


12-2020

Evaluating School Counseling Site Supervisors' Level of Preparedness to Supervise

Amanda G. Stuckey
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Counseling Psychology Commons](#), [Counselor Education Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Citation

Stuckey, A. G. (2020). Evaluating School Counseling Site Supervisors' Level of Preparedness to Supervise. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations* Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/3878>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu.

Evaluating School Counseling Site Supervisors' Level of Preparedness to Supervise

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Counselor Education

by

Amanda G. Stuckey
Northeastern State University
Bachelor of Arts in Psychology, 2009
Northeastern State University
Master of Education in School Counseling, 2013

December 2020
University of Arkansas

This dissertation is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

David D. Christian, Ph.D.
Dissertation Chair

Erin Kern Popejoy, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Kristin K. Higgins, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Allison Ames Boykin, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate school counseling site supervisors' level of preparedness to provide adequate supervision to school counselors in training and determine if any variables could predict the level of preparedness. Professional School Counselors in the United States (N=86) were asked to complete a survey about how prepared they believed themselves to assist a supervisee in developing each ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies, as well as their training and experience with the supervisory process and supervision models.

Results from this study indicate a clear need for continued training, as well as specialized training relevant to supervising in the school counseling specialty area. Statistically significant predictors of school counseling site supervisors' level of preparedness to supervise were experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model, level of education, support from a supervisee's university faculty, and whether the school counseling site supervisor graduated from a CACREP accredited counselor education program. Findings support screening of school counseling site supervisors and suggest future research and a method for the screening process. Implications for this study also support the development of targeted trainings to include the ASCA (2019a) National Model, among other relevant supervision information and updates.

© 2020 by Amanda G. Stuckey
All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgments

Although I will never be able to name the incredible amount of people who have encouraged me and lifted me up throughout the demanding and challenging process of completing a dissertation along with the coursework to earn a doctoral degree, I will begin with a simple thank you. Thank you for believing in me and for sharing a kind word and knowing just when I was on the brink of throwing in the towel.

First and foremost, I need to thank my incredible husband, Zach, and my son, Stetson. To my husband, I owe all of this to you. You sacrificed time, our time, as I spent long hours working on homework or living apart from you so that I could chase my dream. I know that it was not easy for you, although you never let me know that it was hard on you. All of the adjustments and years of putting out plans on hold so that I could do this, you carried for the both of us so that I did not focus on the negative aspects. You saw and handled all the tears of frustration and exhaustion. Thank you for understanding and encouraging me through all of this. Stetson, although you entered the world as I was working on my dissertation, your presence has and continues to inspire me. You make me smile every day and bring me the deepest joy. I always want you to remember that you can do anything if you set your mind to it and you are willing to put forth the hard work and dedication required to accomplish the task. So many people believed in me throughout this journey. I will always believe in you throughout your journey.

To all of my family, thank you. Mom, when you opened the world of books to me, you also taught me to love and value education. You and dad always said that education was one thing that no one could ever take from you. So, I have chased excellence and pushed myself beyond what I thought myself capable of doing. Candice, thank you for believing in me and for

telling me that you, as my older sister, also looked up to me for all of my hard work and accomplishments. It helped make it feel worth it, when I was struggling. Kaitlyn, thank you for the cheesy conversations and encouragement. You helped me laugh and know that this was for greater purpose than just getting another degree. I hope you have seen the good from my experience so that you can chase your dreams and know that you can do absolutely anything you set your mind to. Bea, I'm including you here, because after all we have shared through the years, you feel like family. Thank you for believing in me and pushing me. I will never forget Ireland and how you ushered me to understand that I could impact the world and counseling profession in a bigger way than I imagined at the time. You have been so much more than a mentor through the years.

Thank you to my incredible advisor, chair, and mentor, Dr. Christian, thank you for your patience and for always knowing when to push me to grow and when to simply listen. Through your supervision and advisement, I became more grounded in my theoretical orientation and grew in professional confidence. To my esteemed committee, Dr. Ames, Dr. Popejoy, and Dr. Higgins, thank you for always being ready with encouragement and honest feedback. You made this process much more bearable and less intimidating.

To all of the other people who believed in me that I did not mention, thank you. I have had many incredible people cross my path in the last few years. I cannot imagine completing this part of my journey without all of you.

Dedication

Dad, every tear and ounce of energy I have poured into this dissertation is dedicated to you. I wish you were here to see me complete this leg of my journey. I believe you would be very proud of me. I picture you smiling as you say, "that's my girl". You taught me to never give up, even when things seemed impossible. This one is for you.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Significance of the Study	5
Conclusion.....	6
Chapter 2: Literature Review	7
School Counseling.....	7
History	7
American School Counseling Association	9
National Model	9
Define.....	10
Manage.....	11
Deliver.....	11
Assess.....	13
Domains	13
Academic	13
Career	14
Social/emotional	14
Training of School Counselors.....	14
CACREP	16
ASCA.....	17
Integration of Knowledge and Skill.....	19
Supervision.....	19
Types of Supervision	20
Administrative.....	20
Programmatic	21
Clinical	22
Supervision Models	22
Developmental Models	22

Process Models	23
Orientation-Specific Models	24
School Counseling Supervision Models.....	24
Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems Model.....	25
The School Counseling Supervision Model	26
Site Supervision.....	26
Training of Site Supervisors	27
Site Supervisors Perceived Level of Preparedness	28
Conclusion.....	30
Chapter 3: Methodology	31
Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	31
Participants	32
Definition of Terms.....	34
Development of Survey/Instrument	36
Procedures	36
Recruitment of Participants	36
Informed Consent	37
Analysis of Data	37
Data Screening.....	39
Assumptions for Ordinal Logistic Regression.....	39
Assumptions for Multiple Regression	40
Power Analyses	41
Chapter 4: Results.....	42
Validity.....	42
Outliers	42
Reliability	43
Research Question 1	43
Research Question 2.....	45
Research Question 3.....	46
Research Question 4.....	48
Research Question 5.....	52

Mindset	52
Behavior: Professional Foundation	53
Behavior: Direct and Indirect Student Services	55
Behavior: Planning and Assessment	57
Chapter 5: Discussion	60
Research Question 1	60
Research Question 2	62
Research Question 3	63
Research Question 4	65
Research Question 5	66
Implications for Practice	69
Methodological Implications	72
Implications for Research	73
Limitations	74
Conclusion	76
References	77
Appendices	84
A. Informed Consent	84
B. IRB Approval	86
C. Survey	87
D. Recruitment Materials	103

List of Tables

Table 1: Program Demographics of Contacted Institutions by ACES Region	33
Table 2: Demographics of the Sample Population	34
Table 3: Cronbach Coefficients of Composite Scores	43
Table 4: Frequency of Training in Supervision Models	44
Table 5: Categorized Frequency of Training in Supervision Models.....	44
Table 6: Frequency of Training Methods in Supervision Processes.....	45
Table 7: Categorized Frequency of Training Methods in Supervision Processes	46
Table 8: Frequency of Supervision Models Utilized by School Counseling Site Supervisors.....	47
Table 9: Categorized Frequency of Supervision Models Utilized by School Counseling Site Supervisors.....	48
Table 10: Results of the Multicollinearity Assumption between Independent Variables	50
Table 11: Test of Parallel Lines	51
Table 12: Results of Ordinal Logistic Regression Full Model Maximum Likelihood Estimates .51	
Table 13: Regression Coefficients of Demographic and Support Variables on composite ASCA Mindset Standards and Competencies Score	53
Table 14: Regression Coefficients of Demographic and Support Variables on composite ASCA Professional Foundation Behaviors Standards and Competencies Score	55
Table 15: Regression Coefficients of Demographic and Support Variables on composite ASCA Direct and Indirect Student Service Behaviors Standards and Competencies Score.....	57
Table 16: Regression Coefficients of Demographic and Support Variables on composite ASCA Planning and Assessment Behaviors Standards and Competencies Score	59

Chapter 1: Introduction

During many graduate counseling programs, students are required to complete a designated number of hours in supervised field-based experience to demonstrate successful application of knowledge gained through completion of coursework. This completion of hours showing proficiency is typically supervised by a faculty member or other designated supervisor. These supervised experiences are referred to as supervised practicum and internship in the counseling profession. However, professionals may choose to extend supervised experiences beyond graduate coursework.

In the field of counselor education, supervision is a highly valued process in which future counselors integrate and apply the knowledge and skills gained throughout coursework. This integration process allows counselors to understand and adjust to the discrepancies inherent in real-life application of knowledge gained through the graduate program (Moss et al., 2014). Further, regardless of the specialty area, supervision is a vital component to all training programs (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Dedication to the supervisory process is crucial to maintaining the profession's ethical standards (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). National and state regulatory boards along with professional credentialing and accrediting bodies rely on mandated supervision to ensure only those practicing with sound knowledge, skills, and ethics are allowed into the mental health profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Brott et al., 2017; Cinotti, 2014; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006).

Supervisors and counselor educators are charged with protecting the integrity of the counseling profession by providing experiences throughout the supervision process in which future counselors integrate their knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to practice ethically and competently (Brown et al., 2018). There are three specific forms of supervision in the counselor

education field. The three forms include administrative, programmatic, and clinical supervision (Brott et al., 2017; Roberts & Borders, 1994). Ideal supervision practices should include a combination of all three types of supervision (Brott et al., 2017). The Council of Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2016) provides minimal requirements for counselor education programs to maintain in order to provide necessary gatekeeping practices during supervised practicum and internship experiences of counselors in training (CITs). However, counselor education programs may choose to implement additional requirements for supervised experiences, including training, experience, and credentials of approved site supervisors.

CACREP (2016) also outlines minimum requirements for specialty areas of counseling, including school counseling. Since the school counseling profession has evolved throughout the years to meet the needs of students and stakeholders, it is important that supervised experiences address the complex roles and responsibilities of a school counselor (Gysbers, 2016; Luke & Bernard, 2006). The first school counselors were teachers and school administrators, with no formal training in the conceptualized role of a school counselor (Cook, 2008; Gysbers, 2016; Henderson & Gysbers, 2006). The development of national organizations and a framework for providing a comprehensive school counseling program to meet the needs of all students has allowed the roles and responsibilities of a school counselor to be more clearly defined (ASCA, 2019a; Erford, 2019; Gysbers, 2016). Supervision of school CITs is the next area that needs to evolve. Counselor educators have a need to better understand how to train supervisors of school CITs. A better understanding of the training needs can ensure school CITs are provided with opportunities to fully integrate and apply the knowledge and skills obtained through coursework.

Site supervisors are essential to school CITs' supervised experiences. The complex roles of a school counselor are further complicated by the intricate networks which are characteristic of the school environment (Erford, 2019). Site supervisors guide school CITs as they work to apply the American School Counselor Association's (ASCA, 2019a) National Model, understand the difference between direct and indirect services, provide consultation to school faculty and other stakeholders, and learn to understand and navigate the complex networks and culture of a school environment (CACREP, 2016). Without opportunities to apply knowledge and skills related to their counseling specialty area, school CITs lack practical understanding necessary for ethical and competent practice. CACREP accredited school counseling programs provide this experience to school CITs through required on-site supervision with a fully credentialed school counselor with at least two years of experience (CACREP, 2016). Training site supervisors for adequate supervision is essential to guarantee school CITs are provided with real-life opportunities to integrate and apply knowledge and skills for ethical and competent practice.

Statement of the Problem

Although CACREP accredited counselor education programs require site supervisors to receive "relevant training in counseling supervision" (CACREP, 2016, p. 15) prior to providing supervision, formal training in supervision models, techniques, and methods is traditionally reserved for students in doctoral counselor education programs (Studer, 2005). Many school counseling site supervisors do not have formal training in supervision models and techniques (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011). The lack of formal training in the three forms of supervision leaves school counseling site supervisors unprepared to provide adequate supervision (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; Stickel, 1995). Brott et al. (2017) discovered that due to the lack of training, most school counseling site supervisors rely on professional experiences to provide learning

opportunities believed to be of value for school CITs. Overreliance on past supervision experiences without adequate formal supervision training has the potential to perpetuate a cycle of inadequate supervision as some roles and responsibilities of a school counselor may be overlooked or inadequately addressed (Duncan et al., 2014; Magnuson et al., 2001). Further, when supervisors receive formal training in supervision models and techniques, the context is often more suited for a clinical mental health setting (Bultsma, 2012). Thorough research has concluded that models designed for clinical mental health supervision alone, fail to meet the complex needs of school CITs and school counseling site supervisors (Bultsma, 2012; Devlin et al., 2009; Luke & Bernard, 2006).

