Survey of School Counselor Supervision conducted by Page, Pietrzak and Sutton (2001), 20% of school counselors surveyed reported that they would seek out a supervisory credential if offered for school counselors and 47% of the school counselors reported that they would “possibly” seek out a supervisory credential if offered. With very little incentive for school counselors to seek out additional training in supervision, school counselors may continue to miss out on opportunities to increase their competency as supervisors. Magnuson, Norem and Bradley (2001) claimed, “When counselors without adequate preparation assume responsibility for supervising trainees, they may inadvertently portray supervision as a superficial requirement and miss the opportunity to adequately prepare individual members of the next generation of counselors” (p.214). This deficit in the training of site supervisors and inadvertently in the training of school counseling interns and practicum students counteracts the core responsibility for counselor educators and licensed professionals to serve as gatekeepers to the profession. Clinical counselors recognize and understand the importance of
supervision training because of the expectation that has been set by ACA and state licensing boards. School counselors may be more apt to seek out more training opportunities if ASCA took this same stance.

**Training in Supervision for Professional Counselors**

Most professional counselors are master’s level clinicians who have been trained at the master’s level and hold a professional license issued by the state counseling board. Counselors receive formal training to perform the essential duties as a clinician during their graduate program through coursework and related field experiences. CACREP (2009) accredited programs meet specific standards that ensure students in counseling programs receive adequate preparation to be eligible for state licensure. Likewise, counselor educators receive formal training in doctoral programs as preparation to provide counseling students with meaningful coursework and supervision throughout their graduate program. Site supervisors play a critical role in a counselor-in-training’s development as a counselor, yet, unlike counselor educators, do not have a standardized training requirement.

Professional credentialing groups, program accreditation bodies and state regulatory boards often set their own requirements for supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). The 2014 ACA Code of ethics and CACREP accredited programs require that site supervisors are trained in supervision, but formal training, such as additional coursework is currently not a requirement. The 2009 CACREP Standards state the following in regard to supervised practicum and internship for counselors in training in both school and clinical mental health counseling:

C. Site supervisors must have the following qualifications:
1. A minimum of a master’s degree in counseling or a related profession with equivalent qualification, including appropriate certifications and/or licenses.
2. A minimum of two years of pertinent professional experience in the program area in which the student is enrolled.
3. Knowledge of the program’s expectations, requirements, and evaluation procedures for students.
4. Relevant training in counseling supervision (p.15).

CACREP does not identify specific types of supervision training or what constitutes as adequate training, but standard C.1. asserts that supervisors must have the appropriate certifications and licenses, which in some states would include supervisor credentials. State boards that issue supervisor credentials and professional credentialing groups that offer supervision credentials have specific training requirements that must be met before being permitted to supervise. State departments of education, which license school counselors, do not require any additional certifications for school counselors to supervise.

In 1998, the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC) created the Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS) credential to identify mental health professionals who obtained the appropriate training as recognized by the NBCC’s supervision standards (Borders, 2005). The ACS, now issued by the Center for Credentialing and Education (CCE), requires that applicants hold a master’s degree in mental health, appropriate licenses, have 3 years of experience, at least 100 hours of supervision of supervision and either a graduate class in clinical supervision or 30 hours of training in clinical supervision (Center for Credentialing & Education, 2014). Some states, such as
New Jersey, recognize the ACS as a pre-requisite for providing clinical supervision. The number of states who currently accept the ACS as an approved supervisor credential is unknown. There are also a number of state boards that have created a supervisory endorsement or designation for their professional counselor license requiring fully licensed professional counselors to complete coursework or a specified number of training hours in supervision. For example, in order to obtain the supervisor designation in the state of Ohio, a fully licensed clinical counselor must have completed master’s level coursework in supervision or a minimum of 24 continuing education units (CEU) in counselor supervision training that has been pre-approved by the Counselor Social Worker and Marriage & Family Therapist Board, in addition to 1500 hours of practice as a PCC and 10 hours of supervised supervision under a PCC-S (Ohio Revised Code 4757-17-01). These credentials are not necessary for the purpose of supervising school counselors.

Although the requirements for training in supervision are not consistent across the board, there is a consensus within the counseling profession that some training is needed (Borders, 2014). Much of the research in the past ten years has focused on how to provide effective supervision, relevant models of supervision and what should be included in supervision training (Borders, 2014). The “what” of training supervision has been covered, but the “how” to provide supervision training has not received as much attention. Supervisors in the past have relied more heavily on their own knowledge as a practicing clinician and the understanding of supervision they gained during the time they were supervised to inform the supervisory experience they provide to supervisees than formal training in supervision. Likewise, specific number of years in the field has been
used as a requirement in the absence of specific training requirements (Gazzola et al., 2002).

The argument that trained professionals perform better than untrained professionals is rarely challenged, but is an important issue to address when determining how much training in supervision is required in order to be an effective supervisor. Borders (2005) concluded from a 5-year review of empirical research on supervision from 1999-2004 that supervisors who received training in supervision seemed to value supervision and held a better understanding of the role and responsibilities of a supervisor as it relates to supervisees. Gazzola et al. (2002) suggested that supervisor training has a direct impact on supervisor development, professional identity and self-efficacy (Gazzola et al., 2002). The impact of supervisor training in the counseling profession is consistent with the impact of supervisor training in other related mental health professions (Milne, Sheikh, Pattison & Wilkinson, 2011).

McMahon and Simmons (2004) conducted a study using the Clinical Supervisor Questionnaire (McMahon & Simmons, 2004) to evaluate the effects of supervisor training on counselors’ confidence, self-awareness and knowledge of practical skills, theory and abilities and found that counselors who participated in the training scored higher on the CSQ than the counselors who did not. At minimum, supervision training provides counselors with a breadth of knowledge about supervision that they typically will not get during their master’s level training. CACREP accredited programs only require supervision coursework at the doctoral level (2009), leaving master’s level clinicians to obtain this training through CEU’s at conferences and workshops. Bernard and Goodyear (2014) acknowledge that continuing education workshops on supervision
provide clinicians with opportunities to learn about supervision, but they note that they are limited in that they don’t provide an opportunity for practical application through supervised supervision, and the time restraints may not be feasible for digging into more complex issues. Gazzola et al., (2013), conducted a qualitative study with 10 supervisors-in-training to examine the challenges they face during their first experiences as a supervisor. Research findings showed that although the participants received formal training, novice supervisors still struggled with feeling confident in their ability to supervise and realized soon into supervising that their training was valuable, but could not prepare them for every possible issue that could arise during supervision (Gazzola et al., 2013). These results do not negate the necessity for formal training in supervision, but instead support the need for practical application opportunities that are typically offered in more formalized training programs and post master’s level courses.

The 2014 ACA Code of Ethics specifies, “prior to offering supervision services, counselors are trained in supervision methods and techniques” (F.2.a.). Although methods and techniques are important areas for delivering supervision, in order to provide supervision, there are other critical areas necessary for supervisor development that is not addressed. Bernard and Goodyear (2014) suggest supervision training consist of models of supervision, counselor development, supervision methods and techniques, the supervisory relationship, evaluation, executive skills, ethical and professional issues, multicultural competencies and familiarity with relevant research on supervision. These areas are consistent with the supervision learning outcomes required for CACREP accredited doctoral programs in counselor education and supervision (2009) and are also
in line with training areas identified in section 12 of the *Best Practices in Clinical Supervision* (Borders et al., 2011).

**The Role of ACES**

The Association of Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) was created in 1940 as the National Association for Guidance Supervisors (NAGS) with an emphasis on the supervision of guidance counselors. In 1952 the name was changed to the National Association for Guidance Supervisors and Counselor Trainers (NAGST). It was at this time that counselor trainers were able to obtain membership. In 1961, counselor trainers were renamed counselor educators and NAGST was renamed the Association of Counselor Education and Supervision. During this time ACES was exclusively focused on the supervision and training of school counselors and it was not until 1983 that they made a shift from focusing on counselors with the school setting to the preparation and supervision of all counselors. ACES took on the task of “redefining supervision” and the creation of supervisor credentials (Elmore, 1985).

ACES played a critical role in identifying the roles and responsibilities of supervisors and the creation of relevant standards and ethical codes. In 1990, ACES created the Standards for Counseling Supervisors (Borders, 2005). These standards identified eleven areas in which counseling supervisors should be competent prior to providing supervision. The last section of the standards identified appropriate training for counseling supervisors beyond professional licensure as follows:

4. Graduate training in counseling supervision including didactic courses, seminars, laboratory courses, and supervision practica;
5. Continuing educational experiences specific to supervision theory and practice (e.g., conferences, workshops, self-study); and


The Standards for Counseling Supervisors were specific in identifying formal training through graduate coursework in addition to CEUs in supervision as the appropriate level of training for serving as counseling supervisors. Not too long after, a subcommittee of ACES used these standards to develop the *Curriculum Guide for Training Counseling Supervisors*, which provided a comprehensive curriculum for supervisor training programs (Borders, Bernard, Dye, Fong, Henderson & Nance, 1991). The competency areas identified in the 11 standards were translated into seven core content areas with specific learning objectives. These areas included models of supervision; counselor development; supervision methods and techniques; the supervisory relationship; ethical, legal, and professional regulatory issues; evaluation and administrative skills. The committee envisioned the curriculum serving as the guiding light for supervision training through coursework and workshops, a tool for the assessment and evaluation of supervisor competency and practices, and eventually as a resource for developing an additional credential for identifying qualified supervisors (Borders et al., 1991).

Despite over a decade’s passage of time, the profession still lacks formal training in supervision as a prerequisite for credentialing, and there is no uniform requirement that supervisors have supervisory credentialing. The reason for the absence might be related to the discrepancies between ACES’s position and that which is inferred from the subsequently published 2005 ACA Code of Ethics. Specifically, the 2005 ACA Code of Ethics condensed the supervision standards into section F, and made training a
requirement for counseling supervisors specifically providing “clinical supervision”. By specifying that training be required for ethical clinical supervision, the Code failed to recognize other counseling settings, such as K-12 schools, as locations where trained counselor supervision was ethical and thus necessary. Unlike the original standards developed by ACES, ACA did not require formal training in supervision and only required that supervisors were trained in “supervision methods and techniques” (ACA, 2005). This omission was partially addressed by the revised 2014 ACA Code of Ethics wherein the word “clinical” was removed and thus the ethical obligation was extended to counselors providing “supervision services”; however this version of the Code did not increase the training requirement. Ironically, the requirements for supervision training as identified by ACA have become less definitive, yet supervision training has progressively increased and research addressing the impact of supervision training within the field of counseling and other related professions continues to grow (Milne, Sheikh, Pattison & Wilkinson, 2011).

It is no surprise that the evolution of ACES into what it is today is congruent with the history and development of the larger counseling profession considering that both have deep roots in vocational and guidance counseling. However, it is surprising that after the shift from focusing solely on the supervision of school counselors to the supervision and education of all counselors, regardless of setting, much of what ACES provides in regards to direction on supervision is rarely applied to school counselors. This may in part have to do with the emphasis various documents place on the difference in providing “clinical supervision” versus counseling supervision, and the lack of a consensus within the counseling profession on whether or not school counselors need
clinical supervision. Consequently, school counselors are typically not held to the same standards in regards to supervision; this is evident in the lack of school counselors who receive supervision post licensure (Page, Pietzak, Sutton, 2001) and the lack of training obtained by school counselors prior to serving as supervisors for school counselors-in-training (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011). The 2005 ACA Code of Ethics’ use of the term “clinical supervision” in the section on supervisor preparation implied that training was only necessary for supervisors who were providing clinical supervision, leaving many to question the application for school counselors. However, results from recent studies that support the need for clinical supervision for school counselors and school counselors in training, along with the removal of the word “clinical” from the supervisor preparation section in the new 2014 ACA Code of ethics (F.2.) may revert back to a more unified position on supervision and supervision training for all counselors.

In the meantime, ACES has continued to advocate for formalized training for counseling supervisors and providing direction on areas of competency and best practices for supervision. ACES members, as a subgroup of ACA adhere to the ACA Code of Ethics, and a critical component of practicing ethically whether as a supervisor or clinician involves an awareness of competency and the intentionality of using best practices. Borders (2014) wrote, “Statements of both competencies and best practices enhance one’s ability to practice supervision in an accountable and ethical manner, both are based in conceptual and empirical literature, and both evolve as new knowledge becomes available” (p152). In the absence of ethical guidelines that prescribe clearly defined training requirements, the Best Practices in Clinical Supervision published in 2011, provided supervisors with the additional guidance they desired (Borders et al.,
This document, complementary of the standards developed in 1990, offered a thorough compilation of recommended practices for supervisors to employ throughout the supervision process, in addition to the recommended preparation for serving as supervisors (Borders, 2014). Borders (2014) compared the *Best Practices in Clinical Supervision* to supervision guidelines found in social work, cognitive behavioral therapy in Britain and mental health nurses in North Ireland, and found that despite the discipline specific areas, there were many similarities in the documents that could attest to the external validity of the *Best Practices in Clinical Supervision*. Best practices are not to be confused with standards and codes of ethics in that they are not considered the established requirements for the profession. The ACES taskforce created this document to assist supervisors in instances where the ACA Code of Ethics does not explicitly supply directives. To this end, ACES reiterated their original position that supervision preparation should include both didactic instruction and experiential training, which includes supervised supervision (Borders et al., 2011).

**Supervision Training in Other Disciplines**

Deficits in supervision training are not exclusive to the counseling profession. In fact, compared to its neighbor profession psychology, Milne et al (2001) acknowledge that counseling may be further ahead in regards to addressing the training issue at minimum as a requirement at the doctoral level. There are currently no supervisor training requirements for APA accredited psychology programs or internships (Milne et al, 2011). In 2002, it was reported that about 80% of clinical supervisors in psychology have had no formal training in supervision (Gazzola, DeStefano, Theriault & Audet, 2013; Peake, Nussbaum, & Tindell, 2002). Similar to the ACES task force that put
together the *Best Practices for Clinical Supervisors*, in 2002 the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) had a conference to reach a consensus on competencies for training programs in professional psychology, including supervision. Previous documents published by various professional organizations in psychology had acknowledged supervision as a necessary competency area; however no guidelines for training had been established (Falendar et al., 2004).

As a result, the task force reached a consensus that supervision should be recognized as a core competency area for psychology and proposed a framework for supervision competencies that included recommended training and assessment of supervision competency. Borrowing from the literature on clinical supervision training across disciplines, the task force identified that the necessary training in supervision for psychologists consist of a course in supervision and supervision of supervision (Falendar et al., 2004). Rings, Genuchi, Hall, Angelo and Cornish (2009) conducted a study exploring the views of predoctoral psychology internship training directors on the competencies proposed by Falendar et al. (2004) from the APPIC Conference in 2002. Results of this study showed that overall, the training directors agreed with the competency areas, however there was more variability in their views on the training for supervisors. 43% of participants either strongly agreed or agreed that supervisors should have a course in supervision and 45% of participants reported feeling neutral. 46% of participants agreed that supervisors should have completed supervision of supervision, 19% strongly agreed that this was important and 28% reported feeling neutral (Rings et al., 2009). Further analysis of the data suggested that supervisors who had completed coursework in supervision were more likely to agree that coursework in supervision was
important than supervisors who had received training through workshops, and even more so than those who had received no training at all. The type or history of supervision training had a similar effect on participants who agreed in supervision of supervision as an important component of supervision training (Rings et al., 2009). Further research on supervision training, with an emphasis on outcomes will have an impact on the counseling profession, as well as the other related mental health professions, like psychology. Movement towards stronger expectations for supervisors to be trained in any of the disciplines will surely provide a framework for the other professions to follow.

**Measures of Evaluation**

A thorough review of the literature suggests that there is currently no standardized means for evaluating supervisors. Prior to serving as site supervisors, counselors are expected to obtain some form of training in supervision (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2009, ACES, 1995); however, a formal assessment for evaluating supervisor competency has not been established. Getz (1999) opined, “Central to the important ethical responsibility, that of monitoring client welfare, is the competence of the supervisor who greatly affects the competence of the supervisee” (p.494). Supervisors in clinical mental health are responsible for evaluating counselors’ competency and must submit formal evaluations in order for counselors-in-training to obtain licensure. In states requiring credentials for clinical counselors to serve as supervisors, coursework and/or approved training programs may indicate that a supervisor has the necessary knowledge, but in the absence of supervised supervision, as suggested by ACES in the *Best Practices in Clinical Supervisors* (Borders et al., 2011), skill development and practical application may be more difficult to assess. With inconsistencies in supervisor training requirements, it is no
surprise that a consensus has not been reached on how to appropriately evaluate supervisors’ overall ability to supervise. Evaluation of supervisors in school counseling, like training requirements, is also lacking for school counselors who provide supervision for practicum and internship students.

There are many factors to consider when examining what makes a “good” supervisor. Instead of focusing on a supervisor’s competency and ability to provide effective supervision holistically, previous studies have explored individual factors that contribute to both. Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) looked at supervisor style, and found that specific supervision styles affected supervisee satisfaction and self-efficacy differently using the Supervisory Style Inventory (Friedlander & Ward, 1984), the Supervisor Satisfaction Questionnaire (Ladany, Hill & Nutt, 1996) and the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (Larson et al., 1992). Ladany, Ellis and Friedlander (1999) argued that the supervisory relationship is the foundation of effective supervision and found that supervisees reported higher satisfaction with supervision when the supervisory working alliance was strong using the Supervisor Working Alliance Inventory (Efstavon, Patton & Kardash, 1990) and the Supervisee Satisfaction Questionnaire (Ladany, Hill & Nutt, 1996). Lehrman-Waterman and Ladany (2001) asserted that goal setting and feedback were critical components of effective supervision and found that the use of effective evaluation practices by supervisors were positively related to supervisee satisfaction, supervisee self-efficacy and the working alliance using the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (Lehman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001), the Working Alliance Inventory (Efstavon, Patton & Kardash, 1990), the Self-efficacy inventory (Friedlander & Snyder, 1983), and the Supervisee Satisfaction Questionnaire
(Ladany, Hill & Nutt, 1996). These instruments all measure important aspects of supervision, but individually don’t provide an evaluation of all of the competency areas identified in the *Best Practices in Clinical Supervision* (Borders et al., 2011).

Supervisors provide supervisees with feedback in order to enhance counselor development; likewise, supervisors should solicit feedback from supervisees to enhance their professional development as supervisors. The *Best Practices in Clinical Supervision* (Borders et al., 2011) state: “The supervisor solicits effectiveness feedback from the supervisee and responds to feedback by paying attention to what can/needs to be changed in the supervisory relationship or the supervisory context” (11.d.vii.) Bernard and Goodyear (2014) suggested that supervisors-in-training obtain formal evaluations from supervisors and both informal and formal evaluations from supervisees. Recommended forms included the Supervisor Satisfaction Questionnaire (Ladany, Hill & Nutt, 1996) and the Supervisory Styles Inventory (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). Although these forms provide supervisors-in-training with useful information to reflect and improve, as previously mentioned, neither of these forms provide an objective measure of supervisor performance. Supervisor evaluation forms are not required or commonly used for the purpose of evaluating supervisors providing clinical supervision to licensed counselors; however, they are commonly used by counselor education programs for the purpose of evaluating site supervisors who provide supervision to counselors-in-training. Neither the 2009 CACREP standards nor the 2014 ACA Code of Ethics currently require that counselor education programs require practicum and internship students to complete evaluations of site supervisors, therefore programs who have incorporated them into their
practicum and internship documents have either created their own evaluation form or they modify one that has been used elsewhere.

The Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form (Boylan, Malley & Reilly, 2001) is an evaluation form that has emerged and is available for use by counselor education programs. Two graduate students under the supervision of Dr. Harold Hackney created each items on the form. Hackney and his research students selected their items based on material drawn from Counseling Strategies and Objectives by Hackney and Nye (1973). Dr. Hackney’s credibility in the profession yields expert validity and the number of times it has been used by counselor education programs speaks to the content validity of the instrument. The form was originally published in Dicmick and Krause (1980) Practicum Manual for Counseling and Psychotherapy. In addition, the items on the evaluation form appraise competency areas identified in the Standards for Counseling Supervisors (ACES, 1990), the Curriculum Guide for Training Counseling Supervisors (1991) and the Best Practices for Clinical Supervision (Borders et al., 2011). Items found on the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form are similar to items used on an instrument created by Worthington and Roehlke (1979) to examine effective supervision as perceived by supervisees based on supervisee satisfaction, supervisor competence, and impact on supervisee’s development; however, neither instrument has been tested for validity or reliability. There have been no studies to date that have explored the use of supervisor evaluation forms by practicum and internship students.

Another aspect to explore when seeking ways to evaluate supervisors would be through measurements of self-efficacy. Competency is not ensured through self-efficacy, but Bandura (1982) asserts that self-efficacy has a direct impact on how a person
perceives situations and how they respond. Hence, self-efficacy theory suggests that one’s belief about their own capabilities predicts the manner in which they approach specific tasks and challenges, and is instrumental in producing capability (Bandura, 1982). Counseling self-efficacy has been positively associated with counselor development and performance (Larson, 1998). Likewise, it is probable that supervisor self-efficacy has a direct impact on supervisor development and performance. DeKruyf and Pehrsson (2011) developed the Site Supervisor Self-efficacy Survey (S4) to explore hours of supervision training in relation to supervisor self-efficacy for school counseling site supervisors. The S4 is made up of 28 items which were based off Standards for Counseling Supervisors (ACES, 1990), Curriculum Guide for training Counseling Supervisors (Borders 1991) and supervision guides created specifically for school counseling supervision. Both content and face validity for the S4 was established by means of expert panelist (DeKruyf & Pehrsson).

Haley (2002) developed and instrument similar to the S4 that explored the impact of supervision training on supervisor self-efficacy of counseling psychology doctoral students. Haley created the Supervisor Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (SSQ) to assess supervisor’s confidence in providing supervision in association with style and focus. The SSQ was adapted from the Supervisory Focus and Style Questionnaire (SFSQ) (Yaegar et al., 1989) and contains 42 items based on the discrimination model of supervision (Haley). The SSQ focuses primarily on style and focus whereas the S4 explores all aspects of the supervisory role. Future research should focus on effective ways to evaluate supervisors by both supervisees and supervisor self-report.
Summary

There is a great deal of research that supports the notion that clinical supervision is necessary for counselor development and protecting client welfare. This is indicated in both the ACA Code of Ethics (2014) and the most recent CACREP Standards (2009) sections on supervision. Clinical supervision provides counselors and counselors-in-training with an opportunity to sharpen counseling skills, process ethical dilemmas, consult on cases and address important professional issues. Clinical supervision, although argued as equally important in the school setting (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Lambie & Sias, 2009), has not been a common practice for school counselors beyond pre-licensure training. It is not expected that school counselors receive ongoing clinical supervision, however it is expected that school counselors serve as site supervisors for practicum and internship students; often times with little to no training (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011). ACES has been a driving force in addressing the training needs of clinical supervisors, as identified in the Best Practices in Clinical Supervision (2011), yet, in the absence of specific laws or standards, there is currently no standardized training requirement for school counselors in supervision. At minimum, clinical mental health counselors who provide supervision are required to have supervision training in methods and techniques, as well as obtain ongoing professional development in supervision (ACA, 2014). The necessity for supervisors to obtain adequate training in supervision before supervising interns is not only a requirement, but a respected practice in clinical counseling. In the absence of training expectations for school counselors, supervision training and training opportunities specifically for school counselors has been at a deficit.