While literature describes the lack of training in supervision models and techniques, there is a deficit in the literature to describe how prepared school counseling site supervisors believe they are to provide adequate supervision to school CITs (Cigrand & Wood, 2011). Many factors such as years of experience, amount of varied work experience, support from school CITs program faculty, and exposure to the ASCA (2019a) National Model contribute to the perceived level of preparedness held by school counseling site supervisors (Page et al., 2001; Studer & Oberman, 2006). These factors are amplified by the lack of exposure to formal supervision models and techniques as well as how supervision models are applied in the school counseling profession (Cigrand & Wood, 2011; Peterson & Deuschle, 2006). Some research indicates that school counseling site supervisors who do not receive formal supervision training often avoid supervising school CITs completely (Cigrand & Wood, 2011).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation was three-fold. One purpose was to examine the perceived level of preparedness school counseling site supervisors have for providing school

CITs adequate supervision experiences. Second, was to explore which variables predict higher levels of preparedness, including formal education, years of professional experience, supervision training, support and communication with school CITs program faculty, and exposure to the ASCA National Model. The final purpose was to discover which supervision models school counseling site supervisors have training in, exposure to, and experience using, and the methods in which they received supervision training.

To accomplish this purpose, a survey was administered to determine school counseling site supervisors perceived level of preparedness to provide adequate supervision experiences to school CITs. Demographic information including exposure to supervision training and pertinent work experience was also collected. After all data were collected, descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were performed to address each research question thoroughly.

Significance of the Study

Counselor educators with an understanding of which training methods best prepare school counseling site supervisors to provide adequate supervision will inform how CACREP accredited programs train site supervisors in the future (Cigrand & Wood, 2011; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Further, understanding demographic variables related to adequate supervision may lead to counselor educators making informed decisions about increasing requirements of school counseling site supervisors. Counselor educators may also develop a standardized supervision training method that meets the needs of school counseling site supervisors. Counselor educators' ability to meet the needs of school counseling site supervisors can help to foster relationships between counselor educators and school counselors in the community (Magnuson et al., 2001). Reputation of school counseling training programs and learning opportunities for school CITs

will be increased by the ability to sufficiently prepare school counseling site supervisors for the process of supervision (Brott et al., 2017; Magnuson et al., 2001).

A systemic issue related to the preparation of future school counselors is the lack of a required supervised experience, post-master's degree. Clinical mental health counselors and most other positions within the mental health profession require a period of supervised experience to ensure competent and ethical practice (Bultsma, 2012). By understanding how to best prepare new professionals in the field, advancements in training methods can be incorporated into regulatory board requirements for school counselors (Stickel, 1995). To safeguard the integrity of the school counseling profession, it is crucial that adequate supervision be defined and studied (Brott et al., 2017). This study provides a timely inspection of school counseling site supervisor supervision practices and training methods. This study explores the best ways to train and prepare school counseling site supervisors for the supervision process.

Conclusion

This study informs best practices regarding training of school counseling site supervisors that is both time efficient and pertinent to providing adequate supervision experiences to school CITs. Further, this study offers necessary information about supervision training requirements which could lead to data-driven decisions about advocating for post-master's supervision of credentialed school counselors. By understanding more about supervision experiences of school CITs and novice school counselors, state and national organizations can develop enhanced gatekeeping practices to ensure ethical and competent professionals enter the field. In conclusion, this study explores variables which impact the preparedness and training of school counseling site supervisors.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Site supervisors provide a unique service to school CITs by allowing for the supervised integration of knowledge and skill gained in a master's degree training program. Site supervisors also provide the guidance necessary for school CITs to understand school culture and climate. In this section, I review the literature regarding the history and function of school counseling, the ASCA (2019a) National Model, and key concepts related to school counseling. Next, I explore the unique needs and training requirements of school counselors. Then, I focus on the role site supervisors play in preparing school CITs for transition into employment as well as supervision models used in supervising school CITs. Finally, I provide an overview of the current models of supervision designed specifically for supervising school CITs.

School Counseling

According to the CACREP standards (2016), school counseling is considered a specialty area within the counseling profession. School counseling is a complex profession that involves the constant evaluation of needs within schools, communities, and society. School counselors strive to design and implement comprehensive counseling programs that meet the needs of all students and school stakeholders (Erford, 2019). Due to the constant evaluation of needs, school counselors adapt comprehensive counseling programs to better serve the needs of students, remove barriers to their success (ASCA, 2019a; Erford, 2019).

History

From the first conceptualized ideas of school counselor duties to modern roles and responsibilities, school counselors have adapted to meet societal demands and specific needs of students (Erford, 2019; Rhodes, 2010). The first major adaptation occurred at the beginning of the twentieth century; when families migrated to cities in search of work as a result of the

Industrial Revolution (Baker, 1992; Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). With a more diverse student population, urban teachers and administrators began to provide students with information about career choices (Gysbers, 2016, 2010). Thus, the guidance movement began, introducing the title of vocational or guidance counselor (Erford, 2019). When school counseling training programs began to emerge, many were conducted by faculty with clinical mental health backgrounds, adding an attention to social/emotional development (Christian & Brown, 2018). As the roles and responsibilities of the profession continued to evolve, ASCA called for the title of vocational or guidance counselor to be changed to professional school counselor (Christian & Brown, 2018; Erford, 2019). This new title encompassed the complex roles of counselor, consultant, academic advisor, and social justice advocate (Erford, 2019). ASCA (2017) called for school counseling programs to be comprehensive, developmentally appropriate, and preventative while ensuring needs of all students and stakeholders are met.

As a result of the changing profession, school counselors have continued to adapt their roles to meet the needs of all students and the evolving school environment (Cinotti, 2014; Cook, 2008; Gysbers, 2010). With the original school counselors being educators and administrators within the school, without mental health training, it has continued to be a challenge for school counselors to assert themselves as the mental health professionals within the school environment (Cinotti, 2014). Perceptions of school counselors' roles and responsibilities needed to adapt to fit the evolving profession (Erford, 2019). For this to happen, school counselors needed a professional organization that served to provide training and advocacy for the appropriate school counseling roles and responsibilities as defined by the needs of students and the ever-changing climate of society (Cinotti, 2014; Erford, 2019).

American School Counseling Association

One of the most important changes in the profession of school counseling was the establishment of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA). ASCA was founded in 1952 as an extension of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (Erford, 2019). With the development of ASCA, school counselors had a unique voice to help distinguish them from teachers and administrators (Erford, 2019). ASCA provided support and clarification to the appropriate roles and functions of school counselors (ASCA, 2019a; Erford, 2019; Gysbers, 2016). Modern school counselors strive to provide “a holistic approach emphasizing attention to all three areas,” which include academic, career, and social/emotional development (ASCA, 2019a, p. vii).

The school counseling profession has consistently evolved to meet the needs of all students (Erford, 2019). The constant state of evolution has led to continued misconceptions and ambiguities related to the appropriate roles and responsibilities of professional school counselors (Gysbers, 2016). Some of these misconceptions include the school counselor serving as a librarian of resources, disciplinarian, and testing coordinator (Erford, 2019; Gysbers, 2016). The ASCA (2019a) National Model provides a framework for understanding the appropriate roles and responsibilities of school counselors within the context of making data driven decisions to address unique needs of the school.

National Model

The first version of the ASCA (2019a) National Model was published in 2003. Much like the profession, the ASCA (2019a) National Model has seen changes and updates to address the changing needs and provide support to professional school counselors (Erford, 2019; Hatch, 2014). The ASCA (2019a) National Model is currently in its fourth edition and continues to

provide a framework for school counselors to create comprehensive school counseling programs ensuring access of services to all students within a school setting. The National Model created a way for school counselors to demonstrate accountability for their time and services provided to students (Hatch, 2014). In its current edition, the ASCA (2019a) National Model includes four components: define, manage, deliver, and assess.

Define. The define component of the National Model includes the three standards which define the profession of school counseling. The first standard refers to the ASCA Mindsets and Behaviors for student success (ASCA, 2014a; 2019a). The mindsets and behaviors for student success define the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that promote student success in academic, career, and social/emotional domains (ASCA, 2014a). These student standards provide the measure of accountability to assess how well students have met the thirty-five standards defined in the document (Hatch, 2014). School counselors can operationalize the student standards by writing competencies in the comprehensive school counseling program to define how students will demonstrate each standard has been met (ASCA, 2019a; Hatch, 2014). The second standard included in the define component are the ASCA (2016) Ethical Standards for school counselors. The ethical standards define the principles of behavior required to “maintain the highest standard of integrity, leadership, and professionalism” (ASCA, 2019a, p. 15). School counselors follow these ethical standards to protect students and themselves in all decision-making processes (Erford, 2019). The third standard in the define component is the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies, which define the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required of school counselors to meet the “rigorous demands of the school counseling profession and pre-K-12 students’ needs” (ASCA, 2019a, p. 5). School counselors, school administrators, site supervisors, counselor educators, and many other stakeholders who are

involved in the evaluation of school counselors may use these standards (Erford, 2019). Each behavior competency has a related, measurable indicator to assess the level to which school counselors meet each competency (ASCA, 2019c).

Manage. The manage component of the ASCA (2019a) National Model includes the assessments and tools necessary to implement and manage a comprehensive school counseling program. This includes belief, mission, and vision statements that describe the focus of the program, action plans for delivering the comprehensive school counseling program, lesson plans, calendars, use of time instruments, and other necessary documentation (ASCA, 2019a). The manage component provides the organizational structures and assessments necessary to implement and manage a comprehensive school counseling program (Erford, 2019). A vision statement describes the main goal of the comprehensive school counseling program while the mission statement provides the direction necessary to reach the vision (Dimmitt & Carey, 2007). The manage component contains data collection and analysis procedures in which to make data-informed decisions (ASCA, 2019a). In order for school counselors to address the complex needs of all students with a single comprehensive program, school counselors must make data-informed decisions about planning of activities, strategies, and interventions (ASCA, 2019a; Hatch, 2014). The detailed planning that takes place is essential to assess data collected and make decisions based on careful analysis of data (Hatch, 2014).

Deliver. The deliver component defines the method of implementation of the comprehensive school counseling program. This includes the direct and indirect services provided to students (ASCA, 2019a; Erford, 2019). Direct services provided to students are organized into three categories: instruction, appraisal and advisement, and counseling (ASCA, 2017). Instruction consists of lessons to deliver curriculum of the comprehensive school

counseling program to students and may occur in small groups, classrooms, or individual sessions (ASCA, 2019a). Appraisal includes the assessment of students' abilities, strengths, and interests in either small group, classroom, or individual settings (ASCA, 2019a). Advisement includes planning based on the results of appraisal to help students create plans and goals for their futures that primarily occur through individual sessions (ASCA, 2019a). Counseling includes individual or small group counseling interventions based on counseling theories and techniques, aimed at promoting student success and the removal of barriers (ASCA, 2019a; Erford, 2019). Counseling services may be preventative or responsive in nature (ASCA, 2019a; Dimmitt & Carey, 2007).

Indirect services provided to students are also organized into three categories: consultation, collaboration, and referrals (ASCA, 2019a; Erford, 2019). Consultation services include the advisement and recommendations made to teachers, parents, administrators, and other stakeholders who can support student success (ASCA, 2019a). School counselors serve as the experts in academic achievement, college and career readiness, and social/emotional development (Erford, 2019). Collaboration includes the partnerships with stakeholders to best support student success and, more explicitly, the goals of the comprehensive school counseling program (ASCA, 2019a). Collaboration activities include teaming with school staff, serving on school district committees, implementation of parent workshops, establishing community partnerships, and performing crisis response duties (ASCA, 2019a). Referrals are indirect services provided when the needs of a student are beyond the scope or responsibility of the school counselor role (ASCA, 2019a; Erford, 2019). Referrals may be made for tutoring, counseling services, college planning, or other identified needs (ASCA, 2019a).

Assess. The assess component contains the methods of assessment utilized to determine the effectiveness of the comprehensive school counseling program, inform improvements, and provide support for the continued implementation of the program (ASCA, 2019a). The assess component includes methods of program evaluation to ensure data driven decisions inform interventions designed to achieve the mission and vision of the school counseling program (ASCA, 2019a; Hatch, 2014). Program evaluation methods are utilized to “measure the impact or effectiveness of a school counseling program’s activities and to gain information that can be used for program improvement” (Hatch, 2014, p. 73). Three types of data are examined throughout the assess component: process, perception, and results data (ASCA, 2019a). Process data provides the descriptive information about the event, which includes what the school counselor did (Hatch, 2014). Perception data provides information about what happens because of the event, which includes what the student learned (Hatch, 2014). While results data provide the detailed big picture of what occurred as a result of the intervention provided, which includes how classroom behavior has changed as a result of the intervention implemented (Hatch, 2014). School counselors are also responsible for assessing their own knowledge, skills, and attitudes to focus their professional development appropriately (ASCA, 2019a).

Domains. The ASCA National Model focuses on providing services to students in three domains: academic, career, and social/emotional (ASCA, 2019a). These domains are “broad areas of knowledge base that promote and enhance the learning process” (ASCA, 2019a, p. 148).

Academic. The academic domain includes all activities and strategies that enhance each student’s ability to learn (ASCA, 2014a; Galassi & Akos, 2012). The goal of interventions in the academic domain promote academic success for all students (ASCA, 2019a). An example of academic interventions would be individual meetings with students who are failing one or more

courses. School counselors work to remove barriers to the academic development of students (O'Connor, 2018).