Although the logical argument can be made that trained supervisors make better
supervisors, there has been only one study to date that has explored the impact of supervision training on school counseling site supervisors in relation to the type of training received. This study, conducted by Dekruyf and Pehrsson (2011), examined the impact of supervision training on supervisor self-efficacy by training hours. Self-efficacy is an important variable to explore and is positively associated with capability (Bandura, 1982) however, by itself does not evaluate the actual supervision being provided to school counseling internship students. This study seeks to determine if having formal training in supervision, as evidenced by a graduate class in supervision, increases the competency of site supervisors. For the purpose of this study, site supervisor self-efficacy and evaluations by supervisees will be used as measures of site supervisor competency. A graduate course, as opposed to other training opportunities, was focused on for this study because of its ability to provide counselors with thorough instruction and time for practicing skills learned. Borders and Goodyear (2014) argue that a graduate class is more appropriate for training supervisors than workshops.
Chapter 3

Methods

Overview of Method

This study explored the competency of school counseling site supervisors in relation to having a formal class in supervision via the constructs of student intern evaluation of supervisor and site supervisor self-efficacy. School counseling internship students were surveyed using the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form and school counseling site supervisors were surveyed using the Site Supervisor Self-efficacy Survey (S4). Surveys were employed as the preferred data collection method for this study because they are easy to administer, data can be retrieved quickly, and they can be distributed to a large amount of people at one time. Overall, survey research can be both time and cost efficient for researchers and can produce data that is easily analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics (Creswell, 2003).

Using the traditional classification of research design, the researcher conducted an ex post facto quantitative study. In this study, the researcher was interested in finding out if there was a statistical difference in student ratings on the supervisor evaluation form between school counseling site supervisors who have had a class in supervision and site supervisors who have not, and if there was a statistical difference in supervisor self-efficacy scores on the site supervisor self-efficacy survey (S4) form between school counseling site supervisors who have had a class in supervision and site supervisors who have not.

Research Hypothesis

The following research hypotheses were addressed:
General: School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will receive higher ratings from school counseling internship students than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

Specific RH₁: School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will receive statistically higher (p< 0.05) ratings on the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

Specific RH₀: There will be no statistically significant difference on the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form between site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

General: School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will rate themselves higher in self-efficacy than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

Specific RH₁: School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will rate themselves statistically higher on the Site Supervisor Self-efficacy Survey than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

Specific RH₀: There will be no statistically significant difference on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey between site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.
Target Population

The population of interest for this study included school counseling site supervisors who provide supervision for students from CACREP accredited school counseling programs. The study was limited to the state of Ohio to ensure all participants were held to the same licensure laws and training requirements to obtain a school counseling license. The target population in this study was site supervisors who are currently supervising internship students from CACREP accredited school counseling programs in the state of Ohio. Only students from CACREP accredited programs and their current site supervisors were recruited to participate in this study to ensure uniformity in the minimum requirements of site supervisors in regard to minimum years of experience and relevant training. There are currently fourteen CACREP accredited school counseling programs at universities in the state of Ohio.

Instrumentation

The researcher used the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form (Boylan, Malley & Reilly, 2001) to assess school counseling internship student’s rating of site supervisors. The Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form was created by two graduate assistants under the supervision of Dr. Harold Hackney. The students created items on the evaluation form from material found in Hackney and Nye (1973) Counseling Strategies and Objectives. The form includes 27 questions regarding the supervisor’s competence. Each item is scored on a scale of 1-6 where one is “poor” and six is “good”. Site supervisors can receive raw scores ranging from 27-162. The Student Counselor Evaluation form has not been tested for validity or reliability; however is used in counselor education programs for the purpose of evaluating site supervisors. Items on

The researcher used the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey to assess school counseling site supervisors’ self-efficacy scores. The Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey was created by DeKruyf and Pehrsson (2011) to explore the self-efficacy of site supervisors in relation to specific training in supervision. The survey included 30 questions that were divided into three sections. The first section of the survey included 5 items regarding self-efficacy. Self–efficacy items were scored on a 6-point likert scale where 1 indicates strongly disagree and 6 indicates strongly disagree. Site supervisors’ self-efficacy raw score can range from 15-90. The second section included 6 items requiring participants to identify the number of hours they have completed in various settings. The settings included in the second section of the survey include: in-service training, state or national conference, training at intern’s university, unit or module in a master’s program course, graduate level course in supervision and other. The item for “other” allowed participants to provide an open ended response identifying the setting where training was received and the number of hours. The third section of the survey gathered demographic information which included age, gender, race/ethnicity, grade level of students serviced, number of years as a school counselor, number of interns the supervisor has supervised and current certificates and licenses (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011). The creators of this instrument created self-efficacy items based on the supervision standards found in the Standards for Counseling Supervisors (ACES, 1990), the Curriculum Guide for Training Counseling Supervisors (Borders et al., 1991) and
Supervising the school counselor trainee: guidelines for practice (Studer, 2006). Face and content validity of the instrument was established by use of an expert panel and was piloted with site supervisors who did not participate in the study prior to conducting the research study (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011).

Procedures

Part I: Recruiting School Counseling Internship Students

The researcher sent an email to each of the school counseling program coordinators at the University of Toledo, Bowling Green State University, Heidelberg University, University of Akron, Cleveland State University, University of Cincinnati, University of Dayton, Wright State, Youngstown University, Xavier University, John Carroll University, Malone University, Kent State University and Walsh University (Appendix A). Universities were also provided a copy of the University of Toledo IRB approval letter (Appendix B). The email included a request for permission to visit internship classes in order to recruit participants for the study. The researcher explained the purpose of the study and the amount of class time needed by the researcher to collect data. Of the fourteen programs contacted, two declined to allow the researcher permission to recruit participants, two never responded to the email request and ten programs arranged a time for the researcher to visit their internship classes. Upon acceptance, the researcher traveled to each of the ten schools to invite school counseling internship students to participate. The researcher explained the purpose of the study to school counseling internship students during their scheduled class time. School counseling internship students who agreed to participate in the study were given consent forms prior
to completing the evaluation forms (Appendix C). Students who participated in the study were required to provide the researcher with contact information for their site supervisors. Students wrote the email address for their site supervisors on the bottom of the demographic section form. The researcher distributed the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form (Appendix D) in person in order to increase participation rate of school counseling internship students. 90% of the students at the CACREP accredited programs (N = 104) visited participated in this study. The researcher collected completed evaluation forms and secured them in a manila envelope.

Part II: Recruiting School Counseling Internship Site Supervisors

The researcher contacted the site supervisors identified by school counseling internship students who participated in the study using the email address provided during data collection on the demographic section of each Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form. The researcher individually emailed 104 site supervisors to explain the purpose of the study and to invite them to participate. The invitation email included a link to the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey to be completed online through survey monkey (Appendix D). IRB approved consent was included in the email and provided within the survey on survey monkey. The researcher sent the email invitation to site supervisors three times over the course of three weeks. Site supervisors who agreed to participate in the survey provided written consent through survey monkey. Five emails came back as undeliverable and two site supervisors sent back an email declining to participate. 60 Site supervisors completed the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey (Appendix E) via survey monkey at a 58% return rate.
Part III: Coding Data

After collecting the data, the researcher sorted surveys and evaluation forms in order to match the appropriate evaluation form of site supervisor with the self-efficacy survey completed by that site supervisor. Two surveys were thrown out due to the participants’ failure to provide their email address. Without the email address, researcher was unable to match the site supervisor survey to the intern evaluation form. Each evaluation form completed by internship students was assigned an identification code that included the letter “I” and a number beginning with 1. The self-efficacy survey completed by the associated supervisor was assigned an identification code that includes the letter “S” and the corresponding number assigned to the internship evaluation form. For example, evaluation form I1 was paired with S1. Data was analyzed by the researcher.

Sampling procedures

The researcher used a convenience sample for the purpose of recruiting participants in this study. The researcher was interested in surveying school counseling and internship students from CACREP accredited school counseling programs, and their current site supervisors. The researcher lives in the state of Ohio and only recruited participants from CACREP accredited programs in the state of Ohio due to their proximity to researcher. Convenience sampling is a nonprobability sampling procedure in which participants are chosen based solely on the accessibility or proximity to the researcher (Ross, 2005). Convenience sampling is both cost and time efficient for the researcher. Some limitations of convenience sampling are the inability to ensure the sample is representative of the entire population and the risk or sampling bias.
Description of Participants

The survey population in this study included 58 site supervisors and 60 school counseling internship students from ten CACREP accredited programs in the state of Ohio. Two site supervisors were currently supervising two internship students at the time of this study. 90% of site supervisors who participated in this study were between the ages of 35-64 (n = 52) and 10% were between the ages of 25-34 (n = 6). 90% of site supervisors identified themselves as European American/White (n = 52), 9% African American/Black (n = 5) and 1 site supervisor declined to answer. 41% of site supervisors worked in high schools (n = 24), 26% worked in multi-level school buildings (n = 15), 19% worked in middle schools (n = 11) and 12% worked in elementary schools (n = 7). Years of experience working full time as a school counselor varied from 2 years to 37 and 47% of site supervisors had supervised four or more interns over the course of their careers (n = 27). 95% of site supervisors reported being a Licensed School Counselor (n = 55) and 5% reported being a Licensed Professional Counselor (n = 3).

Of the 60 school counseling internship students who participated in this study 91% were between the ages of 20-34 (n = 55) and 9% were between the ages of 35-64 (n = 5). 87% of interns identified as European American/White (n=52), 8% identified as African American/Black (n = 5), 2% identified as Latino/Hispanic (n = 1) and 3% identified as other (n = 2). 65% of interns were more than half-way through their internship having completed between 301-600 hours of internship (n = 39) and 35% had completed between 1-300 hours of internship (n = 21). Only 8% of interns (n = 5) had received any training in supervision at the time of this study.

Research Design
This study compared two pre-defined groups’ (school counseling site supervisors who have taken a graduate course in supervision and school counseling site supervisors who have not taken a graduate course in supervision) mean scores on the continuous variable “supervisor self-efficacy”. This study also compared two pre-defined groups’ (school counseling site supervisors who have taken a graduate course in supervision and school counseling site supervisors who have not taken a graduate course in supervision) mean scores on the continuous variable “supervisor competence”. The researcher had no ability to randomly assign participants to either supervisory condition. This type of research design is called the “static-group comparison” design and is considered a pre-experimental design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963).
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The static-group comparison design controls for four threats to internal validity; history, testing, instrumentation, and regression. History threats take into account unexpected events that occur during the study that could have an effect on the dependent variable. History is controlled for using the static group comparison because this design only compares the differences between the two groups and not change that has occurred over the course of the study. Instrumentation is controlled for in the static group comparison when the dependent variable is measured the same way for all participants. In this study, all research participants will be given the same surveys to measure site supervisor self-efficacy and site supervisor competency. Regression is controlled for using the static group comparison through reliability of the instrument. If the instrument is reliable, in the instance that statistical regression were to occur, all participants would regress at the same rate. Testing was not a part of research design for this study, therefore posed no
threat to internal validity (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). This study did not control for external threats to validity.

**Statistical Analysis**

This dissertation employed descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to describe both samples’ demographic compositions and report the means, standard deviations, and range of scores for each of the two criterion variables. An independent t-test was used to analyze the research questions identified for this study. A t-test examined the difference between two group means (Erford, 2008). The two groups explored in this study were school counseling site supervisors who have taken a graduate class in supervision and school counseling site supervisors who have not taken a graduate class in supervision. An independent t-test requires a continuous dependent variable and a categorical independent variable. To address the first research question, the site supervisor rating obtained from the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form was the continuous variable, and the history of a graduate class in supervision was the categorical variable. To address the second research question, the site supervisor self-efficacy score obtained from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey was the continuous variable and the history of a graduate class in supervision was the categorical variable.