Career. The career domain encompasses school counselors' efforts to assist students in career exploration, career preparedness, and understanding the work to school connection (ASCA, 2014a). The career domain has been an essential component of the school counseling profession since its inception (O'Connor, 2018). Interventions in the career domain promote students' acquisition of knowledge and skills related to the school to work transition (ASCA, 2019a). An example of an intervention in the career domain is a career fair for students to interact with members of the community in various careers.

Social/emotional. The social/emotional domain encompasses all behaviors of the school counselor to assist students with managing their emotions and apply interpersonal skills, such as character development (ASCA, 2014a). The primary goal of interventions in the social/emotional domain promote social growth as students navigate through development into adulthood (ASCA, 2019a). An example of an intervention in the social/emotional domain includes classroom lessons about bullying. Interventions in the social/emotional domain impact the school climate (O'Connor, 2018).

Training of School Counselors

When the school counseling profession was developed, it was difficult to distinguish the unique roles of the school counselor from teachers and administrators in the school (Erford, 2019). This was largely due to school counseling positions being held by teachers and school administrators without any specialized training (Cook, 2008; Henderson & Gysbers, 2006). As the school counseling profession shifted, standardized roles and responsibilities for school counselors began to emerge (Gysbers, 2016). With the development of formal training programs

for school counselors, the roles became further distinguished (Cinotti, 2014; Erford, 2019).

These formal training programs were primarily taught by faculty members with backgrounds in clinical mental health, which may have contributed to the shift from the traditional focus of the school counseling profession to one that incorporated social/emotional development (Christian & Brown, 2018). The holistic view of student is the foundation for modern school counselor training. Modern school counselors receive training in academic, career, and social/emotional domains as well as theories, methods, and techniques of counseling to prepare to meet the varied needs of students in a school environment (ASCA, 2014b).

School counselors are essential to the mission of schools to promote equity and access to challenging curriculum and educational experiences for all students (ASCA, 2019a). It can be difficult to define the many responsibilities and tasks of school counselors because of the variance between schools, districts, and states (Erford, 2019). Only school counselors are uniquely qualified and trained to work in educational settings with students who display varying issues related to academic, career, and social/emotional needs (Dollarhide & Saginak, 2006; Mason & Perera-Diltz, 2010). All school counselors strive to address the academic, career, and social/emotional needs for all students (ASCA, 2019c). Because school counselors provide individual and small group counseling to promote student success in the three domains of the ASCA (2019a) National Model, school counselors are trained in counseling theories, techniques, and interventions while receiving training specific to school counseling (CACREP, 2016). School counselors are required to hold a minimum of a master's degree in school counseling or other qualifying degree as well as meet additional state mandated requirements for certification (ASCA, 2015).

Initially, school counselors were teachers and administrators without formal training in counseling methods (Rhodes, 2010). As the profession began to take shape with specific roles and responsibilities, training programs emerged. Early training programs focused on career development as part of the vocational guidance movement (ASCA, 2019a; Rhodes, 2010). Training programs then met the need to address standardized testing by including training in administering educational assessments (Erford, 2019). Modern school counselors receive training in the specific skills and knowledge of clinical mental health counseling while learning specifically about the complex roles and responsibilities required of school counselors (CACREP, 2016). School counselors in training currently have a national organization, model to use as a framework for services, information about accountability, data usage, and formal procedures to guide their professional development (ASCA, 2019a; Erford, 2019). To ensure ethical and competent school counselors enter the field, school CITs should be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and attitudes described in the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies throughout their supervised practicum and internship experiences.

CACREP

CACREP established core training standards to which all accredited programs minimally adhere in order to provide quality, reputable training for CITs (CACREP, 2016). CACREP promotes counselor development and commitment to professionalism with the core standards (Gibson et al., 2012). CACREP accreditation ensures a program meets standards outlined by the counseling profession, which includes a minimum of sixty hours completed to earn a master's degree (CACREP, 2016).

The foundational knowledge and skills school CITs must demonstrate include the history of school counseling, varying models of school counseling programs, career development theories, models of collaboration and consultation, and educational assessments (CACREP, 2016). Counselor education programs for school counseling must develop competencies which describe how each standard is taught and assessed in the curriculum (CACREP, 2016). Counselor education programs with CACREP accredited school counseling specialty areas align with ASCA standards, competencies, and ethics (ASCA, 2019a; CACREP, 2016). Further, CACREP and ASCA are the two primary organizations that support the training and development of school counselors (Zyromski et al., 2019). Zyromski et al. (2019) noted that “as ASCA contributes to the professional attributes of theory, ethics, and culture, CACREP sets the training standards that school counselors must meet in order to refer to themselves as school counselors” (p. 2). For this reason, there is a benefit to counselor education programs utilizing ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies and other ASCA concepts to increase the rigor of the coursework and ensure CACREP (2016) standards are accurately measured to demonstrate proficiency.

ASCA

ASCA (2017) takes the position that school counselors are best prepared when training programs “align with the philosophy and vision of the ASCA National Model, ASCA School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies, ASCA Mindsets and Behaviors for Student Success, and the ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselors” (p. 62). Counselor education programs for school counseling more adequately prepare students for the complex roles of the profession by emphasizing advocacy, leadership, collaboration, and the ability to assess systemic change to best promote student success and the removal of barriers (ASCA, 2014b). ASCA

(2017) believes it to be best practice to guide school CITs through the process of developing and implementing a comprehensive school counseling program.

The professional standards and competencies of school counselors outlined by ASCA (2019c) describe the “mindsets and behaviors school counselors need to meet the rigorous demands of the school counseling profession” (p. 1). Mindsets describe the beliefs about student achievement and success held by school counselors while the behaviors outline behaviors school counselors demonstrate through implementing a school counseling program which are essential to student achievement and success (ASCA, 2019c). Behavior standards have specific corresponding competencies to describe how each behavior can be measured for achievement (ASCA, 2019c). Seven specific mindsets are described, while behavior standards are separated into three categories: professional foundation, direct and indirect student services, and planning and assessment (ASCA, 2019c). Professional foundation includes nine behavior standards which define specific skills which form the “professional orientation” of the effective school counselor (ASCA, 2019c, p. 1). Direct and indirect service behavior standards describe interactions or interventions provided to students, parents, teachers, and other stakeholders who impact students’ achievement and success (ASCA, 2019c). The planning and assessment behavior standards describe activities which school counselors must be knowledgeable in performing for the “design, implementation, and assessment of the comprehensive school counseling program (ASCA, 2019c, p. 1). While these standards and competencies provide the ideal demonstration of adequate and appropriate training in school counseling, many school CITs still describe inconsistencies between knowledge gained through coursework and their supervised experiences (Brott et al., 2017; Erford, 2019).

Integration of Knowledge and Skill

For school CITs, it is essential for counselor education programs to clearly define expected roles and responsibilities to be performed during supervised field-based practicum and internship experiences (Akos & Scarborough, 2004). While certification requirements are mandated for school counselors in each state, ASCA (2015) encourages each states' certification process to include a description of the school counselor role, minimum standards for entry into the school counseling profession, and continuing education requirements. Counselor education programs expected learning outcomes combined with minimum certification requirements guide school CITs through the process of identifying gaps that exist between knowledge obtained through coursework and the practical application of skills and attitudes (Belser, 2017; Moss et al., 2014). It is crucial that supervised field-based experiences include opportunities to understand and integrate knowledge of different grade and developmental levels as well as how environmental influences change the school counseling program mission and vision (ASCA, 2014a) and fill in the identified gaps. These experiences may be provided by both the supervisor and the counselor education program.

Supervision

Bernard and Goodyear (2019) defined supervision as the process that is “evaluative, hierarchical, extends over time, and has the purpose of enhancing the professional services offered” (p. 9). A supervisor serves as a gatekeeper for the profession, guarding against unethical practices (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Since all counselor education programs must provide CITs with a supervised experience, CACREP standards (2016) provide a framework to enhance the knowledge and skill required of specialty areas of counseling, while allowing for creativity to meet the needs of CITs. The process of supervision encourages self-awareness and professional

identity development through a constant cycle of practice and feedback (Borders, 1991). The most widely used supervision models focus on the development of clinical counseling skills required in the overarching counseling profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). A deficit exists for specialty areas, namely school counseling. It is essential for counselor education programs to address the unique needs existing for supervision of specialty areas.

CACREP (2016) requires CITs in practicum and internship to receive individual or triadic supervision performed by a site supervisor, counselor educator faculty member, or a student supervisor being supervised by a counselor educator faculty member. Individual or triadic supervision is in addition to group supervision provided by a counselor educator faculty member or a supervised student supervisor, averaging 90 minutes each week (CACREP, 2016). While the requirements for supervision remain similar for practicum and internship students, intentional focus on knowledge and skill application varies. In practicum, supervision focuses on the development of counseling skills throughout the supervised experience (CACREP, 2016). The development of skills related to the CITs specialty area is the intentional focus during internship experiences (CACREP, 2016). For this reason, site supervisors provide valuable training opportunities in which future counselors in specialty areas, such as school counseling, learn the explicit skills required to practice ethically and competently in a specific context (Brown et al., 2018).

Types of Supervision

Administrative

Administrative supervision has been defined by Brott et al. (2017) as “evaluative and generally provided by an administrator within the building” (p. 140). Bultsma (2012) described administrative supervision as focusing on “daily administrative activities school counselors

perform” (p. 10). While ASCA (2019b) describes the ideal supervision as provided by certified school counselors, in some situations, administrators with little or no training in the school counseling profession provide the required site supervision for school CITs’ field-based practicum and internship experiences. Page et al. (2001) found an overwhelming majority of school counselors preferred to be supervised by practicing school counselors. Administrative supervision provided by practicing school counselors is important for school CITs because it provides a focus on the daily administrative duties school counselors may be asked to perform in the school setting (Brott et al., 2017). An understanding of these daily activities may allow school CITs the ability to advocate for themselves in future professional situations. Although important, it is not sufficient to meet the diverse needs of school CITs.

Programmatic

Programmatic supervision is led by a school counselor site supervisor or a director of school counseling and oversees the delivery of a comprehensive school counseling program (Brott et al., 2017). This type of supervision allows school CITs to better understand how to create and implement a comprehensive school counseling program. Further, programmatic supervision allows the school CIT to engage in program evaluation practices and engage in data driven decisions (Brott et al., 2017). While vital for school CITs to fill in gaps of knowledge and skill related to the various roles and responsibilities of the profession, it is not, alone, sufficient for adequate supervision. Programmatic supervision encompasses the additional roles beyond counseling and the administrative or cultural aspects of a school environment that school CITs experience.

Clinical

Clinical supervision, the rarest form of supervision provided to school counselors, is typically offered by supervisors who are licensed professional counselors (Bultsma, 2012; Cinotti, 2014). Clinical supervision focuses on “ethical counseling practice and intentional induction into the profession” (Brott et al., 2017, p. 140). Clinical supervision is necessary to the development of essential counseling skills with the increased importance and promotion of mental health for all students. Performing only clinical supervision is not sufficient for the training of school counselors, since the majority of their time is spent providing direct and indirect services beyond individual counseling (Akos & Scarbrough, 2004). For example, clinical supervision is not designed to address conducting classroom guidance lessons, developing a crisis response plan, or creating a parent outreach program.

Supervision Models

Supervisors who have a strong theoretical foundation and model of supervision with which to meet the needs that arise within supervision provide more reliable and substantiated supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Three broad categories of supervision in the counselor education field include developmental models, process models, and orientation-specific models (Brott et al., 2017). Descriptions of various models follow.

Developmental Models

Developmental models of supervision focus on the “intricacies of the learning process for the supervisee” (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019, p. 51). These models are utilized to conceptualize the developmental level of the supervisee to provide developmentally appropriate feedback to address the needs of the supervisee during optimal times (Brott et al, 2017; Lambie & Sias, 2009). The most widely known developmental model is the Integrated Developmental Model

(Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010). Other developmental models include the Loganbill, Hardy, and Delworth Model (1982), Systemic Cognitive Developmental Supervision Model (Rigazio-DiGilio et al., 1997), and Ronnestad & Skovholt's (2003) Life-Span Developmental Model. Developmental models allow supervisors of school CITs to consider their level of personal and professional development in providing learning opportunities and feedback that are developmentally appropriate (Lambie & Sias, 2009).

Process Models

Process models of supervision center around the supervisory relationship and the process of supervision itself (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). In the counseling profession, some supervisors choose to utilize a process model during supervision due to the intentional choice of interventions based on the context and focus of each supervision session. The most widely used process model is the Discrimination Model developed by Bernard (1979, 1997). The Discrimination Model allows supervisors to choose from three roles and three focus areas with which to respond to a supervisee in sessions (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Roles included in the Discrimination Model include counselor, consultant, and teacher (Bernard, 1979). The original three focus areas of the Discrimination Model include personalization, intervention, and conceptualization (Bernard, 1979). Some variations of the Discrimination Model include the added fourth focus area of professional issues to include ethics and other issues that arise within the supervision process which impact CITs' ability to practice ethically and competently (Lanning, 1986). Luke and Bernard (2006) developed a supervision model integrating the Discrimination Model with unique aspects of the school counseling profession. Other process models include the Events-Based Supervision Model, The Systems Approach to Supervision Model, and the Hawkins and Shohet Model of Supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019).

Orientation-Specific Models

Theoretically based models of supervision are tied to the supervisors' counseling theoretical orientation (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Counseling theoretical orientation may be defined as "a conceptual framework used by a counselor to understand client therapeutic needs" (Poznanski & McLennan, 1995). Many of the techniques the supervisor would utilize in individual counseling are also employed during individual supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). These models are best applied to supervision when a supervisor wishes to model a specific theoretical orientation for the supervisee who closely aligns with the supervisor's particular theory, with the exception of Mahrer's (2005) Discovery-Oriented Model. Mahrer's (2005) Discovery-Oriented Model is designed to guide the supervisee through the development of their own theoretical orientation. These models of supervision are more common in clinical settings than school settings. The primary focus on providing individual or small group counseling from a strong theoretical orientation, make these models less appropriate for supervision of school CITs, due to the multiple roles and responsibilities of school counselors.

School Counseling Supervision Models

There is strong agreement among members of the counseling profession that supervision is vital to counselor education programs and the personal and professional development of CITs (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; Brott et al, 2017; Cinotti, 2014; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Erford, 2019; Page et al., 2001; Stickel, 1995). Several models for supervising school CITs have been developed. However, many site supervisors of school CITs lack the exposure and training in these school specific models (Brott et al., 2017). Further, these developed models remain conceptual (Bledsoe et al., 2019). Formal training in supervision practices typically focuses on the primary supervision models in the field of counselor education (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019).

Wood and Rayle (2006) found the primary supervision models to be lacking in their ability to address the complex roles and responsibilities school counselors will be asked to fulfill. School counselors work in multifaceted networks of students, parents, teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders (ASCA, 2019a). Supervision provides the opportunities for school CITs to develop professional behaviors necessary to successfully navigate these complex networks (Akos & Scarborough, 2004). Since many supervision models used by supervisors of school CITs lack the comprehensive application and exploration of these complex networks and multifaceted roles of school counselors, it is important for supervisors of school CITs to seek training in supervision models specific to the school setting. The two most popular supervision models specific to school counseling include the Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems Model (Wood & Rayle, 2006) and the School Counseling Supervision Model (Luke & Bernard, 2006).

Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems Model

The Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems Model developed by Wood and Rayle (2006) addresses the systemic roles and responsibilities of the school counseling profession. The theoretical foundation of this supervision model draws on the Working Alliance Model of Supervision (Bordin, 1983), the Discrimination Model (Bernard, 1979), and the Systems Approach to Supervision Model (Holloway, 1995). Wood and Rayle (2006) utilized the concept of mutual agreements from the Working Alliance Model of Supervision, the supervisory roles from the Discrimination Model, and the systemic context of the Systems Approach to Supervision Model. A strength of this model is the ability to conceptualize supervision within the complex systems in which the school CIT training functions (Brott et al., 2017). However, this model of supervision has not been researched to determine its effectiveness or limitations.

The School Counseling Supervision Model

The School Counseling Supervision Model (SCSM) integrates the heavily researched Discrimination Model with the multifaceted roles of a school counselor (Luke & Bernard, 2006). This model adds a third dimension to the Discrimination Model with the points of entry to provide context to supervision with school CITs. The SCSM introduces four points of entry: large group intervention, counseling and consultation, individual and group advisement, and planning, coordination, and evaluation (Luke & Bernard, 2006). While the points of entry introduced are similar to the ASCA National Model, it lacks specific ASCA language to guide the supervisor in application of the model. The SCSM includes specific school counseling roles, responsibilities and language (Brott et al., 2017; Brown et al., 2018). A strength of this model is the emphasis it places on the implementation of comprehensive school counseling programs. Brown et al. (2018) examined site supervisor self-efficacy after receiving training in the SCSM and determined that site supervisors benefit from training in supervision models. However, there remains a dearth of literature on the utilization and effectiveness of the SCSM with school CITs.

Site Supervision

Field-based practicum and internship activities of school CITs allow for integration of knowledge and skill application. Site supervision provided by certified professional school counselors during school CITs' field-based practicum and internship experiences support vital opportunities for school CITs to apply the knowledge gained in a counselor education program (ASCA, 2019b). These experiences serve to bridge the gap between course knowledge and practical application (Brown et al., 2018). One of the key opportunities site supervisors offer is the supported immersion into a school culture and climate, where school CITs must quickly acclimate in order to gain credibility with students, teachers, administrators, and other

stakeholders (Cigrand et al, 2014; Peterson & Deuschle, 2006). ASCA ethical standards (2016) call for site supervisors to “regularly pursue continuing education activities on both counseling and supervision topics and skills” (Standard D.b.). Site supervisors of school CITs in CACREP accredited programs are required to have some relevant training in supervision (CACREP, 2016). Both primary organizations support the call for site supervisors to be trained in appropriate models of supervision.

Training of Site Supervisors

Current literature suggests that for the majority of site supervisors of school CITs, there is a significant lack of training in supervision (Bledsoe et al., 2019; Brott et al, 2017; Brown et al., 2018, Cigrand & Wood, 2011; DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Smith & Koltz, 2015; Uellendahl & Tenenbaum, 2015). The lack of supervision training may be due to formal supervision training typically being reserved for doctoral counselor education programs (Studer, 2005). CACREP (2016) requires site supervisors to hold a master’s degree in counseling or a related profession, two years of related professional experience, knowledge of the counselor education program requirements, and relevant training in counseling supervision. ASCA (2019b) states that site supervisors should “hold a master’s degree and meet additional certification requirements as defined by each state” (p. 1). While some states require school counselor site supervisors to receive additional training in supervision practices, it is not a requirement for all states (ASCA, 2019b). Further, site supervisors who have received formal training in supervision models are more likely to be trained in clinical supervision models (Bultsma, 2012). In the supervision literature, there is agreement that clinical supervision models do not fully address the complex roles and responsibilities of school counselors (Bledsoe et al., 2019; Brott et al., 2017; Brown et al., 2018; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). The lack of standardized training for school

counseling site supervisors has led to a deficit in amount of practicing school counselors who are willing to serve as site supervisors for school CITs (Studer, 2005). This may be due to a perceived inability to provide adequate supervision.

Most practicing school counselors rely on their professional experience performing roles and responsibilities of a school counselor, experiences as an intern, and evaluative administrative supervision experiences to provide supervision to school CITs (Brott et al., 2017). The unstandardized supervisory roles performed by school counselors in the various school settings leads to “unbalanced and inappropriate supervision and poor modeling on the part of the supervisor” (Cigrand & Wood, 2011, p. 3). Training site supervisors seeks to foster site supervisor self-efficacy and ability to provide adequate and sufficient supervision to school CITs (Brown et al., 2018; Spence et al., 2001).

Site Supervisors Perceived Level of Preparedness

Exposure to supervision models and techniques provides site supervisors with understanding of models of supervision and developmental levels of school CITs (Brown et al., 2018; Swank & Tyson, 2012; Wambu & Myers, 2019). The contextual understanding gained by receiving training in supervision presents a strong foundation on which school counselor site supervisors can promote meaningful opportunities (Wambu & Myers, 2019). These meaningful opportunities allow school CITs to expand and integrate knowledge and skills essential to school counselor roles (ASCA, 2019b). Further, site supervisors must be prepared to address the complexity of the multiple roles school counselors perform in their daily responsibilities (ASCA, 2019b).

A recent study examining the preparedness of school counseling site supervisors (Wambu & Myers, 2019) found that the majority of respondents were not exposed to supervision training

while in their counselor education programs. DeKruyf and Pehrsson (2011) also discovered over half of the school counseling site supervisors who responded to a survey reported little to no training in supervision. Wambu and Myers (2019) discussed the assumption held in the school counseling profession that an effective school counselor will also be an effective site supervisor. However, without formal training, school counseling site supervisors rely on their professional experiences when providing supervision (Brott et al., 2017). Since the ASCA (2016) ethical code calls for training in supervision before engaging in the supervision of school CITs, site supervisors without this training are practicing outside their area of practice (Swank & Tyson, 2012). Brown et al. (2018) proposed a model of training which includes the School Counselor Supervision Model and found this training method to be effective in increasing school counseling site supervisors' self-efficacy and perceived level of preparedness.

Although there is a lack of literature to describe the perceived level of preparedness school counseling site supervisors experience for providing adequate supervision (Bjornestad et al., 2014; Brown et al., 2018), there is agreement in the profession that the majority believe themselves ill-prepared (Brott et al., 2017; Swank & Tyson, 2012; Uellendahl & Tenenbaum, 2015; Wambu & Myers, 2019). In a study conducted by Uellendahl and Tenenbaum (2015) 41% of respondents perceived themselves not prepared at all to provide adequate supervision to school CITs. Self-efficacy has been determined to be an essential component of effective supervision (Bjornestad et al., 2014). School counseling site supervisors who experience high self-efficacy are also more prepared to address the complexities of the profession by providing meaningful opportunities for school CITs (Bjornestad et al., 2014). For this reason, it is imperative that counselor education faculty understand which factors contribute to a higher self-efficacy and perceived level of preparedness to supervise school CITs.

While training programs for site supervisors have been developed, specifically for school counseling site supervisors, there is a paucity of literature exploring factors which best prepare site supervisors in the counseling profession to provide adequate supervision. Understanding what best prepares a site supervisor for supervising school CITs is non-existent in school counseling literature. With further research to determine which factors best prepare site supervisors for supervision, counselor educators will be able to focus training efforts and determine ideal credentials of supervisors when developing training programs and requirements for counselor education programs.

Conclusion

In conclusion, site supervisors of school CITs are a crucial element in counselor education. Field-based practicum and internship experiences provide school CITs with opportunities to apply knowledge and skills in the complex systems in which school counselors function. Because the roles and responsibilities of school counselors are multifaceted, site supervisors provide the guidance necessary for school CITs to experience these roles in a supportive environment. The vital role site supervisors play in the development of school CITs is further complicated by the lack of formal training in supervision models and techniques. There is little research to determine the perceived level of preparedness of site supervisors as well as which factors influence the perceived level of preparedness to offer adequate supervision to school CITs. To fully address the concerns of site supervisors' ability to adequately prepare future school counselors for success in the field, post-master's degree, counselor educators can engage site supervisors in training to ensure that they are adequately prepared to provide the support and guidance required of them.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this study was three-fold. First, I examined site supervisors' perceived level of preparedness to provide adequate supervision to master's level school counseling students. Second, I explored factors affecting site supervisors' perceived level of preparedness. Finally, I assessed which supervision models school counseling site supervisors have training, exposure, and experience in implementing within the school environment. I utilized a survey developed for this study to measure site supervisors' perceived level of preparedness as well as other demographic and supervision related variables.

In this chapter, I describe the methods and procedures I will use to conduct this study. I begin by presenting the research questions and hypotheses. I then define the target sample population, key terms, procedures for the development of the survey, the survey dissemination procedures, and brief overview of the statistical analyses performed.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

To address the three purposes of this study, I posed five research questions:

1. Which supervision models are school counseling site supervisors trained to implement?
2. In what ways do school counseling site supervisors receive training in supervision?
3. Which supervision models are utilized in school counseling site supervision?
4. What is the perceived level of preparedness for school counseling site supervisors to provide adequate supervision?
5. What are the factors that predict the perceived level of preparedness to provide adequate supervision to school CITs?

Based on the research questions and literature in the area, I posit the following hypotheses:

1. A majority of school counseling site supervisors report not receiving training in any specific models of supervision.
2. School counseling site supervisors report limited training through workshops or by attending a supervision session at a conference for professional development.
3. School counseling site supervisors report using clinical mental health models of supervision during the supervision process.
4. A majority of school counseling site supervisors report lower perceived preparedness to provide adequate supervision to school CITs.
5. School counseling site supervisors with more years of experience, more education, more experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model, and higher levels of communication and perceived support from their supervisees' institution would predict higher perceived levels of preparedness to provide adequate supervision to school CITs.

Participants

Participants for this study were school counseling site supervisors who were or had previously provided supervision for school CITs. Participants were recruited with the assistance of program chairs for school counselor education programs, which hold current CACREP accreditation. Program chairs, of CACREP accredited school counseling programs, were contacted by email and asked to send the survey for this study to school counseling site supervisors who were serving or had served as site supervisors for school CITs during the time of the institutions CACREP accreditation. All 50 state-level school counselor associations were contacted by email and asked to distribute the survey to the respective members. Five states responded to the request, stating the survey would be distributed. The survey was also posted to

message boards for ASCA and counselor educators (CESNET). In order to participate in the study, participants have had experience supervising a school CIT. All information about targeted institutions were collected through the CACREP website and each institutions' website. All information about state school counselor associations and message boards were obtained through websites of the associated professional organization.