This study used an *a-priori* alpha level of .05 to control for making a Type 1 error. The researcher employed a Bonferroni correction technique (Newman, Fraas, & Laux, 2000). This study tested two hypotheses. As such, the original alpha was divided by the number of hypothesis to arrive at an adjusted alpha rate of .025. Thus, each test of significance needed to have a *p*-value less than .025 in order to be considered statistically significant.
Power is the ability to detect group differences, if those differences do in fact exist (McNeil, Newman, & Kelly, 1996). Power is calculated as a relationship between a study’s alpha, the sample size, and the anticipated effect sizes. According to Cohen (1992), a small effect size for a t-test is .20, a medium effect size is .05, and a large effect size is .80. As stated above, this study aimed to collect a total of 45 school counseling internship students and 45 school counseling internship supervisors. Using the values, power for detecting small, medium, and large effect sizes is .66, .97, and .99, respectively. In other words the researcher was 66% confident that she would detect group differences if the magnitude of this difference is small, 97% confident that she would detect group differences if the magnitude of this difference is small, 97% confident that medium differences would be found, and 99% confident that large differences would be detected.

**Threats to Validity**

1.) Sampling: The use of convenience sampling for the purpose of this study served as a threat to validity. Convenience sampling is criticized as being weak in that the sample may not be representative of the entire population (Ross, 2005). Site supervisors who provide supervision for school counseling internship students from CACREP accredited programs in the state of Ohio may not be representative of site supervisors who provide supervision for school counseling internships students from all CACREP accredited school counseling programs. This limited the researcher’s ability to generalize the results of the study. Recruiting participants from only CACREP accredited programs does suggest that the training and expectations for supervising
internship students will be the same regardless of state. This assumed uniformity decreased the risk of systematic error.

2.) Instrumentation: The Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form is an instrument that has not been studied by anyone. This instrument has not been tested for reliability and there was no way to ensure that this instrument is valid for the purpose of this study.

3.) Design: The selection of groups in this study limited the ability of the researcher to know if there were any other differences within the sample population beyond the independent variable being studied (Campbell & Stanley1963). In this study, without knowledge of additional differences between the two groups being compared, there were no means to predict if the dependent variable (site supervisor competency) was impacted solely by the independent variable (history of graduate class in supervision). This threat to validity can be controlled by collecting demographic information from participants that will provide data to account for any extraneous or confounding variables.

4.) Response Bias: The Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey relied on self-report of the site supervisor. A limitation associated with self-report includes the inability to determine if a participant is being truthful in his or her responses. This could not be controlled because self-efficacy can only be reported through self-report.
Chapter 4

Results

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis of data obtained from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey and the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form. Descriptive findings and inferential results from a one-way ANOVA used to analyze scores from both instruments will be reported.

Descriptive Findings

Descriptive statistics for the scores from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey are presented in Table 4.1. Of the site supervisors who participated in this study, 83% (n = 48) reported that they have not had a graduate course in supervision and 17% (n = 10) reported that they have had a graduate course in supervision.

Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics for the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Course in Supervision</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>11.02608</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>9.15848</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>81.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69.7414</td>
<td>10.66649</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for the scores from the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form are presented in Table 4.2. Of the school counseling internship students who participated in this study, about 82% (n = 49) of their site supervisors reported that they have not had a graduate course in supervision and about 18% (n = 11) reported that they have had a graduate course in supervision.
Table 4.2 Descriptive statistics for the scores form the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Course in Supervision</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>126.0306</td>
<td>26.15527</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>122.2727</td>
<td>23.10883</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>157.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>125.3417</td>
<td>25.47972</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

A one-way ANOVA was used to test research hypothesis one. Research hypothesis one was “School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will receive statistically higher \((p < .05)\) ratings on the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.” Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances (.34) was not significant \((p = .72)\), which allowed the researcher to assume equal variances. The results \([F (1, 58) = .193, p = .662]\) indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups of supervisors on their student evaluations. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \(d = .15\) is considered small. Therefore, site supervisors who received formal training in supervision were not rated higher on the student evaluation of supervisors form by school counseling internship students than site supervisors who did not receive formal training in supervision. As such, the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis that “There will be no statistically significant difference on the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form between site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.”
A one-way ANOVA was also used to test research hypothesis two. Research hypothesis two was: “School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will rate themselves higher in self-efficacy than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.” Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances (.43) was not significant ($p = .52$), which allowed the researcher to assume equal variances. The results [$F (1,56) = .140, p = .709$] indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups of supervisors on their rating of themselves on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, $d = .14$ is considered small. Therefore site supervisors who received formal training in supervision did not rate themselves higher on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy survey than site supervisors who did not receive formal training in supervision. As such, the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis that “There will be no statistically significant difference on the Site Supervisor Evaluation of Supervisor form between site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

Secondary Analysis

The researcher conducted post hoc analysis on the five items that were added to the demographic section of both the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey and the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form regarding the supervision of interns in five areas. Descriptive findings and inferential results from a one-way ANOVA used to analyze scores from each of these five items are reported below.

Descriptive Findings
Descriptive statistics for the scores from the additional four items on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey demographics section are presented in Table 4.3. Of the site supervisors who participated in this study, 83% (n = 48) reported that they have not had a graduate course in supervision and 17% (n = 10) reported that they have had a graduate course in supervision.

Descriptive statistics for the scores from the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form demographics section are presented in Table 4.4. Of the site supervisors who participated in this study, 82% (n = 49) reported that they have not had a graduate course in supervision and 18% (n = 11) reported that they have had a graduate course in supervision.

ANOVA

Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances was conducted for all 5 supervisor evaluations of their own competence. The tests for individual counseling (.66, p = .42), group counseling (1.01, p = .32), consultation (.63, p = .43) and case conceptualization (.02, p = .89) were not significant. However, Leven’s test was significant for classroom guidance (7.68, p = .008). As such, ANOVA results were calculated for the four former tests of significant and Welch’s test was conducted for the group counseling comparison.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if there was a significant difference in the confidence rating of site supervisors between site supervisors who have received a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who did not when providing supervision to interns regarding individual counseling. The results [F (1,56) = .289, p = .593] indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups on their confidence rating providing supervision to interns regarding individual
counseling. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .10 \) is considered small. Therefore, site supervisors who received formal training in supervision did not have a higher confidence rating in providing supervision to interns regarding individual counseling than site supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision.
Table 4.3 Descriptive statistics for the scores from the additional four items on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your confidence providing supervision to interns regarding individual counseling?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.2083</td>
<td>.58194</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1000</td>
<td>.56765</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.1897</td>
<td>.57604</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your confidence providing supervision to interns regarding group counseling?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.8958</td>
<td>.72169</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1000</td>
<td>.56765</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.9310</td>
<td>.69742</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your confidence providing supervision to interns regarding consultation?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.1042</td>
<td>.66010</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
<td>.63246</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.0517</td>
<td>.66021</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your confidence providing supervision to interns regarding classroom guidance?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.2083</td>
<td>.68287</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3000</td>
<td>1.41814</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.0517</td>
<td>.90655</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your confidence providing supervision to interns regarding case conceptualization?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.8958</td>
<td>.92804</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>.82327</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.8621</td>
<td>.90705</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 Descriptive statistics for the scores from the additional four items from the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate your supervisor's ability to provide supervision to interns regarding individual counseling?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.4082</td>
<td>1.33726</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1818</td>
<td>1.72152</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.3667</td>
<td>1.40177</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate your supervisor's ability to provide supervision to interns regarding group counseling?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.7143</td>
<td>1.74404</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.3636</td>
<td>1.12006</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.6500</td>
<td>1.64497</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate your supervisor's ability to provide supervision to interns regarding consultation?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.7143</td>
<td>1.24164</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8182</td>
<td>.87386</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.7333</td>
<td>1.17699</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate your supervisor's ability to provide supervision to interns regarding classroom guidance?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.9583</td>
<td>1.52927</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5455</td>
<td>1.69491</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.8814</td>
<td>1.55458</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate your supervisor's ability to provide supervision to interns regarding case conceptualization?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.3125</td>
<td>1.50398</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6364</td>
<td>1.28629</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.1864</td>
<td>1.47945</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if there was a significant difference in the confidence rating of site supervisors between site supervisors who have received a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who did not when providing supervision to interns regarding group counseling. The results \( F (1,56) = .706, p = .404 \) indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups on
their confidence rating providing supervision to interns regarding group counseling. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, $d = .15$ is considered small. Therefore, site supervisors who received formal training in supervision did not have a higher confidence rating in providing supervision to interns regarding group counseling than site supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if there was a significant difference in the confidence rating of site supervisors between site supervisors who have received a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who did not when providing supervision to interns regarding consultation. The results $[F (1, 56) = .1.781, p = .187]$ indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups on their confidence rating providing supervision to interns regarding consultation. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, $d = .23$ is considered small. Therefore, site supervisors who received formal training in supervision did not have a higher confidence rating in providing supervision to interns regarding consultation than site supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if there was a significant difference in the confidence rating of site supervisors between site supervisors who have received a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who did not when providing supervision to interns regarding classroom guidance. The results $[F (1, 56) = 9.56, p = .003]$ indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the two groups on their confidence rating providing supervision to interns regarding classroom guidance. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, $d = .37$ is between small and medium but closer to medium. Therefore, site supervisors who have not received formal
A one way-ANOVA was used to test if there was a significant difference in the confidence rating of site supervisors between site supervisors who have received a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not when providing supervision to interns regarding case conceptualization. The results \[ F(1, 56) = .317, p = .539 \] indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups on their confidence rating providing supervision to interns regarding case conceptualization. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .1 \) is considered small. Therefore, site supervisors who received formal training in supervision did not have a higher confidence rating in providing supervision to interns regarding case conceptualization than site supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision.

Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances was conducted for all 5 student evaluations of the supervisor’s competence. The tests for individual counseling (1.58, \( p = .21 \)), consultation (2.61, \( p = .11 \)), classroom guidance (.16, \( p = .69 \)), and case conceptualization (.46, \( p = .50 \)) were not significant. However, Leven’s test was significant for group counseling (6.74, \( p = .01 \)). As such, ANOVA results were calculated for the four former tests of significant and Welch’s test was conducted for the group counseling comparison.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if there was a significant difference in the intern’s rating of their site supervisor between site supervisors who have received a
graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not in their ability to provide supervision regarding individual counseling. The results [F (1,58) =1.991, p = .632] indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups on their intern’s rating of their ability to provide supervision regarding individual counseling. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .07 \) is considered small. Therefore, site supervisors who received formal training in supervision were not rated higher by their interns on their ability to provide supervision regarding individual counseling than site supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if there was a significant difference in the intern’s rating of their site supervisor between site supervisors who have received a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not in their ability to provide supervision regarding group counseling. The results [F (1,58) =.404, \( p = .527 \)] indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups on their intern’s rating of their ability to provide supervision regarding group counseling. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .12 \) is considered small. Therefore, site supervisors who received formal training in supervision were not rated higher by their interns on their ability to provide supervision regarding group counseling than site supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if there was a significant difference in the intern’s rating of their site supervisor between site supervisors who have received a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not in their ability to provide supervision regarding consultation. The results [F (1,58) =.069, \( p = .794 \)] indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups on their
intern’s rating of their ability to provide supervision regarding consultation. According to 
Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .05 \) is considered small. Therefore, site 
supervisors who received formal training in supervision were not rated higher by their 
interns on their ability to provide supervision regarding consultation than site supervisors 
who have not received formal training in supervision.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if there was a significant difference in the 
intern’s rating of their site supervisor between site supervisors who have received a 
graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not in their ability to 
provide supervision regarding classroom guidance. The results \( [F (1,58) = .627, p = .432] \) 
indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups on 
their intern’s rating of their ability to provide supervision regarding classroom guidance. 
According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .13 \) is considered small. 
Therefore, site supervisors who received formal training in supervision were not rated 
higher by their interns on their ability to provide supervision regarding classroom 
guidance than site supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if there was a significant difference in the 
intern’s rating of their site supervisor between site supervisors who have received a 
graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not in their ability to 
provide supervision regarding case conceptualization. The results \( [F (1,58) = 1.898, p = 
.174] \) indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups 
on their intern’s rating of their ability to provide supervision regarding case 
conceptualization. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .23 \) is 
considered small. Therefore, site supervisors who received formal training in supervision
were not rated higher by their interns on their ability to provide supervision regarding case conceptualization than site supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision.

After reviewing the data, the researcher was interested to know if there was a significant difference in the scores from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy survey between site supervisors who have received supervision training in either an in-service, conference, a workshop provided by the intern’s university, or a unit/module within a graduate course and site supervisors who have not had training in each setting. Descriptive findings and inferential results from a one-way ANOVA used to analyze scores from both instruments will be reported.

**Descriptive Findings**

Descriptive statistics for the scores from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey are presented in Table 4.5. Of the site supervisors who participated in this study, 77% (n = 43) reported that they have not had supervision training at an in-service and 23% (n = 13) reported that they have had a graduate course in supervision.

Table 4.5 Descriptive statistics for scores from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey and demographic question regarding training at an in-service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training at an In-service</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67.9070</td>
<td>10.35975</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74.9231</td>
<td>10.86632</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69.5357</td>
<td>10.80061</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for the scores from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey are presented in Table 4.6. Of the site supervisors who participated in this study, 78% (n
= 43) reported that they have not had supervision training at a conference and 22% (n = 12) reported that they have had a graduate course in supervision.

Table 4.6 Descriptive statistics for scores from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey and demographic question regarding training at a Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training at a Conference</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67.6279</td>
<td>10.09013</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77.1667</td>
<td>10.41706</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69.7091</td>
<td>10.82123</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for the scores from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey are presented in Table 4.7. Of the site supervisors who participated in this study, 89% (n = 49) reported that they have not had supervision training at a workshop provided by the intern’s university and 11% (n = 6) reported that they have had supervision training at a workshop provided by the intern’s university.

Table 4.7 Descriptive statistics for scores from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey and demographic question regarding training at a workshop from intern’s university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training at workshop at intern’s University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68.7347</td>
<td>10.45980</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77.6667</td>
<td>11.36075</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69.7091</td>
<td>10.82123</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for the scores from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey are presented in Table 4.8. Of the site supervisors who participated in this study, 85% (n = 46) reported that they have not had supervision training during a unit/module within a
graduate course and 15% (n = 8) reported that they have had supervision training during a unit/module within a graduate course.

Table 4.8 Descriptive statistics for scores from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey and demographic question regarding training during a unit/module in a graduate course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training during unit/module in course</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68.9348</td>
<td>10.51222</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73.1250</td>
<td>12.87786</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69.5556</td>
<td>10.86220</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for the scores from the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey are presented in Table 4.9. Of the site supervisors who participated in this study, 76% (n = 44) reported that they have not had supervision training at an in-service and 24% (n = 14) reported that they have had supervision training at an in-service.

Table 4.9 Descriptive statistics for scores from the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form and the site supervisor demographic question regarding training at an in-service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training at an In-service</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>123.2273</td>
<td>25.92082</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>132.9643</td>
<td>23.38348</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>125.5776</td>
<td>25.48009</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for the scores from the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form are presented in Table 4.10. Of the site supervisors who participated in this study, 77% (n = 44) reported that they have not had supervision training at a conference and 23% (n = 13) reported that they have had supervision training at a conference.
Table 4.10 Descriptive statistics for scores from the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form and the site supervisor demographic question regarding training at a conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training at a Conference</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>122.8295</td>
<td>25.30809</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>136.6154</td>
<td>24.21961</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>125.9737</td>
<td>25.52580</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for the scores from the Student Counselor Evaluation form are presented in Table 4.11. Of the site supervisors who participated in this study, 89% (n = 51) reported that they have not had supervision training provided at a workshop by the intern’s university and 11% (n = 6) reported that they have had supervision training provided at a workshop by the intern’s university.

Table 4.11 Descriptive statistics for scores from the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form and the site supervisor demographic question regarding training at a workshop at intern’s university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training at workshop at intern’s University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>125.3039</td>
<td>26.23168</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>131.6667</td>
<td>19.31493</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>154.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>125.9737</td>
<td>25.52580</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for the scores from the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form are presented in Table 4.12. Of the site supervisors who participated in this study, 86% (n = 48) reported that they have not had supervision training during a unit/module within a graduate course and 14% (n = 8) reported that they have had supervision training during a unit/module within a graduate course.

Table 4.12 Descriptive statistics for scores from the Student Counselor
Evaluation of Supervisor form and the site supervisor demographic question regarding training during unit/module in graduate course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training during unit/module in course</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>123.2396</td>
<td>26.36285</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>139.2500</td>
<td>14.28036</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>125.5268</td>
<td>25.53080</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if site supervisors who received training at an in-service received higher ratings on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey than site supervisors who have not. Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances (.015) was not significant (p = .90), which allowed the researcher to assume equal variances. The results [F (1, 54) = 4.479, p = .039] indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of supervisors on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .66 \) is between medium and large, but more towards medium. Therefore, site supervisors who received supervision training at in-service received higher scores on the Site-Supervisor Self-Efficacy survey than site supervisors who did not receive training at an in-service.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if site supervisors who received supervision training at a conference received higher ratings on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey than site supervisors who have not. Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances (.003) was not significant (p = .96), which allowed the researcher to assume equal variances. The results [F (1, 54) = 8.271, p = .006] indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of supervisors on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .93 \) is
considered large. Therefore, site supervisors who received supervision training at a conference received higher scores on the Site-Supervisor Self-Efficacy survey than site supervisors who did not receive training at a conference.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if site supervisors who received training at a workshop provided by the intern’s university received higher ratings on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey than site supervisors who have not. Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances (.38) was not significant (p = .54), which allowed the researcher to assume equal variances. The results [F (1, 54) = 3.833, p = .056] indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups of supervisors on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, $d = .8$ is considered large. Therefore, site supervisors who received supervision training at a workshop provided by the intern’s university did not receive higher scores on the Site-Supervisor Self-Efficacy survey than site supervisors who did not receive training at a workshop provided by the intern’s university.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if site supervisors who received training during a unit/module within a graduate course received higher ratings on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey than site supervisors who have not. Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances (.38) was not significant (p = .54), which allowed the researcher to assume equal variances. The results [F (1, 54) = 1.014, p = .319] indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups of supervisors on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, $d = .36$ is between small and medium, but more towards medium. Therefore, site supervisors who received supervision training during a unit/module within
a graduate course did not receive higher scores on the Site-Supervisor Self-Efficacy survey than site supervisors who did not receive training during a unit/module within a graduate course.

The researcher was also interested to know if there was a significant difference in the scores from the Student Evaluation of Supervisor forms between site supervisors who have received supervision training in either an in-service, conference, a workshop provided by the intern’s university, or a unit/module within a graduate course and site supervisors who have not had training in each setting.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if site supervisors who received supervision training at in-service received higher ratings on the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form than site supervisors who have not. Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances (.44) was not significant (p = .51), which allowed the researcher to assume equal variances. The results [F (1, 56) = 1.566, p = .216] indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups of supervisors on the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, $d = .39$ is between small and medium, but more towards medium. Therefore, site supervisors who received supervision training at an in-service did not receive higher scores on the Student Evaluation of Site Supervisor form than site supervisors who did not receive training at an in-service.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if site supervisors who received training at a conference received higher ratings on the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form than site supervisors who have not. Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances (.13) was not significant (p = .72), which allowed the researcher to assume equal variances. The results
[F (1, 56) = 3.033, \( p = .087 \)] indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups of supervisors on the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .56 \) is considered large. Therefore, site supervisors who received supervision training at a conference did not receive higher scores on the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form than site supervisors who did not receive training at a conference.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if site supervisors who received training at a workshop provided by the intern’s university received higher ratings on the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form than site supervisors who have not. Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances (.1.06) was not significant (\( p = .31 \)), which allowed the researcher to assume equal variances. The results [F (1, 56) = .330, \( p = .568 \)] indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups of supervisors on the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .28 \) is considered small. Therefore, site supervisors who received supervision training at a workshop provided by the intern’s university did not receive higher scores on the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form than site supervisors who did not receive training at a conference.

A one way-ANOVA was used to test if site supervisors who received training during a unit/module within a graduate course received higher ratings on the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form than site supervisors who have not. Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances (6.11) was significant (\( p = .017 \)), which meant the researcher could not assume equal variances. As a result, Welch’s test was used to compare the means. The results [F (1, 56) = 2.589, \( p = .113 \)]. The results [F (1, 56) = 2.784, \( p = .101 \)]
indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups of supervisors on the Student Evaluation of Site Supervisor form. According to Cohen (1992), the calculated effect size, \( d = .76 \) is considered large. Therefore, site supervisors who received supervision training during a unit/module within a graduate course did not receive higher scores on the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form than site supervisors who did not receive training during a unit/module within a graduate course.

### Summary

The hypothesized differences in students' and supervisors' ratings between those who had a university-based graduate supervision course and those who didn't did not materialize. Further, the data indicate that there was no differences in the student’s and supervisors’ ratings in the five areas of supervision specific to school counselors between site supervisors who had received formal training in supervision and those who had not. Finally, additional post-hoc analyses were conducted to determine if varying types of supervision training were associated with differences in supervisor self-rating and student ratings of supervisors. These post-hoc analyses of supervision training produced interesting results. Specifically, school counseling site supervisors who had received supervision training at an in-service reported higher self-efficacy scores than site supervisors who had not. This was also true with site supervisors who had received supervision training at professional conferences. Interestingly, student’s ratings were no different for site supervisors in either of these two groups.
Chapter 5

Discussion

Chapter five begins with a summary of the literature upon which the research questions are based. Next, the author re-states the study’s purpose, procedures, and findings. The findings are integrated into the current literature base. Then, findings’ implications are presented for researchers, counselor educators and practicing school counselors. The study’s limitations are identified and discussed. Chapter five concludes with suggestions for future research and a general summary of the study conducted.

Summary of Findings

The researcher set out to explore if having formal training in supervision, as indicated by taking a graduate course in supervision, increases the competency of school counseling site supervisors. School counseling site supervisor competency was assessed via the constructs of student intern evaluation and site supervisor self-efficacy. School counseling internship students were surveyed using the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form and school counseling site supervisors were surveyed using the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey. The two hypothesis for this study were as follows: 1) School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will receive higher ratings on the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision; and 2) School counseling site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision will rate themselves higher in self-efficacy than school counseling site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision. The research findings did not show any differences in self-efficacy or student evaluation scores between site supervisors who
have had a graduate course in supervision and site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision.

The researcher added five additional questions to the demographics section of both the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor Form and the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey. The questions explored the student’s evaluation of their site supervisor and the supervisor’s confidence when providing supervision in the following areas: 1) individual counseling; 2) group counseling; 3) consultation; 4) classroom guidance; and 5) case conceptualization. There were no differences in how students rated their site supervisors in any of these five areas regardless of whether or not a site supervisor had taken a graduate course in supervision. These findings were consistent with how site supervisors rated their confidence providing supervision in each of the areas except when providing supervision to interns regarding classroom guidance. Interestingly, site supervisors who have not had a graduate course in supervision had more confidence providing supervision on classroom guidance lessons than those site supervisors who have had a graduate course in supervision. Higher ratings in any area for site supervisors who have not had formal training in supervision were not expected. Site supervisors showed no difference in their level of confidence when providing supervision in any other area regardless of formal training in supervision.