Table 1 provides demographics of the school counselor education programs ($N=262$) which met requirements for participation in this study, sorted by regions of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES). These regions include: North Atlantic (NARACES), North Central (NCACES), Rocky Mountain (RMACES), Southern (SACES), and Western (WACES). The majority of the targeted programs were from public institutions ($n=185$) with face-to-face instructional methods ($n=242$). Further, the majority of the targeted programs were from public institutions within SACES ($n=90$).

Table 1

Program Demographics of Contacted Institutions by ACES Region

ACES region	N Programs	Funding		Instruct. Method		Yrs. CACREP accred.
		Public	Private	Traditional	Online	
NARACES	46	26	20	43	3	17.80
NCACES	70	48	22	66	4	19.76
RMACES	11	10	1	10	1	28.27
SACES	119	90	29	108	11	17.89
WACES	16	11	5	15	1	22.69
N	262	185	77	242	20	

The majority of the sample population ($n=86$) identified as female (87.21%) and white (80.23%). Ethnically, the remaining participants self-identified as 12.79% Black, 2.33% Latinx, 2.33% Asian or Pacific Islander, and 2.33% as multicultural. Most participants held a Master's degree (62.79%), with 15.12% holding a second Master's Degree and 22.09% holding a Doctorate. Further, 80.23% of participants graduated from a CACREP accredited graduate

program. While all participants held school counseling certification or licensure, slightly less than half (43.02%) of participants held additional licensure as a Licensed Professional Counselor or similar certification. Participants had an average of 13 years of experience and on average, supervised 6 supervisees. Table 2 describes demographics of participants by ACES region.

Table 2
Demographics of the Sample Population

ACES region	N	Gender		Ethnicity				Education			CACREP		Yrs. Exp.	No. Super.
		Female	White	Black	Latinx	Asian	Other	Masters	2 nd Masters	Doctorate	Graduate	LPC	<i>M</i>	
NARACES	29	29.07	30.23	2.33	1.16	0.00	0.00	19.77	8.14	5.81	23.26	15.12	16	8
NCACES	24	23.26	22.09	3.49	0.00	1.16	1.16	17.44	5.81	4.65	25.58	10.47	14	7
RMACES	4	4.65	4.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.16	1.16	2.33	4.65	2.33	10	10
SACES	21	23.26	16.28	6.98	0.00	1.16	0.00	16.28	0.00	8.14	22.09	13.95	11	5
WACES	8	6.98	6.98	0.00	1.16	0.00	1.16	8.14	0.00	1.16	4.65	1.16	11	2
% of sample		87.21	80.23	12.79	2.33	2.33	2.33	62.79	15.12	22.09	80.23	43.02		

Definition of Terms

1. *Adequate Supervision of School CITs* - The ASCA (2019c) School Counselor

Professional Standards and Competencies describe the “mindsets and behaviors school counselors need to meet the rigorous demands of the school counseling profession” (p.

1). The combined mindsets, behavior standards, and corresponding competencies were used to define adequate supervision as the extent to which school counseling site supervisors are able to provide opportunities for the CITs to experience and demonstrate mastery of each.

2. *Formal Training* – Formal training was defined, minimally, as training through graduate level coursework in supervision, which includes: understanding the purpose and function of supervision, models of supervision, roles and relationships involved in the process, clinical supervision skills and techniques, assessment of supervisees’ developmental level, responsibilities and gatekeeping in supervision, ethical and legal issues related to supervision, and cultural implications (CACREP, 2016).

3. *Group Supervision* – Supervision of three or more CITs provided by either a site supervisor or a counselor education faculty member.
4. *Individual Supervision* – The process of supervision between one site supervisor and one CIT (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; CACREP, 2016).
5. *School Counseling* – A profession in which counselors with specialized knowledge and training in the development and implementation of comprehensive school counseling programs as well as interventions to promote student success in the academic, career, and social/emotional domains work in a school setting (ASCA, 2019a).
6. *Site Supervision* – The process of field-based practicum and internship experiences provided by a credentialed school counselor to a school CIT where the school CIT is exposed to vital experiences with the intention of developing skills and integration of knowledge and skills related to the school counseling profession (ASCA, 2019b; CACREP, 2016).
7. *Supervision* – The definition proposed by Lambie and Sias (2009) stating supervision is “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. 359) was utilized for this study.
8. *Supervisor Preparedness* – For the purposes of this study, level of preparedness is defined by supervisors’ perceived level of preparedness to provide vital opportunities for school CITs to apply and integrate knowledge and skill in a school setting.

9. *Triadic Supervision* – Supervision that includes one site supervisor and two CITs (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019).

Development of Survey/Instrument

Survey questions were developed using literature to examine concepts related to school counseling and supervision. Demographic information obtained included years of school counseling experience, credentials, and educational background. Participants were also asked about their training and exposure to supervision models, methods and techniques, models of supervision utilized, their level of experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model, as well as which supervision techniques they utilize in the supervision process. The survey is included in Appendix C.

Procedures

I obtained approval to conduct this study from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Arkansas, which is included in Appendix B. The survey was administered using Qualtrics© software, Version 1.3. Data were exported from Qualtrics© software and stored on an encrypted flash drive. In accordance with IRB, I protected the identities of all eligible participants and de-identified all data before storage and analyses were performed.

Recruitment of Participants

In order to be eligible to participate in the study, participants must have been supervising or have previously supervised a master's level school CIT. Once IRB approval was obtained, I contacted program chairs from CACREP accredited master's level school counseling programs in the United States ($N=262$), requesting the survey be forwarded to current or former site supervisors of school CITs. I also sent the survey to state school counselor associations ($N=50$) and posted to the message boards for ASCA and counselor educators (CESNET). The survey

could also be forwarded to potential participants, resulting in snowball sampling procedures. Recruitment materials utilized in this study are included in Appendix D.

Informed Consent

IRB informed consent procedures were followed, and consent was obtained from each participant who completed the survey. A copy of the informed consent is included in Appendix A. In order to gain consent for participation, I included the informed consent as the first page of the survey. If the participant chose not to provide consent, the survey was terminated, for that participant, and no data were collected. There were no consequences for declining to participate. Furthermore, participants could also choose to decline to participate after providing consent, before completing the survey, without any penalty or consequence.

Analysis of Data

All analyses were performed using SASTM software, Version 9.4 of the SAS System for Windows. The alpha level for all analyses was set at 0.05. Data were collected using Qualtrics© software, Version 1.3 before being imported into the SAS System for Windows. Both inferential and descriptive statistics were used in data analysis. The following list outlines the statistical methods employed to thoroughly answer each research question:

1. Descriptive statistics were performed to describe the demographic data of participants. Analyses performed include means and frequency procedures.
2. Research Question 1: To describe the models of supervision school counseling site supervisors are trained to implement, I used descriptive statistics to examine the frequency to which participants reported training in popular models of supervision. Further, I explored the extent to which school counseling site supervisors are trained

- in clinical mental health models or models specific to the school counseling specialty area.
3. Research Question 2: I analyzed the frequency of modes of training reported by participants to determine the ways in which school counseling site supervisors receive training in supervision. By comparing the frequency of training methods, which include formal graduate-level coursework, self-study, conferences, webinars, workshops, or seminars, I gained an understanding of how school counseling site supervisors prepare for the supervision process.
 4. Research Question 3: A frequency analysis was performed to determine the supervision models school counseling site supervisors utilized during the supervision process. Participants were asked to select which models were utilized during supervision and list any additional models utilized. Only popular models of clinical mental health and school counselor supervision were named.
 5. Research Question 4: An ordinal logistic regression was performed to determine the extent to which school counseling site supervisors believe themselves to be to provide adequate supervision. I relied on the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies, which are categorized into mindsets and behaviors, to define adequate supervision. Further, behaviors are categorized into three areas, which include professional foundation, direct and indirect student services, and planning and assessment (ASCA, 2019c). Composite scores for the four areas of the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies: mindsets, behavior: professional foundation, behavior: direct and indirect student services, and behavior: planning and assessment, were calculated by adding the

scores for each corresponding area. The ordinal logistic regression analysis method was then employed to determine the impact each composite score had on the participants' level of preparedness.

6. Research Question 5: To thoroughly answer research question 5, I utilized the technique of multiple regression to explore which variables predicted higher composite scores from each of the four areas outlined in the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies (mindsets, behavior: professional foundation, behavior: direct and indirect student services, and behavior: planning and assessment). Included in the regression models were demographic variables of education, graduation from a CACREP program, location (as sorted by ACES region), years of experience, credentialing as Licensed Professional Counselor or similar licensure, and experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model. The additional variable included in the model was perceived support from the supervisees' university.

Data Screening

Before each analysis was conducted, data were screened to ensure data met assumptions vital to the interpretation of each analysis. No data were missing, therefore I proceeded with testing model assumptions. All observations were independent of each other. One outlier was detected that had an extreme standardized residual ($z > \pm 3$). I excluded this participant from all analyses, resulting in 86 total participants for analyses.

Assumptions for Ordinal Logistic Regression

An ordinal logistic regression was utilized to answer research question 4, due to the ordinal outcome variable and four continuous predictor variables. To ensure data met the

assumption of multicollinearity among independent variables, I examined the Pearson Correlation Coefficients. All independent variables were moderate to highly correlated, as expected from literature and similarity of the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies. All correlations were less than .80, with a variance inflation factor (VIF) less than 10, meeting minimal assumptions of multicollinearity (Hosmer et al., 2013). However, correlations regarding the behavior standards and competencies were .7021, .7229, and .6678. Although the higher correlations were expected, I proceeded with caution in my analyses. VIF for mindset, professional foundation behavior, student service behavior, and planning and assessment behavior were 1.57, 2.70, 2.22, and 2.45, respectively. A minimum of 10 participants for each predictor variable was obtained to meet the sample size assumption, as detailed by Hosmer et al. (2013). Finally, to address the linear relationship of log odds, I examined scatterplots of the logit model. The scatterplot for the mindset composite score did not appear to be completely linear, while the scatterplots for the three behavior composite scores appeared linear in nature. After checking assumptions required for logistic regression and ensuring all were minimally met, I cautiously proceeded with the ordinal logistic regression analysis.

Assumptions for Multiple Regression

All predictor variables were continuous or dichotomous and independent of each other. Initially, I examined scatterplots to determine that relationships amongst variables included in the regression analyses were linearly related. To determine if data met assumptions of multicollinearity, I examined correlations. All correlations were less than .8. To ensure the assumption of multicollinearity was met, I also examined the VIF. All VIF values were less than 2, with tolerance level all above .73, indicating no issues related to multicollinearity (Cohen et al., 2015). Model specifications were evaluated to determine if the assumption of

homoscedasticity was met. The specifications for all four predictor variables were greater than .05, meeting the assumption and failing to reject the null hypothesis that error terms were consistent across predictor variables (Cohen et al., 2015). All predictor variable error terms were evaluated for any statistical significance in correlation, which would have violated the assumption that error terms were independent of each other. I utilized the Durbin-Watson analysis and determined an absence of first order autocorrelation, as all independent variables were between 1.5 and 2.5 (Cohen et al., 2015). Finally, data were analyzed to determine if independent variables were normally distributed. After initial review of histograms indicated that data were close to normally distributed, I examined the Shapiro-Wilk statistic to determine if values were consistent with my initial review. The composite scores for mindset and student services behavior were determined to be slightly negatively skewed. However, because multiple regression is robust to deviations against normality, I proceeded with my analysis (Cohen et al., 2015).

Power Analyses

With the purpose of determining the number of participants necessary for this study, I conducted a priori power analysis using G*Power 3.1 (Faul et al., 2009). Power is described as the likelihood of correctly rejecting a null hypothesis and is directly affected by the level of significance and sample size of the study (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Consistent with research in behavioral sciences, a priori power analysis was conducted with a desired power level of .90. All levels of significance were set to .05, in accordance with behavioral sciences research. To answer research question 4, with an ordinal logistic regression, 85 participants were necessary to achieve a power level of .90. To appropriately address research question 5, I determined 130 participants were necessary to achieve a power of .90 with the multiple regression.

Chapter 4: Results

In this chapter I present the results of the statistical analyses performed to thoroughly answer all research questions in this study. First, I present procedures I used to address validity of the survey, as well as how I identified and dealt with outliers. Then, I present the reliability coefficients for the survey instrument utilized. Next, I address the first three research questions with the frequency analyses performed. Then, I present results of the ordinal logistic regression performed to thoroughly address the fourth research question. Finally, I address research question 5 by presenting the results of the multiple regression analysis.

Validity

All questions regarding the construct of adequate supervision were developed from the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies. This publication was developed by school counseling experts in the field at ASCA (2019c). It can be assumed that the survey has a sufficient amount of content validity, as questions directly reflect the mindsets and behaviors outlined in the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies. However, due to a lack of quantitative research referencing adequate supervision of school counselors, other measures of validity were not obtained. Replication of this study as well as other procedures, i.e. pilot testing, principal component analysis, or internal consistency analysis with Cronbach's alpha, may be used in the future to determine validity of the survey instrument.