Although this study focused solely on the differences in self-efficacy and student evaluation between site supervisors who have taken a graduate course in supervision and those who have not, the researcher found some interesting findings regarding site supervisors who have received supervision training in other settings. Site supervisors who participated in this study identified four other places at which they received training.
outside of an actual master’s level course in supervision. The other settings identified were as follows: 1) at an in-service; 2) at a professional conference; 3) at a training provided by the intern’s university and 4) through a unit/module on supervision during another master’s level course. The findings showed that there were no differences in how students rated their site supervisors regardless of training in any of the four identified settings. In addition, there were also no differences in how site supervisors rated their self-efficacy based on whether or not they had training at their intern’s university or through a unit or module during another master’s level class. There were, however, differences in the self-efficacy scores of site supervisors who have received training during an in-service and those who have received training at a professional conference. Site supervisors who have received training at an in-service had higher self-efficacy than those who have not received training at an in-service. Self-efficacy was also higher in site supervisors who have received training at a professional conference in comparison to those who have not.

**Interpretation of Findings**

The researcher’s failure to reject both null hypotheses in this study does not necessarily indicate that formal training in supervision does not have an effect on site supervisor self-efficacy or their ability to provide interns with quality supervision. These findings showed that there were no differences in the self-efficacy of site supervisors or evaluation by student interns between site supervisors who had taken a graduate course in supervision and those who had not. Graduate coursework in supervision is typically only required by doctoral students in counselor education programs and focuses primarily on how to provide clinical supervision to clinical counselors in training or seeking
independent licensure. Although supervision models and counselor development does not discriminate between counselor setting, when training school counseling interns, it is possible that even after taking a graduate course in supervision, school counseling site supervisors may have not received enough information that is applicable to the school setting. This could explain the absence of any difference in competency between site supervisors who have received formal training in supervision and those who have not.

In addition to the inability to control for the type of training provided to site supervisors through graduate coursework, the selection of participants into the pre-defined groups (site supervisors who have received formal training in supervision and those who have not) made it impossible for the researcher in this study to rule out that site supervisors who did not receive training through a graduate course did not have any other training in supervision. Research findings did not show any difference between the two groups, but it is known that some site supervisors who have not received training specifically through a graduate course, have received training in supervision through inservices, professional conferences, workshops provided by the intern’s university and/or through a module within another master’s level course. Training received by site supervisors in the other settings may have had an equal effect on the site supervisors’ competency than training received by a graduate course in supervision.

Differences found between site supervisors who have received training at a professional conference and those who have not, and site supervisors who have received training at an in-service and those who have not indicate that training may have an impact on self-efficacy of site supervisors. In-services provided by school districts are the most assessable professional development opportunities school counselors have. These training
opportunities are provided during normal work hours, free of any charge and are typically required for school personnel. It is probable that any training on supervision provided through an in-service for school employees would focus on supervising professionals within the context of the school. This information may be equally beneficial for school counselors when learning the foundation of providing supervision and addressing professional and ethical issues in a school. Likewise, professional conferences also provide school counselors with professional development opportunities that may be more accessible and efficient than taking a graduate course in supervision. Professional conferences may even be more likely to provide school counselors with supervision training sessions that are geared more towards the school setting. If training provided through conferences provides supervisors with ways to apply supervision models and best practices for working with school counselors in-training, then it would make sense that school counselors who have received training at professional conferences would have higher self-efficacy than those who have not. Although graduate coursework may not currently address the supervisory needs of school counselors, in-services and professional conferences are alternatives for school counselors to receive applicable training.

**Context of Findings**

Two studies in particular have explored the training needs of school counselors in supervision. Dekruyf and Pehrsson (2011) looked at the self-efficacy of school counseling site supervisors in relation to the amount of training in supervision they had received. Dekruyf and Pehrsson used the original version of the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey to assess the self-efficacy of school counseling site supervisors in the
state of Oregon and Washington and found that site supervisors who had received training in supervision reported higher self-efficacy than site supervisors who had not received training in supervision. They also found that 40% (n=147) of the school counselors who participated in the study had reported having no training in supervision and only 23% reported having taken a graduate course in supervision. This study used an updated version of the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey and also looked at the self-efficacy of site supervisors in relation to their training. Unlike the Dekruyf and Perhsson study, which looked at supervision training from the various settings, the researcher focused solely on training in the form of a graduate course in supervision to address the research questions for this study. The findings from this study were not consistent with the findings from the Dekruyf and Perhsson study in that site supervisors who had taken a graduate course in supervision did not report higher self-efficacy than those who had not taken a graduate course in supervision. However, because the researcher in this study only looked at one setting, whereas Dekruyf and Pehrsson looked at training in all settings, there is no way to determine if the findings for training that was obtained specifically from a graduate course would have been consistent with this study. Only 17% of school counselors in this study reported having a graduate course in supervision. This was comparable to the number of school counselors who had reported having a graduate course in supervision from the Dekruyf and Pehrsson study.

Page, Pietrzak and Sutton (2001) explored school counselors’ experience with supervision. Page, Pietrzak and Sutton (2001) found that only 20% (n=) reported that they would seek out a supervision credential if offered for school counselors and 47% reported that they would “possibly” seek out a credential if offered for school counselors.
The small percentage of school counselors who would pursue further training in supervision from the Page, Pietrzak and Sutton (2001) was consistent with the findings from this study which showed that only a small number of school counselors actually pursued graduate coursework in supervision.

**Implications for Counselor Educators, Researchers and Practicing School Counselors**

The findings from this study failed to show an increase in self-efficacy or higher evaluation scores from interns for site supervisors who had received formal training in supervision, however, site supervisors who had received training at an in-service or a professional conference did report higher self-efficacy than those who had not received training at either. These findings do not negate the importance of obtaining training in supervision, but implies that an actual graduate course may not be necessary to provide school counseling site supervisors with enough knowledge to provide quality supervision or that current graduate coursework may not provide site supervisors with knowledge applicable to providing supervision in the school setting. Counselor educators should consider modifying current graduate classes in supervision or creating an additional course specifically for supervising school counselors.

Bernard and Goodyear (2004) suggest that supervision curriculum should include the following topics: 1) models of supervision 2) counselor development, 3) supervision methods and techniques, 4) the supervisory relationship, 5) evaluation of supervisees, 6) executive skills, 7) ethical and professional issues in supervision, 8) multicultural competencies and 9) relevant research on supervision. All of these topics identified by Bernard and Goodyear are universal for providing supervision to all counselors in
training. The way in which students evolve from the first day of practicum to the last day of internship is an individual process, but the stages of counselor development are consistent regardless of setting. Methods and techniques, the supervisory relationship and how to evaluate supervisees are all skill sets that are applicable in both the clinical and school setting. Models of supervision are modifiable to the school setting, and some models, such as the discrimination model of supervision, have already been modified to not only use for school counselors, but also incorporate the planning and implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program. Researchers should explore the effectiveness of various models of supervision when providing supervision to school counseling interns in order to provide site supervisors with models that are applicable for supervising in the school.

Supervision curriculum does not need to be completely revamped, but classroom discussions, opportunities for practicing skills, relevant research and how supervision is delivered to interns should focus on the specific roles and responsibilities of school counselors. School counselors do not diagnose students, complete diagnostic assessments or conduct on-going therapy but they do provide students with brief therapeutic interventions, crisis intervention, consulting with parents and other professionals, and appropriate classroom guidance lessons. Graduate coursework in supervision for school counselors should focus on these areas, providing supervisors-in-training with methods and techniques to increase skill development and self-efficacy in interns. If current graduate coursework allowed for the integration of supervision needs specific to school counselors, having a graduate course in supervision, may have had a greater impact on site supervisor self-efficacy and student evaluation scores than found in this study. In
addition, addressing school counselor supervision more explicitly in graduate coursework may make these courses more appealing for school counselors who work regularly with interns and encourage those who have not worked with interns to become site supervisors.

Another implication for counselor educators from these findings would be that if site supervisors are receiving effective supervision training through in-services or professional conferences, then counselor educators and school districts should increase the number of supervision training opportunities for school counselors in these settings. Bernard and Goodyear (2014) argue that supervision training at workshops and conferences do not provide an opportunity for supervisors-in-training to practice skills and have supervised supervision experiences. They also note that it limits the opportunity to spend much needed time learning about different models and processing issues that may occur during supervision. However, due to the time and cost efficiency of attending professional conferences for school counselors, paired with the findings from this study, conference sessions at minimum should cover counselor development, models of supervision and methods and techniques. Another option would be for supervision training to be offered through learning institutes during conferences in order to have more time to practice skills and process potential issues. Counselor educators and practicing school counselors with experience providing supervision to interns should be invited to submit proposals for presentations on school counselor supervision.

Only 11% of site supervisors reported having received supervision training at a workshop provided by the intern’s university. Counselor educators should provide yearly opportunities for site supervisors who agree to take on school counseling interns to obtain
supervision training at the University. Counselor educators are responsible for ensuring that site supervisors have had “relevant training in supervision” as required by CACREP (2009). Providing site supervisors with training opportunities in supervision would not only allow counselor educators to confirm that site supervisors who take on interns have received quality training, but also demonstrates their commitment to ensuring interns have optimal training experiences. Counselor educators could provide CEUs as an incentive for school counseling site supervisors to register for supervision training workshops, or it could be a program requirement in order to take on interns. Making supervision training an expectation for site supervisors sends the message that training is important, and site supervisors should be held accountable.

School counselors who agree to take on interns should be required to have a specific number of hours in supervision training. The findings in this study did at minimum show that some training, specifically from in-services and conferences increased site supervisor self-efficacy. In the absence of graduate coursework that is feasible for school counselors and that is applicable, trainings should be pursued at conferences and in-services in order to continue learning new skills. Site supervisors have a huge responsibility to help interns develop skills, solidify their professional identity as school counselors and become confident professionals who are capable of making ethical decisions. Having a working knowledge of counselor development allows site supervisors to recognize what interns need from them as supervisors and areas in which interns may need improvement. Interns may not be comfortable expressing their needs during the internship process, making it critical that the supervisory relationship supports this type of disclosure. It is equally important that supervisors understand those needs that
may not be verbally communicated but evident in interns’ behavior. Having a theoretical
framework for how supervision is delivered makes supervision more intentional and
ensures supervision time is focused on the needs of the intern. School counselors are
responsible for obtaining continuous professional development; supervision is just one of
the many options school counselors have to choose from. School counselors should
advocate to administrators for opportunities to attend conferences and workshops
provided by counseling organizations and universities that will have supervision training
opportunities. Site supervisors should also request that universities provide them with this
type of training, if they are expected to take on interns. Researchers should continue to
explore school counselors’ attitudes about supervision and their training needs.
Qualitative designs should investigate site supervisors understanding of counselor
development, supervision models and how supervision is delivered to interns. Further
research in this area can dig deeper into some issues that may be impeding the
supervision process in order to continue to improve supervision trainings for school
counselors.

Limitations

The researcher found limitations to the study in the following areas: 1) Sampling;
2) Instrumentation; 3) Design; and 4) Response Bias. The use of convenience sampling
for the purpose of this study created a limitation to the generalizability of the findings to
the entire population. The sample for this study only included participants from CACREP
accredited programs in the state of Ohio. Site supervisors from the state of Ohio may not
accurately represent site supervisors from CACREP accredited programs across the
United States. This limits the researcher’s ability to assume these findings would be consistent in other states.

There were also issues with one of the instruments used in this study. The Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form has not been tested for reliability. This instrument has not been studied and the researcher had no way to ensure that the instrument is valid for the purpose of this study. The researcher was limited in that there are currently no supervisor evaluation forms that have been tested for reliability or validity at the time of this study.

Limitations within the research design included the researchers inability to predict if the dependent variable (site supervisor competency) was impacted solely by the independent variable (history of graduate class in supervision). This limitation was created through the pre-selection of groups. The researcher did not exhaust all demographic identifiers that could rule out extraneous or confounding variables. Response bias posed an additional threat to the reliability of the findings. The Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey relied solely on the self-report of the site supervisors. A limitation associated with self-report includes the inability to determine if a participant is being truthful in his or her responses. For example, site supervisors who have not had training in supervision may have been more inclined to rate themselves higher on items in order to not feel badly about serving as site supervisors without proper training. This could not be controlled because self-efficacy can only be reported through self-report. Response bias is also a limitation with the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form. It is possible that interns could rate their site supervisor higher if they felt uncomfortable with having to imply that they were currently receiving poor supervision.
Future Research

Future research should explore instruments used to evaluate site supervisors in school counseling. There are currently no instruments used to evaluate site supervisors that have been tested for reliability and external validity. The evaluation form used in this study should be evaluated to establish some technical adequacy. In addition, current instruments used by counselor education programs should be tested, and the creation of a universal means of evaluating supervisors should be considered.

Another area that researchers should explore is the specific training opportunities that are currently available to school counselors at professional conferences and in-services. The findings from this study showed that school counselors who received training from in-services and professional counselors reported higher self-efficacy. Future research should also explore current supervision training curriculum that can be modified for implementation through conference workshops and in-services within school districts.

This study focused on training in supervision for school counselors by way of a graduate course in supervision. Graduate coursework in supervision should be evaluated on its ability to provide school counselors with supervision training that is applicable in the school setting. Future research should also evaluate if there are differences in self-efficacy and student evaluation of site supervisors who have received any training and those who have received none. Studies should also look at other variables that could impact the competency of site supervisors. Some other variables may include years of experience as a school counselor, number of interns supervised and their own personal experiences as a supervisee. The Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey could be used to investigate how other variables impact self-efficacy. Qualitative research should also be
employed to gain insight into site supervisors’ understanding of supervision and what variables they believe have impacted how they deliver supervision. A supervisor evaluation form that has been tested for both reliability and validity should be used to examine other aspects of site supervisor competency.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to determine if having formal training in supervision, as indicated by taking a graduate class in supervision, increased the competency of school counseling site supervisors. School counseling interns from CACREP accredited programs in the state of Ohio were asked to evaluate their site supervisors using the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form and their respective site supervisors were surveyed using the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey to assess their level of confidence when providing supervision to interns. The Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey also obtained information regarding site supervisors’ history of supervision training. The following research questions were addressed in this study: 1) Do school counseling site supervisors who have taken a graduate class in supervision receive higher ratings from internship students on the supervisor evaluation form than school counseling site supervisors who have not taken a graduate class in supervision? and 2) Do school counseling site supervisors who have taken a graduate class in supervision rate themselves higher in self-efficacy than school counseling site supervisors who have not taken a graduate class in supervision?

Results indicated that there was no difference in ratings of site supervisors from internship students between site supervisors who have taken a graduate course in supervision and those who have not. There was also no difference in how site supervisors
rated themselves in self-efficacy between site supervisors who have taken a graduate course in supervision and those who have not. Additional findings from the study indicated that there was a difference in how site supervisors rated themselves in self-efficacy between site supervisors who have received supervision training at an in-service and those who have not, and between site supervisors who have received training at a professional conference and those who have not. However, there were no differences in how students evaluated site supervisors in these groups. These results did not support the researchers hypothesis that site supervisors who have taken a graduate course in supervision would receive higher ratings from interns and rate themselves higher in self-efficacy than site supervisors who have not, but differences found between site supervisors who have received training at an in-service or professional and those who have not, indicate that training does have an impact on self-efficacy. The findings from this study support the need more training opportunities for school counselors through workshops at professional conferences and educator in-services as well as the need for adapting current graduate coursework in supervision to apply to the school setting. Future research should explore training needs of school counselors in supervision, additional variables that impact site supervisor competency and reliable instruments for evaluating supervisors.
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Appendix A

Permission to Recruit Email

Dear School Counseling Program Coordinator:

My name is Leslie Neyland and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Toledo in the Counselor Education and Supervision program. I am currently working on my dissertation entitled “Supervision Training among School Counseling Internship Supervisors: Does It Matter?” and would like to invite students from your program to participate in my study. The purpose of this study is to determine if having formal training in supervision increases the competency of school counseling site supervisors. An exploration of school counseling site supervisor training will provide counselor educators with a better understanding of the training needs of school counseling site supervisors as it relates to providing interns with quality supervision. This study will yield data that will assist school counseling programs and professional associations in creating appropriate training opportunities for site supervisors that will enhance the internship experience for our next generation of school counselors. Participants for this study will include both school counseling internship students currently enrolled in a CACREP accredited school counseling program in the state of Ohio, and their respective site supervisors. I am requesting permission to visit your school counseling internship class(es) to recruit participants for this study. I would need about 15 minutes of class time to explain the purpose of my research project and obtain informed consent. In addition, participation in this study will include a survey they should take no more than 10 minutes for students to complete.

If this is something that is feasible for your internship class(es) I would love to visit your program to recruit participants. I am looking to collect data from January 12, 2015-February 23, 2015. Please respond with the day of the week and times of your class(es) and contact information for the school counseling internship instructor. I hope to coordinate a time and date that will be best for you and your students. Thank you for your time, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Leslie Neyland, MA, LPC, LSC, NCC
Part-Time Instructor & Doctoral Candidate
Department of School Psychology, Higher Education & Counselor Education
The University of Toledo
Appendix B
University of Toledo IRB Approval Letter

The University of Toledo
Department for Human Research Protections
Social, Behavioral & Educational Institutional Review Board
Office of Research, Rm. 2300, University Hall
2101 West Bancroft Street, Mail Stop 944
Toledo, Ohio 43606-3390
Phone: 419-530-2844 Fax: 419-530-2841
(FWA00010638)

To: John Laux, Ph.D. and Leslie Neyland
Department of School Psychology, Higher Education & Counselor Education & Supervision

From: Walter Edinger, Ph.D., Chair
Kamala London Newton, Ph.D., Vice Chair
Mirella Pardee, Chair Designee
Patricia Case, Ph.D., Chair Designee

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 12/15/14

Subject: IRB #200455
Protocol Title: Supervision Training among School Counseling Internship Supervisors. Does it Matter?

On 12/15/14, the Protocol listed below was reviewed and approved by the Chair and Chair Designee of the University of Toledo (UT) Social Behavioral & Educational Institutional Review Board (IRB) via the expedited process. The Chair and Chair Designee noted that signed and dated consent is required prior to an individual taking part in this research. This action will be reported to the committee at its next scheduled meeting.

Items Reviewed:
- IRB Application Requesting Expedited Review
- Current IRB Approved Recruitment Letter (version date 12/15/14)
- Current IRB Approved Consent Form(s) (version date 12/15/14)
- Current IRB Approved Assessments (version date 12/15/14)

This protocol approval is in effect until the expiration date listed below, unless the IRB notifies you otherwise.

Only the most recent IRB approved Consent/Assent form(s) listed above may be used when enrolling participants into this research.

Approval Date: 12/15/14  Expiration Date: 12/14/15

Number of Subjects Approved: 200

Please read the following attachment detailing Principal Investigator responsibilities.
Appendix C

Site Supervisor Recruitment Email

School Counseling Site Supervisor:

My name is Leslie Neyland and I am a doctoral candidate in the counselor education and supervision program at the University of Toledo. You are invited to participate in a dissertation research project entitled “Supervision Training among School Counseling Internship Supervisors: Does it Matter?” which I am conducting under the direction of John Laux, PhD. The purpose of this study is to determine if having formal training in supervision increases the competency of school counseling site supervisors. An exploration of school counseling site supervisor training will provide counselor educators with a better understanding of the training needs of school counseling site supervisors as it relates to providing interns with quality supervision. This study will yield data that will assist school counseling programs and professional associations in creating appropriate training opportunities for site supervisors that will enhance the internship experience for our next generation of school counselors.

I am contacting you because you are currently supervising an internship student who has agreed to participate in my study. Participation in this study is voluntary and will require you to complete an online survey that should take no more than 10 minutes to complete. Your voice is greatly valued as we seek to find ways to improve the internship experience for students and training opportunities for site supervisors. In order to participate in this research project, the only requirement is that you are currently supervising an internship student who is enrolled in a CACREP accredited school counseling program in the state of Ohio. If I have contacted you, it has already been established that you meet this requirement.

Identification of participants is necessary solely for the purpose of coding completed surveys; however, survey responses will not be associated with any identifying information. Therefore, no one, including the researcher will be able to associate your survey responses with your identity. Minimal risks are anticipated and you may choose to stop the survey at any time. Completion of the survey serves as your voluntary agreement to participate in this research project.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/FF6DFYZ
Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey
Thank you for agreeing to complete this brief 10 minute survey. There are 35 questions. Read more...

This study has been approved (#200455) by the Institutional Review Board at The University of Toledo in accordance with federal regulations. Any questions regarding the purpose or procedures of this research project should be directed to Dr. John Laux at John.Laux@utoledo.edu or by phone at 419-530-4705.

Thank you for your time
Leslie Neyland, MA, LPC, LSC, NCC
ADULT RESEARCH SUBJECT - INFORMED CONSENT FORM
“Supervision Training among School Counseling Internship Supervisors: Does it Matter?”

Principal Investigator:  
John Laux, PhD, (faculty), 419-530-4705 
Leslie Neyland, MA, (student investigator), 419-508-1337

Purpose: You are invited to participate in the research project entitled, “Supervision Training among School Counseling Internship Supervisors: Does it Matter?” which is being conducted at the University of Toledo under the direction of John Laux, PhD and Leslie Neyland, MA. The purpose of this study is to determine if having formal training in supervision increases the competency of school counseling site supervisors.

Description of Procedures: This research study will take place at CACREP accredited school counseling programs in the state of Ohio and participants will be asked to complete a survey that will take no more than 10 minutes to complete. The survey will include questions asking you to evaluate your current school counseling internship site supervisor, in addition to providing demographic information. You will also be asked to provide contact information for your current site supervisor for the purpose of inviting them to participate in this research study.

Potential Risks: There are minimal risks to participation in this study, including loss of confidentiality. Answering surveys may cause you to feel anxious or uncomfortable. If this happens, you may choose to stop taking the survey and not participate in this study.

Potential Benefits: The only direct benefit to you if you participate in this research may be that your voice will be used to gain a better understanding of the training needs of school counseling site supervisors as it relates to providing supervision to interns and this research will yield data that will assist school counseling programs and professional associations in creating appropriate training opportunities for site supervisors that will enhance the internship experience for our next generation of school counselors.

Confidentiality: The researchers will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you provided this information, or what that information is. The consent forms with signatures will be kept separate from responses, which will not include names and which will be presented to others only when combined with other responses. Survey responses will not be shared with site supervisors. Although we will make every effort to protect your confidentiality, there is a low risk that this might be breached.
**Voluntary Participation:** Your refusal to participate in this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled and will not affect your relationship with The University of Toledo or any of your classes at your current institution. In addition, you may discontinue participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits.

**Contact Information:** Before you decide to accept this invitation to take part in this study, you may ask any questions that you might have. If you have any questions at any time before, during or after your participation you should contact a member of the research team (John Laux, PhD 419-530-4705 or Leslie Neyland, MA 419-508-1337).

If you have questions beyond those answered by the research team or your rights as a research subject or research-related injuries, the Chairperson of the SBE Institutional Review Board may be contacted through the Office of Research on the main campus at (419) 530-2844.