Outliers

Initially, I examined scatterplots to determine if any outliers existed in the data set. Once I identified visual outliers, I converted raw data into standardized z scores. As prescribed by

Shiffler (1988), I employed a cut-off score of ± 3 to identify outliers with an extreme standardized residual. One outlier was identified with this criterion and omitted from analyses.

Reliability

For a review of overall reliability, I computed a standardized Cronbach's α of .82 to describe the four composite scores of mindsets, behavior: professional foundation, behavior: student services, and behavior: planning and assessment relation to the dependent variable of prepared. Table 3 lists the Cronbach coefficients for the four composite scores.

Table 3
Cronbach Coefficients of Composite Scores

Variable	N	Reliability Coefficient
Mindset Composite	86	.8116
Behavior: Professional Foundation Composite	86	.7392
Behavior: Student Services Composite	86	.7636
Behavior: Planning and Assessment Composite	86	.7529

Research Question 1

Regarding the first research question, I hypothesized that a majority of school counseling site supervisors would report not receiving training in any specific models of supervision. However, according to a descriptive frequency analysis of popular models of supervision in which school counseling site supervisors had reported training, only 37.21% of participants reported no training in any specific models of supervision. Table 4 details the frequency and percentage of each model reported by participants. Interestingly, 45.35% of participants reported training in the most popular supervision model specific to school counseling, the School Counseling Supervision Model (Luke & Bernard, 2006). Note that participants were asked to select or name any supervision models in which they had received training.

Table 4*Frequency of Training in Supervision Models*

Supervision Model	N	% of Sample
*Discrimination Model	19	22.09
*Events-Based Supervision Model	8	9.30
*Hawkins and Shohet Model	3	3.49
*Systems Approach to Supervision Model	22	25.58
*Integrated Developmental Model	21	24.42
*Loganbill, Hardy, and Delworth Model	4	4.65
*Systemic Cognitive-Developmental Supervision Model	11	12.79
*Reflective Developmental Model	13	15.12
*Ronnestad & Skovholt Lifespan Developmental Model	12	13.95
*Theoretical Orientation Specific Supervision	7	8.14
+Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems Model	13	15.12
+School Counseling Supervision Model	39	45.35
No Training in Supervision Models	32	37.21

*Note: *indicates a Clinical Mental Health Model of Supervision, + indicates a School Counseling Specialty Area of Supervision*

To account for multiple selections, table 5 provides the frequency and percentage of participants who received training in clinical mental health models only, school counseling models only, both clinical and school counseling models, and those who reported no training. It is encouraging to note that the majority of participants (74.07%) with training in supervision models, reported training in school counseling supervision models or both clinical mental health and school counseling supervision models. However, it is most concerning to note that 37.21% of the sample of school counseling site supervisors report no training in supervision models.

Table 5*Categorized Frequency of Training in Supervision Models*

Supervision Model	N	% of Sample
Clinical Mental Health Models only	14	16.28
School Counseling Models only	16	18.60
Both CMH and SC Models	24	27.91
No Training	32	37.21

Research Question 2

Research question 2 pertained to determining the ways in which school counseling site supervisors receive training in supervision. To answer this question, I performed a frequency analysis. I hypothesized that school counseling site supervisors would report limited training through workshops or by attending a supervision session at a conference for professional development. My hypothesis, if true, would have shown a greater frequency in workshop and conference, over all other training methods. However, results indicated the greatest frequency of participants indicated they received training through coursework (51.16%). Further, self-study accounted for 37.21% of the training methods, indicating a need for future professional development. Interestingly, 24.42% of participants indicated no training in supervision, which suggests a gap in preparation of school counseling site supervisors by universities. It is important to note that participants could select multiple forms of training, as applicable. Table 6 details the frequency of training methods reported by participants.

Table 6
Frequency of Training Methods in Supervision Processes

Training Method	N	% of Sample
Coursework	44	51.16
Self-Study*	32	37.21
Conference*	21	24.42
Webinar*	12	13.95
Workshop*	27	31.40
Seminar*	7	8.14
No Training Received	21	24.42

*Note: *Indicates a self-directed form of training*

I further disaggregated the data to account for multiple selections allowed and determine which participants received training through coursework alone, self-directed study, coursework and self-directed study, or no training received. For the purposes of this study, I referred to self-directed study as study not required through graduate-level training. Although, I should note that

some participants may have sought out training through coursework and it was not required for their program of study. I proceeded with the analysis under the assumption that coursework was required. Table 7 presents the frequency and percentage of this analysis. It should be noted that while 37.21% of participants reported no training in specific supervision models, 24.42% of participants reported receiving no training in the supervision process. Therefore, 12.79% of participants reported receiving some type of training in supervision processes, but had no training in a guiding model of supervision. A distinct gap is presented as 24.42% report training through self-directed study and an additional 24.42% report no training, concluding that 48.84% of participants reported training through seeking out additional training when necessary or supervising without training. These results indicate a concerning lack of training in supervision provided to site supervisors of school counselors. These results may also indicate a lack of adherence to the CACREP (2016) standards requiring “relevant training in counselor supervision” (p. 15). This is a tentative assumption, as not all site supervisors surveyed supervised school CITs from CACREP accredited counselor education programs.

Table 7

Categorized Frequency of Training Methods in Supervision Processes

Training Method	N	% of Sample
Coursework only	11	12.79
Self-Directed Study only	21	24.42
Coursework and Self-Directed Study	33	38.37
No training	21	24.42

Research Question 3

I utilized a frequency analysis to answer research question 3. My hypothesis for this research question was that school counseling site supervisors would report utilizing clinical mental health models of supervision more often than supervision models specific to school counseling. Table 8 presents data referring to specific models of supervision employed during

the supervision process. To account for participants' ability to select multiple models they employ during the supervision process, I further disaggregated and categorized data. Information about how models were classified is also provided in Table 8. The most popular clinical mental health model utilized was the Integrated Developmental Model (13.95%). The most utilized model specific to school counseling was the School Counseling Supervision Model (36.05%). More concerningly, 39.53% of participants reported not using any model during the supervision process.

Table 8

Frequency of Supervision Models Utilized by School Counseling Site Supervisors

Supervision Model	N	% of Sample
*Discrimination Model	11	12.79
*Events-Based Supervision Model	5	5.81
*Hawkins and Shohet Model	0	0.00
*Systems Approach to Supervision Model	7	8.14
*Integrated Developmental Model	12	13.95
*Loganbill, Hardy, and Delworth Model	1	1.16
*Systemic Cognitive-Developmental Supervision Model	5	5.81
*Reflective Developmental Model	11	12.79
*Ronnestad & Skovholt Lifespan Developmental Model	6	6.98
*Theoretical Orientation Specific Supervision	4	4.65
+Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems Model	13	15.12
+School Counseling Supervision Model	31	36.05
No Supervision Model Utilized	34	39.53

*Note: *indicates a Clinical Mental Health Model of Supervision, + indicates a School Counseling Specialty Area of Supervision*

After data were further disaggregated and categorized, 22.09% utilized a model designed for clinical mental health supervision, 19.77% utilized a model designed for school counseling supervision, and 18.61% integrated clinical mental health and school counseling supervision models during the supervision process. Of the participants who reported utilizing a model, over a third reported utilizing only a clinical mental health model of supervision. This is of particular concern because, as noted previously, clinical supervision models, alone, fail to meet the

complex needs of school CITs and school counseling site supervisors (Bultsma, 2012; Devlin et al., 2009; Luke & Bernard, 2006). However, well over half of participants (63.46), who reported supervising with a model, reported employing a model that was designed for supervising school CITs. This study also determined that although the majority of participants reported having training in supervision models, a large number of participants also report supervising without a guiding model of supervision.

Table 9

Categorized Frequency of Supervision Models Utilized by School Counseling Site Supervisors

Supervision Model	N	% of Sample
Clinical Mental Health Model	19	22.09
School Counseling Model	17	19.77
Integrated CMH and SC Model	16	18.61
No Model Utilized	34	39.53

Research Question 4

To answer research question 4, pertaining to participants' perceived level of preparedness to provide adequate supervision, I conducted a cumulative odds ordinal logistic regression. In this type of analysis, a change in log-odds is expressed as a one unit change in the predictor variable, after accounting for all of the other predictor variables. This analysis was selected due to the ordinal outcome variable of perceived level of preparedness, which was based on a 4-point Likert Scale question and the continuous nature of the predictor variables. Predictor variables included four composite scaled scores for each of the corresponding areas of the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies. Mindsets composite scaled scores were constructed from questions related to beliefs which school counselors hold related to student success and achievement (ASCA, 2019c). Participants with higher composite scores were described as more prepared to assist a school CIT in developing appropriate mindsets. The Professional Foundation Behavior composite scaled score was constructed utilizing questions

which reflected the essential skills required to perform necessary duties of school counselors (ASCA, 2019c). Higher composite scores for Professional Foundation Behavior indicate higher preparedness to assist CITs in developing these essential skills. Composite scaled scores for Student Service Behavior were determined by responses to questions related to the direct and indirect services provided to students or in collaboration with other education stakeholders (i.e. teachers, parents), as defined by the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies. Participants with higher scaled scores for Student Service Behavior indicate higher perceived levels of preparedness to assist a school CIT in developing and implementing professional and essential behaviors. Planning and Assessment composite scaled scores were constructed from questions related to all behaviors related to the design, implementation, and assessment of a comprehensive school counseling program (ASCA, 2019c). Higher composite scaled scores for Planning and Assessment Behaviors indicate a higher level of preparedness to supervise school CITs' development of appropriate behaviors related to evaluation and implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program. Together, these standards and competencies outline the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitudes for a school counselor to be effective. The inference was drawn that if these knowledge, skills, and attitudes ensure an effective school counselor then a supervisor must be prepared to provide supervision in these specific areas for adequate supervision to occur. Therefore, a supervisor with higher composite scaled scores in all four areas would perceive themselves to be more prepared to provide adequate supervision to a school CIT, than if they had lower scores in particular areas. The outcome variable was overall level of preparedness to provide supervision to a school CIT.

I hypothesized that all four predictor variables would be statistically significant, indicating them good predictors for perceived level of preparedness to supervise. However, the

predictor variable for mindset did not appear to have a linear relationship with the log odds and cell sizes were not equal, which presented difficulty with interpreting and generalizing data. After analyzing to determine assumptions for performing the ordinal logistic regression were met, I proceeded with caution. Table 10 describes the VIF and tolerance of each predictor variable. While tolerance levels are moderate, the predictor variables related to behavior competencies, are correlated. I proceeded with the knowledge of the moderate level of multicollinearity because the assumption had been minimally met.

Table 10

Results of the Multicollinearity Assumption between Independent Variables

Variables	Tolerance	VIF
Mindset	.6350	1.5746
Behavior: Professional Foundation	.3701	2.7018
Behavior: Direct and Indirect Student Services	.4498	2.2229
Behavior: Planning and Assessment	.4076	2.4533

The initial model tested included all four areas of the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies. As demonstrated in Table 11, the proportional odds, as assessed by a full likelihood ratio test to compare the full fitted model with varying location parameters was statistically significant, (Wald $\chi^2(4)=14.522$, $p=.0058$). Additionally, the proportional odds assumption was satisfied, (Wald $\chi^2(4)=7.4410$, $p=.1143$), indicating that the logit surfaces were parallel, and the odds ratios can be interpreted as constant across all possible cut points of the outcome. Therefore, the null hypothesis can be rejected, finding that the model with predictors included performs significantly better than by chance. The model correctly classified 72.8% of school counseling site supervisors in corresponding level of preparedness to supervise. Predicting level of preparedness to supervise is 50% by chance alone. Therefore, a classification rate of 72.8% is markedly better than chance. However, none of the predictor variables were statistically significant, as demonstrated in Table 12.

Table 11
Test of Parallel Lines

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	AIC	χ^2	df	<i>p</i>
Null Hypothesis	145.836	149.836			
Fitted Model	129.155	141.155	14.5220	4	.0058

Table 12
Results of Ordinal Logistic Regression Full Model Maximum Likelihood Estimates

Variable	B	SE	Wald χ^2	<i>p</i>	OR
Mindset	-.0676	.0689	.9629	.3265	.935
B: Professional Foundation	.0992	.0585	2.8814	.0896	1.104
B: Student Services	.0244	.0409	.3561	.5507	1.025
B: Planning and Assessment	.0534	.0495	1.1654	.2803	1.055

Note: OR=odds ratio

The lack of significant predictors found in the model is an indication that, although assumptions were minimally met, the unequal cell sizes may be preventing accurate interpretation of the ordinal logistic regression analysis. The overwhelming majority (95.35%) of participants rated themselves as prepared to provide adequate supervision to school CITs, ($N_{agree}=39$, $N_{strongly\ agree}=43$). While standard practice with the ordinal logistic regression would be to remove insignificant predictor variables to identify the best model, if any of the predictor variables were removed, significant roles and responsibilities of the school counseling profession would be omitted. There is not enough evidence to determine that any of the four areas of the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies are not good predictors of perceived level of preparedness to supervise a school CIT, without further research and a more diverse population. Data will need to be collected from site supervisors who rate themselves as not prepared to provide supervision in order to better analyze if the current model is appropriate for determining overall perceived level of preparedness to supervise a school CIT.

Research Question 5

Research question 5 was formed to determine what factors, if any, predicted perceived level of preparedness to provide adequate supervision to school CITs. I hypothesized that school counselors with more years of experience, more education, more experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model, and higher levels of perceived support from supervisees' institution would predict higher perceived levels of preparedness to provide adequate supervision.

Although, I predicted there would be no difference between a CACREP graduate and a non-CACREP graduate in perceived level of preparedness, this variable was included because CACREP and ASCA standards are similar regarding requirements for supervision training. To answer this research question, I performed four simultaneous multiple regression analyses. The four composite scores, defined by the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies, were the outcome variables. Predictor variables included demographic information of the school counseling site supervisor (education, graduation from a CACREP accredited counselor education program, location (sorted by ACES region), years of experience as a school counselor, experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model and variables related to supervisees (perceived communication level and support of their supervisee's institution). Results are listed by outcome variables.

Mindset

The composite score for mindset standards and competencies describes the mindsets school counselors must hold to perform roles and responsibilities effectively (ASCA, 2019c). The possible minimum composite score for mindset was 16, while the maximum score was 64. Results describe a range of scores for mindset as 46 to 64. The first regression explored which, if any, of the predictor variables (education, graduation from a CACREP university, years of

experience, experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model, perceived support from supervisees' university, and location of practice, as sorted by ACES region predicted scores on preparedness to supervise someone in the mindset area of the ASCA (2019c) Professional Standards and Competencies. The overall regression model for the composite mindset score was not statistically significant ($R^2=.1012$, $F(9, 76) = 0.95$, $MSE = 17.6333$, $p = .4872$), indicating no predictor variables in the proposed model could significantly predict the composite score for preparedness to supervise in the mindset area of the ASCA (2019c) Professional Standards and Competencies. This is further evidenced by the small effect size ($f^2=.1125$), accounting for only 11% of the variance in the outcome variable. Table 13 presents the results.

Table 13

Regression Coefficients of Demographic and Support Variables on composite ASCA Mindset Standards and Competencies Score

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Education	.8243	.5913	1.39	.1674
CACREP graduate	.7175	1.2680	.57	.5731
Years of Experience	-.0208	.0646	-.32	.7480
ASCA Experience	.2148	.6646	.32	.7474
University Support	.9841	.7170	1.37	.1739
ACES Region				
NARACES vs. SACES	.5919	1.3193	.45	.6549
NCACES vs. SACES	.1091	1.2801	.09	.9323
RMACES vs. SACES	-.9496	2.3440	-.41	.6865
WACES vs. SACES	-2.0006	1.8423	-1.09	.2809

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Behavior: Professional Foundation

Professional foundation behavior composite scores detail the preparedness to supervise a school CIT in professional behaviors consistent with performing all roles and responsibilities of a school counselor effectively (ASCA, 2019c). The possible minimum composite score for professional foundation behavior was 18 with a maximum possible score of 72. Actual range of professional foundation behavior composite scores utilized in this study were 49 to 72. The

overall regression model was statistically significant ($R^2=.3179$, $F(9, 76) = 3.94$, $MSE = 30.5501$, $p = .0004$), indicating at least one of the predictor variables included in the model significantly predicted preparedness to supervise professional foundation behavior composite scores. The proposed model accounts for 46% ($f^2=.4660$) of the variance in the outcome variable, indicating a large effect size.

Upon further analysis of parameter estimates, education of the school counseling site supervisor was a significant predictor ($t=3.40$, $p=.0011$). School counselors, minimally, hold a master's degree in school counseling or a related field (ASCA, 2015). The significance of education here means that having a second master's or doctoral degree significantly predicted higher composite scores on preparedness to supervise professional foundation behavior. Further, the school counseling site supervisor's experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model was also a statistically significant predictor of preparedness to supervise professional foundation behavior composite scores ($t=3.50$, $p=.0008$). These results indicate that the more education and experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model that the school counseling site supervisor has, the more prepared site supervisors perceive themselves to be to provide supervision in professional foundation behaviors. Table 14 details the results of the professional foundation behavior regression analysis.

Table 14

Regression Coefficients of Demographic and Support Variables on composite ASCA Professional Foundation Behaviors Standards and Competencies Score

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Education	2.6478	.7783	3.40	.0011***
CACREP graduate	.7709	1.6690	.46	.6455
Years of Experience	.1153	.0851	1.35	.1795
ASCA Experience	3.0617	.8748	3.50	.0008***
University Support	.5151	.9438	.55	.5868
ACES Region				
NARACES vs. SACES	2.9356	1.7365	1.69	.0950
NCACES vs. SACES	.7653	1.6849	.45	.6509
RMACES vs. SACES	.3233	3.0853	.10	.9168
WACES vs. SACES	2.7167	2.4249	1.12	.2661

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Behavior: Direct and Indirect Student Services

Direct and Indirect Student Services behavior composite scores outline the services provided to students, and other stakeholders, by school counselors consistent with performing all roles and responsibilities of a school counselor effectively (ASCA, 2019c). The possible minimum composite score for direct and indirect student services behavior was 21 with a maximum possible score of 84. Actual range of data utilized in this study were 42 to 84. The overall regression model was statistically significant ($R^2 = .2736$, $F(9, 76) = 3.18$, $MSE = 53.9043$, $p = .0026$), indicating at least one of the predictor variables included in the model significantly predicted preparedness to supervise direct and indirect student services behavior composite scores. The model accounted for 37% of the variance ($f^2 = .3766$) in the outcome variable, indicating a large effect size.

Upon further analysis of parameter estimates, site supervisors' experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model was a statistically significant predictor ($t = 2.97$, $p = .0040$). This statistical significance indicated that those with a thorough understanding of the prescribed roles and responsibilities, as well as how to increase equity and remove barriers to student success

through experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model perceive themselves to be more prepared to provide supervision regarding direct and indirect student services to school CITs consistent with the ASCA (2019c) Professional Standards and Competencies. Perceived support from supervisees' university was also statistically significant ($t=2.13, p=.0367$). The results indicate the more support the site supervisor perceives from their supervisees' university, the more prepared they will perceive themselves to supervise behaviors related to direct and indirect student services. As the direct and indirect student services area represents the majority of supervision procedures, it is evident a clear and communicative partnership must be established for adequate supervision to occur.

The ACES region in which the school counseling site supervisor worked was not a statistically significant predictor of composite scores on direct and indirect student service behavior ($t=1.65, p=.1709$). However, it should be noted that a statistically significant difference between perceived level of preparedness to supervise direct and indirect student service behaviors was identified between two ACES regions. The North Atlantic (NARACES) composite scores were significantly higher, statistically ($t=2.27, p=.0263$) with the Southern (SACES) region as the reference group. This statistical significance indicates that the NARACES region is more prepared to supervise school CITs development of direct and indirect student service behaviors than the SACES region. Table 15 presents the results.

Table 15

Regression Coefficients of Demographic and Support Variables on composite ASCA Direct and Indirect Student Service Behaviors Standards and Competencies Score

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Education	.5919	1.0339	.57	.5687
CACREP graduate	.9219	2.2170	.42	.6787
Years of Experience	.0994	.1130	.88	.3821
ASCA Experience	3.4532	1.1621	2.97	.0040**
University Support	2.6654	1.2537	2.13	.0367*
ACES Region				
NARACES vs. SACES	5.2281	2.3066	2.27	.0263*
NCACES vs. SACES	2.3872	2.2381	1.07	.2895
RMACES vs. SACES	2.2984	4.0983	.56	.5766
WACES vs. SACES	-.2337	3.2211	-.07	.9423

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Behavior: Planning and Assessment

The planning and assessment composite scores detail the behaviors necessary to perform all school counselor roles and responsibilities effectively (ASCA, 2019c). The possible minimum composite score for planning and assessment behavior was 16, with a possible maximum score of 64. Actual range of data utilized in this study were 37 to 64. The overall regression model was statistically significant ($R^2 = .3040$, $F(9, 76) = 3.69$, $MSE = 38.4022$, $p = .0007$), indicating at least one of the predictor variables included in the model significantly predicted the composite score for planning and assessment. Further, the model accounted for just over 43% of the variance ($f^2 = .4367$) in the outcome variable, indicating a large effect size.

Upon further analysis of parameter estimates, the education of site supervisors was determined to be a statistically significant predictor ($t = 3.02$, $p = .0035$) of perceived level of preparedness to supervise behaviors related to planning and assessment standards and competencies. These results indicate that as site supervisors gain further education (second master's or doctoral degree), their composite scores of perceived level of preparedness for supervision of planning and assessment behaviors also increases. Graduation from a CACREP

accredited counselor education program was also determined to be a statistically significant predictor ($t=2.10, p=.0389$) of perceived level of preparedness to supervise planning and assessment behaviors. Further, site supervisors' experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model was also determined to be statistically significant in the proposed model to predict composite scores of perceived level of preparedness to supervise planning and assessment behaviors. Because CACREP (2016) standards align with ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies, an inference may be drawn that, in general, CACREP accredited counselor education programs provide more adequate training in the roles and responsibilities of the school counseling profession as outlined by ASCA (2019a), than non-CACREP accredited counselor education programs. It is evident that the intentional training in ASCA (2019a) defined roles and responsibilities of school counselors increases perceived level of preparedness to supervise planning and assessment composite scores.

A final statistically significant predictor of composite scores on perceived level of preparedness to supervise planning and assessment behaviors was identified in the ACES region variable. Participants from the NCACES region reported higher perceived levels of preparedness for supervising planning and assessment behaviors than the SACES region, which was used as the reference group for the analysis ($t=2.21, p=.0303$). This result may indicate that counselor education programs in the NCACES region place a higher value on preparing site supervisors to both supervise and perform these behaviors as a professional school counselor. Results are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

Regression Coefficients of Demographic and Support Variables on composite ASCA Planning and Assessment Behaviors Standards and Competencies Score

Variables	β	SE	t	p
Education	2.6342	.0872	3.02	.0035**
CACREP graduate	3.9324	1.8713	2.10	.0389*
Years of Experience	.0665	.0954	.70	.4877
ASCA Experience	2.2835	.9808	2.33	.0226*
University Support	1.6565	1.0581	1.57	.1216
ACES Region				
NARACES vs. SACES	3.5977	1.9469	1.85	.0685
NCACES vs. SACES	4.1688	1.8890	2.21	.0303*
RMACES vs. SACES	1.0478	3.4592	.30	.7628
WACES vs. SACES	-.0228	2.7188	-.01	.9933

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

All participants included in this study had a minimum of 2 years of relevant experience, as required by CACREP (2016) standards. Based on the results and lack of statistical significance through multiple regression analyses, more experience did not increase perceived level of preparedness to supervise school CITs in the four areas of the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies. To determine if the two years of required experience is a good predictor for level of preparedness, participants with less than two years of experience would need to be included in a sample. However, this study determined that an increase in required relevant experience is not necessary to increase level of preparedness to supervise a school CIT.

Further, experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model appears to be a statistically significant predictor variable for all behavior standards and competencies, as outlined by the ASCA (2019c) Professional Standards and Competencies. Therefore, more experience and training for school counseling site supervisors in the ASCA (2019a) National Model would be beneficial in improving the overall perceived level of preparedness to supervise school CITs.

Chapter 5: Discussion

In this chapter, I discuss the implications of the results presented in the previous chapter regarding the perceived level of preparedness for school counseling site supervisors. I begin by discussing the results of each of the five research questions in relation to previous literature. Then, I discuss implications for practice and future research. Next, I present the methodological implications. Finally, I end this chapter by reviewing the limitations associated with the current study.

Research Question 1

According to the findings in this study, the majority of school counseling site supervisors had some type of training in supervision models. This result is especially important because previous research found a significant lack of training in supervision for school counseling site supervisors (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Wambu & Myers, 2019). While a little more than 80% of participants in this study graduated from a CACREP accredited program, the graduation status of participants in the Wambu and Myers (2019) study are not known. This could indicate that the CACREP accredited programs may provide school CITs more opportunities to receiving training in supervision, to prepare for future supervision endeavors. Nevertheless, the improvement in training reported suggests that counselor education programs are improving in their efforts to provide training in supervision to school counseling site supervisors.

Of those who had received some type of training in supervision models, it was determined that the majority of school counseling site supervisors had training in models specific to school counseling. Again, this result indicates that counselor education faculty have improved training efforts to ensure school counseling site supervisors receive relevant training, as previous research indicated the majority of training being focused on clinical supervision models

(Bultsma, 2012). The largest percentage of those with training in supervision reported training in both clinical mental health and school counseling supervision models. Because research has concluded that models designed for clinical mental health supervision alone, fail to meet the complex needs of school CITs and school counseling site supervisors (Bultsma, 2012; Devlin et al., 2009; Luke & Bernard, 2006), school counseling site supervisors seek additional training in models specific to the school counseling specialty area to drive their practice. However, there is still a small percentage of site supervisors who engaged in supervision without adequate training in models specific to the school counseling specialty area.