Before you sign this form, please ask any questions on any aspect of this study that is unclear to you. You may take as much time as necessary to think it over.

**SIGNATURE SECTION – Please read carefully**

You are making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Your signature indicates that you have read the information provided above, you have had all your questions answered, and you have decided to take part in this research.

The date you sign this document to enroll in this study, that is, today's date must fall between the dates indicated at the bottom of the page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Subject (please print)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person Obtaining Consent</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This Adult Research Informed Consent document has been reviewed and approved by the University of Toledo Social, Behavioral and Educational IRB for the period of time specified in the box below.

Approved Number of Subjects: 200

IRB # 200455

ICF Version Date: 12/15/14
Appendix E

Intern Demographic Information

School Counseling Internship Student Demographic Information

Age

- □ 20-24
- □ 25-34
- □ 35-44
- □ 45-54
- □ 55-64
- □ 65+

Gender:

- □ Male
- □ Female
- □ Transgender

Race/Ethnicity

- □ African American/Black
- □ Asian American/Pacific Islander
- □ Biracial/Multicultural American
- □ European American/White
- □ Latino(a) American/Hispanic
- □ Native American/American Indian
- □ Other

Grade level at which you are currently working with as an intern

- □ Elementary School
- □ Middle School
- □ High School
- □ Multilevel School
- □ Alternative School
- □ Other

Total Hours of internship Completed

- □ 0-100
- □ 101-200
- □ 201-300
- □ 301-400
- □ 401-500
- □ 501-600

Number of direct hours

- □ 0-40
- □ 41-80
- □ 81-120
- □ 121-160
- □ 161-200
- □ 201-240
- □ 240+

Have you ever been a classroom teacher?

- □ Yes
- □ No

Have you had any training in clinical supervision?

- □ Yes
- □ No
Appendix F
Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor Form

Boylan, Malley, & Petty Reilly, 2001

STUDENT COUNSELOR EVALUATION OF SUPERVISOR

Suggested Use: The practicum or internship supervisor can obtain feedback on the supervision by asking student counselors to complete this form. The evaluation could be done at midterm and/or final. The purposes are twofold: (1) to provide feedback for improving supervision and (2) to encourage communication between the supervisor and the student counselor.

Directions: The student counselor is to evaluate the supervision received. Circle the number that best represents how you, the student counselor, feel about the supervision received. After the form is completed, the supervisor may suggest a meeting to discuss the supervision desired.

Name of practicum/Internship supervisor: ____________________________
Period covered: from ____________________ to ____________________

1. Gives time and energy in observations, tape processing, and case conferences.
   - Poor: 1
   - Adequate: 3
   - Good: 5

2. Accepts and respects me as a person.
   - Poor: 1
   - Adequate: 3
   - Good: 5

3. Recognizes and encourages further development of my strengths and capabilities.
   - Poor: 1
   - Adequate: 3
   - Good: 5

4. Gives me useful feedback when I do something well.
   - Poor: 1
   - Adequate: 3
   - Good: 5

5. Provides me the freedom to develop flexible and effective counseling styles.
   - Poor: 1
   - Adequate: 3
   - Good: 5

6. Encourages and listens to my ideas and suggestions for developing my counseling skills.
   - Poor: 1
   - Adequate: 3
   - Good: 5

7. Provides suggestions for developing my counseling skills.
   - Poor: 1
   - Adequate: 3
   - Good: 5

8. Helps me understand the implications and dynamics of the counseling approaches I use.
   - Poor: 1
   - Adequate: 3
   - Good: 5

9. Encourages me to use new and different techniques when appropriate.
   - Poor: 1
   - Adequate: 3
   - Good: 5

10. Is spontaneous and flexible in the supervisory sessions.
     - Poor: 1
     - Adequate: 3
     - Good: 5

11. Helps me define and achieve specific concrete goals for myself during the practicum experience.
    - Poor: 1
    - Adequate: 3
    - Good: 5

12. Gives me useful feedback when I do something wrong.
    - Poor: 1
    - Adequate: 3
    - Good: 5

13. Allows me to discuss problems I encounter in my practicum setting.
    - Poor: 1
    - Adequate: 3
    - Good: 5

14. Pays appropriate amount of attention to both me and my clients.
    - Poor: 1
    - Adequate: 3
    - Good: 5

* Printed by permission from Dr. Harold Heckney, Assistant Professor, Purdue University. This form was designed by two graduate students based upon material from Counseling Strategies and Objectives by H. Heckney and S. Nye, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1973. This form originally was printed in Chapter 10 of the Practice Manual for Counseling and Psychotherapy by K. Dunick and F. Kruis, Accelerated Development, Muncie, IN, 1980.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Focuses on both verbal and nonverbal behavior in me and in my clients.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Helps me define and maintain ethical behavior in counseling and case management.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Encourages me to engage in professional behavior.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Maintains confidentiality in material discussed in supervisory sessions.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Deals with both content and effect when supervising.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Focuses on the implications, consequences, and contingencies of specific behaviors in counseling and supervision.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Helps me organize relevant case data in planning goals and strategies with my client.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Helps me to formulate a theoretically sound rationale of human behavior.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Offers resource information when I request or need it.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Helps me develop increased skill in critiquing and gaining insight from my counseling tapes.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Allows and encourages me to evaluate myself.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Explains his/her criteria for evaluation clearly and in behavioral terms.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Applies his/her criteria fairly in evaluating my counseling performance.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS**

---

**Date**  
Signature of practicum student/mentee

My signature indicates that I have read the above report and have discussed the content with my supervisee. It does not necessarily indicate that I agree with the report in part or in whole.

---

**Date**  
Signature of supervi

Instructions for submitting this form.
Appendix G
Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey

Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey

Thank you for agreeing to complete this brief 10 minute survey. There are 35 questions. Your responses will provide valuable insight into the unique challenges and needs of site supervisors of school counseling interns. Your involvement is voluntary, and you may opt out at any time.

By completing this survey you acknowledge that you have read and understand the following and agree to participate in this research:

“Supervision Training among School Counseling Internship Supervisors: Does it Matter?”

Principal Investigator: John Laux, PhD (faculty), 419-530-4705; Leslie Neyland, MA, (student investigator), 419-508-1337
IRB Approval #20045

Purpose: You are invited to participate in the research project entitled, “Supervision Training among School Counseling Internship Supervisors: Does it Matter?” which is being conducted at the University of Toledo under the direction of John Laux, PhD and Leslie Neyland, MA. The purpose of this study is to determine if having formal training in supervision increases the competency of school counseling site supervisors.

Description of Procedures: This research study will take place at CACREP accredited school counseling programs in the state of Ohio and participants will be asked to complete an online survey that will take no more than 10 minutes to complete. Participants will receive a link to the online survey via email. The survey will include 35 questions about your level of confidence in providing supervision to school counseling interns, training and demographic information.

Potential Risks: There are minimal risks to participation in this study, including loss of confidentiality. Answering surveys may cause you to feel anxious or uncomfortable. If this happens, you may choose to stop taking the survey and not participate in this study.

Potential Benefits: The only direct benefit to you if you participate in this research may be that your voice will be used to gain a better understanding of the training needs of school counseling site supervisors as it relates to providing supervision to interns and this research will yield data that will assist school counseling programs and professional associations in creating appropriate training opportunities for site supervisors that will enhance the internship experience for our next generation of school counselors.

Confidentiality: The researchers will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you provided this information, or what that information is. The consent forms with signatures will be kept separate from responses, which will not include names and which will be presented to others only when combined with other responses. Although we will make every effort to protect your confidentiality, there is a low risk that this might be breached.
Voluntary Participation: Your refusal to participate in this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled and will not affect your relationship with The University of Toledo or the institution in which you are currently supervising a school counseling intern from. In addition, you may discontinue participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits.

Contact Information: Before you decide to accept this invitation to take part in this study, you may ask any questions that you might have. If you have any questions at any time before, during or after your participation you should contact a member of the research team (John Laux, PhD 419-530-4705)

Email of Participant: (Participant email is required for coding purposes. No identifying information will be shared in any presentation of data. Please provide the email in which you were contacted)

This section collects data regarding your confidence in your ability to carry out various aspects of the site supervision of school counseling interns.

Please honestly rate your confidence level using the following scale where 1 is "Needs Development" and 6 is "Expert".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Development</th>
<th>Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to coordinate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an effective internship experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to describe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my school's needs, standards, procedures,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and policies to my intern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Development</td>
<td>Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability during supervision to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ME AND MY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERN (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, minority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifestyle, disability, learning style, motivational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style, experience, theoretical orientation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to DESCRIBE THE ELEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF VARIOUS MODELS OF SUPERVISION (e.g., roles, areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of focus, techniques).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to ASSIST MY INTERN TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORM PROFESSIONALLY AND ETHICALLY AS A SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELING INTERN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to DESCRIBE THE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to GIVE MY INTERN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE FEEDBACK.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to GIVE MY INTERN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE FEEDBACK.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to describe the characteristics of an effective supervisory working alliance (Bordin’s bond, goals, tasks).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to use support interventions appropriate to my intern’s developmental stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to use challenge interventions appropriate to my intern’s developmental stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability during supervision, to address the relationship dynamics between me and my intern (e.g. power, parallel process, resistance, transference, trust, intimacy, responsibility).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability during evaluation to address my intern’s anxiety, differences in perceptions, and deficient performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to describe my personal model of supervision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For this section please indicate the hours of clinical supervision training you have received by selecting the corresponding number of training hours for each of the following.

In service (e.g. half day = 4 hours; 1 day = 8 hours)
- None
- Hours

Number of Hours

State or National conference (e.g. one 50-minute workshop = 1 hour; half day = 4 hours; 1 day = 8 hours)
- None
- Hours

Number of Hours

Training at intern's university (e.g. one 50-minute workshop = 1 hour; half day = 4 hours; 1 day = 8 hours)
- None
- Hours

Number of Hours
Unit or Module in a master’s program course (e.g. two 3-hour classes = 6 hours)

- None
- Hours

Number of hours

Graduate level course in supervision (e.g. 3 semester credits = 45 hours; 3 quarter credits = 30 hours)

- None
- Hours

Number of hours

Other (Please list setting and hours if applicable.)

This section collects demographic data.

Please select the answers that best describe you.

Gender

- Male
- Female
- Transgender

Age

- 20-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 +
Race/Ethnicity: (Select all that apply)

- African American/Black
- Asian American/Pacific Islander
- Biracial/Multiracial American
- European American/White
- Latina/o American/Hispanic
- Native American/American Indian

Other (please specify) 

Grade level at which you currently practice as a school counseling site supervisor: (Select all that apply)

- Elementary School
- Middle School
- High School
- Multilevel School
- Alternative School

Other (please specify) 

Including this year, how many years have you worked PART TIME as a school counselor?

- 0 years. I have only worked FULL time as a school counselor.
- 0 years. I am not a school counselor.
- Years PART time 

Number of years 

Including this year, how many years have you worked FULL TIME as a school counselor?

- 0 years. I have only worked PART time as a school counselor.
- 0 years. I am not a school counselor.
- Years FULL time 

Number of years 

Including this year, how many master's level school counseling interns have you supervised?
State in which you currently work as a school counseling site supervisor.

Certificate(s) and/or License(s) you currently hold. (Select all that apply.)

- State Certified or State Licensed School Counselor
- National Certified Counselor (NCC)
- National Certified School Counselor (NC3C)
- National Certified Career Counselor (NCCC)
- State Certified or State Licensed School Psychologist
- Licensed Professional Counselor
- Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist
- None
- Other (please specify)

Please rate your confidence level using the following scale where 1 is “needs development” and 6 is “expert” when providing supervision to interns regarding the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Development</th>
<th>Export</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case conceptualization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prev  Done