Although the majority of participants reported training in supervision models, over a third of participants reported no training in any models of supervision. This finding is concerning because both ASCA and CACREP call for training in supervision for site supervisors to practice ethically. Standard D.b of the ASCA (2016) Ethical Standards requires site supervisors of school counselors to “have the education and training to provide clinical supervision” (p. 8). School counseling site supervisors without training in supervision models and practices are violating ASCA (2016) Ethical Standards. The practice of providing supervision without the necessary training raises concerns about the adequacy of supervision experiences for school CITs. While CACREP (2016) standard Section 3, Standard P.5 requires site supervisors to receive “relevant training in counseling supervision” (p. 15), it is evident that current efforts to provide training do not always include information about pertinent supervision models, which provide a guide for site supervisors. While overall efforts to provide more training that is relevant to the school counseling profession have improved, there remains work to be done to ensure all school counseling site supervisors are practicing ethically and within their scope of knowledge. To

further examine training methods of school counseling site supervisors, I posed a second research question.

Research Question 2

The results of the frequency analysis conducted to answer the second research question offers important insight as to how school counseling site supervisors receive training. Studer (2005) determined that formal training in supervision models, techniques, and methods are traditionally reserved for students in doctoral education programs. However, this study determined that, of school counseling site supervisors with training, a majority receive training through graduate-level coursework during their master's degree program. It appears that opinions about supervision may have evolved and it is deemed important to receive supervision training outside of doctoral-level coursework. Although the previous statement is encouraging, there remains a population of school counseling site supervisors who do not receive formal training and are left to seek out training opportunities individually or simply rely on professional experiences. Brott et al. (2017) reported that many school counseling site supervisors rely on professional experiences to determine the methods and techniques in which they approach the supervision process, rather than a supervision model. The method of self-study or relying on professional experiences to provide adequate supervision has not been studied. However, the general consensus, in literature, is that self-study or reliance on professional experiences is not an ideal foundation on which to provide supervision to school CITs (Bledsoe et al., 2019; Brott et al., 2017; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006).

This study also determined that slightly under a quarter of the sample population did not receive any training in the supervision process, while another quarter did not have training through coursework and sought out training opportunities through self-study, conference

sessions, webinars, workshops, or seminars, if at all. Therefore, even though ASCA (2016) and CACREP (2016) both speak to the necessity of site supervisors of CITs to have training relevant to the supervision process in order to engage in supervision practices, many site supervisors of school counselors are proceeding without any training or only self-directed trainings. Brott et al. (2017) stated that a lack of training led school counseling site supervisors to rely on professional experiences to guide the type of opportunities they provide for their supervisees. It is concerning for any amount of school counseling site supervisors to report a lack of training in supervision, as it details a gap in preparation of school counseling site supervisors.

In 1995, Stickel encouraged professionals and counselor educators to seek an understanding of how to best prepare new counseling professionals in the field. Almost twenty-five years later, a paucity of literature to determine best practices still exists. More research is required to better understand how varying training methods and procedures impact practice of school counseling site supervisors. Further research would inform possible regulatory board requirements to be instituted for supervisors of school counselors, similar to clinical mental health supervision. However, even when training occurs, the gap between training and implementation must be studied to lead to a more standardized supervision experience for school CITs.

Research Question 3

To explore utilization of supervision models, I posed a third research question. The results from this study determine that although a majority of school counseling site supervisors report training, many site supervisors still do not utilize a model of supervision to guide the supervision process, which affirms previous research (Brott et al., 2017). Further, the overreliance on professional and past supervision experience, may perpetuate a cycle of

inadequate supervision. School counseling site supervisors who operate without a guiding model to provide supervision opportunities relevant to the integration of knowledge acquisition and skill application rely on their own experiences to decide which opportunities to provide to their supervisees (Brott et al., 2017). However, results from this study indicate that, of site supervisors who report utilizing a supervision model, a majority are guided by or integrate a model of supervision specific to the school counseling profession. Whether this training in school counseling specific models comes through graduate coursework or self-directed study to fill gaps identified through the supervision process, school counseling site supervisors have clearly identified a use for a model that reflects the unique roles and responsibilities of the school counseling profession, supporting previous research findings (Bledsoe et al., 2019; Brott et al., 2017; Brown et al., 2018; Cigrand & Wood, 2011; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). While models undoubtedly exist, a model that aligns with the ASCA (2019a) National Model does not. Some models come close but lack language specific to the evolving profession and revisions made to the ASCA (2019a) National Model.

Even though gaps in training have been identified, it does not appear that school counselors avoid the responsibility of site supervision due to a lack of training, as previously suggested by Cigrand and Wood (2001). The ASCA (2019a) National Model weaves the theme of leadership throughout the entire model, indicating a need to assume a leadership position in multiple arenas (e.g., school, district, community, state, region, nation). Supervision is a form of leadership as supervisors identify strengths and growth areas for supervisees to grow personally and professionally. It is evident that school counselors believe supervision of school CITs is an important way to advocate for and be a leader in the profession, even though it adds more responsibilities to an already complex and full list. Counselor educators also serve as gatekeepers

to ensure CITs are provided with supervision, consistent with their specialty area, that is adequate and provides opportunities to integrate knowledge and skill. More research is necessary to determine if adequate supervision is provided by school counseling site supervisors who do not utilize a model of supervision to guide the process.

Research Question 4

To evaluate the perceived level of preparedness to provide adequate supervision of school counseling site supervisors, I answered a fourth research question. While the model was found to be statistically significant, none of the predictors were statistically significant. This indicates the model is significantly better at predicting level of preparedness to supervise than chance alone, however none of the predictors are significant predictors of the level of preparedness. Because current literature fails to define what adequate site supervision for school CITs looks like or includes, I sought to provide a quantitative measure for adequate supervision with this study. The unequal cell sizes prevent accurate interpretation of data collected. If this model, with further research, is found to be statistically significant at predicting preparedness to provide adequate supervision in all four areas of ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies, it could result in a screening procedure counselor education faculty could use to evaluate potential site supervisors. Counselor education faculty could provide this screener to any school counselor who wishes to serve as a site supervisor for a school CIT. Once school counseling site supervisors can be screened for level of preparedness, counselor education faculty may identify gaps in knowledge and provide targeted training and necessary support to school counseling site supervisors to improve adequate supervision of school CITs.

Research Question 5

Regarding my fifth and final research question, the statistical significance in the multiple regression suggests that experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model, education, university support, and graduation from a CACREP accredited program should be information included in site supervisor screening procedures. School counseling site supervisors who report more experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model are more prepared to provide adequate supervision to school CITs in all behavior standards and competencies. This provides credence to the CACREP (2016) and ASCA (2019b) requirement for relevant training to be provided to school counseling site supervisors. Counselor education faculty would be wise to evaluate potential school counseling site supervisors' experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model. Better screening procedures could allow school CITs to be placed with site supervisors who have training as well as a plan for implementation of supervision procedures. Further research needs to be conducted to develop best practices for school counseling site supervisor screening and site placement procedures.

All school counseling site supervisors are required to hold a master's degree in school counseling or a related field that qualifies them to have a state certification or license as a school counselor (ASCA, 2019b). This study identified school counseling site supervisors with more education, either a second master's or doctoral degree, perceived themselves to be more prepared to provide supervision in professional foundation and planning and assessment behavior standards and competencies. Interestingly, it did not appear that more education indicated more preparedness to supervise direct and indirect student service behavior standards and competencies. Although additional formal education may include advanced knowledge and skill related to the counseling profession, supervision, leadership, or teaching, it likely does not

include advanced knowledge related to the school counseling profession and the services provided to students and stakeholders, as evidenced by CACREP (2016) standards for Counselor Education and Supervision doctoral programs. However, additional support was desired when supervising the services provided to students and stakeholders, which may be due to a reliance on professional experiences and less knowledge about the supervision process.

Higher levels of perceived support from supervisees' institution was a significant predictor of direct and indirect student service behavior standards and competencies. This is valuable information for counselor education programs, as this is the area in which site supervisors need the most support. More research in this area could determine the specific areas site supervisors need support from counselor education faculty members, as well as what type of support is needed. This could lead to more consistency among counselor education programs regarding partnerships with site supervisors of school CITs.

The final significant predictor determined that school counseling site supervisors who graduated from a CACREP accredited program perceived themselves to be more prepared to provide supervision in the planning and assessment behavior of the professional standards and competencies. As CACREP (2016) standards align with the ASCA (2019a) National Model, it is interesting, though not surprising, that those who graduate from a CACREP accredited program perceives themselves to be more prepared to supervise behaviors related to the design, implementation, and assessment of comprehensive school counseling programs. Being awarded status as a school with a Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) is a demanding and difficult process. School districts often hire consultants to assist with the program evaluation process and design of a comprehensive program that aligns with the mission and vision statements for the counseling department, school, and district. CACREP standards (Section 5,

Standard G.3.a-o) require school counselor education programs to document how students acquire knowledge and skills related to

“(a) development of school counseling program mission statements and objectives, (b) design and evaluation of school counseling programs, (c) core curriculum design, lesson plan development, classroom management strategies, and differentiated instructional strategies, (d) interventions to promote academic development, (e) use of developmentally appropriate career counseling interventions and assessments, (f) techniques of personal/social counseling in school settings, (g) strategies to facilitate school and postsecondary transitions, (h) skills to critically examine the connections between social, familial, emotional, and behavior problems and academic achievement, (i) approaches to increase promotion and graduation rates, (j) interventions to promote college and career readiness, (k) strategies to promote equity in student achievement and college access, (l) techniques to foster collaboration and teamwork within schools, (m) strategies for implementing and coordinating peer intervention programs, (n) use of accountability data to inform decision making, [and] (o) use of data to advocate for programs and students,” (p. 33)

which are all related to the design, implementation, and assessment of comprehensive school counseling programs. Based on these results, it appears that CACREP accredited program faculty are better at educating school CITs on comprehensive school counseling programs, in alignment with the ASCA (2019a) National Model.

While site supervisors’ training in supervision techniques, models, and processes were not analyzed as predictors of level of preparedness to supervise, they are clearly vital components for adequate supervision and need to be studied further. For the integration of knowledge acquisition and skill application to be successful, CITs must be provided with opportunities specific to professional standards and competencies, relevant to their specialty area, during the supervision process. The process of supervision allows CITs to be placed in roles during a time of support and overview to identify further growth areas as well as areas of strength. In reality, some school counselors are the only counselor in their building and will be faced with making quick decisions in complicated and delicate situations. Adequate and effective

supervision allows school counselors the best opportunities to integrate knowledge and skills in preparation for entrance into the school counseling profession.

Implications for Practice

I will now discuss the implications for practice. While, the overarching implication for practice is the call for mandatory training in supervision for those who supervise, screening procedures which assist counselor educators in safeguarding the school counseling profession and promoting ethical practice should be the primary focus. Proper screening procedures to ensure school counseling site supervisors have the necessary training and preparation to provide adequate and ethical supervision would allow counselor educators to identify gaps in training as well as enhance gatekeeping and protect school CITs. Screening would also provide measurable information which counselor education faculty can utilize to ensure school counseling site supervisors receive relevant training and orientation to the program, per CACREP accreditation standards. Further, programs can use meaningful trainings targeted at the specific gaps identified through screening to increase school counseling site supervisors' engagement and better prepare them to provide adequate supervision. Based on the current study's results, these trainings should also include information related to the evolving profession and any updates to the ASCA (2019a) National Model.

While this study establishes the need for screening of potential school counseling site supervisors, the results also provide guidance on the information to include in the screening process. Based on the findings of this study, a program could screen potential supervisors by assessing their knowledge of and training in supervision, experience supervising, perceived level of preparedness to supervise using the ASCA (2017) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies, and demographic information such as level of education and years of

experience as a school counselor. As this study identified experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model as a statistically significant predictor for perceived level of preparedness, programs should also assess knowledge of the ASCA (2019a) National Model. Further, the ASCA (2019a) National Model provides valuable information about appropriate roles and responsibilities of counselors and should also be included in screening methods, aimed at identifying gaps in knowledge and application.

Experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model, education beyond master's degree, and graduation from a CACREP accredited program were all found to be significant predictors for school counseling site supervisor's level of preparedness to provide adequate supervision to school CITs. As this is the first study to specifically explore which variables contribute to a school counseling site supervisor perceiving themselves to be prepared to provide adequate supervision, these findings should be further explored by research. However, concerning practice, these findings provide valuable information to be utilized in selection and preparation of school counseling site supervisors.

Counselor education faculty who apply these findings to the selection of school counseling site supervisors may prefer or seek out supervisors who have continued education beyond a master's degree, i.e. professional certificate programs, doctoral degree, or second master's degree. Further, preference may be shown towards school counseling site supervisors with graduate level training from a CACREP accredited counselor education program. Although a direct cause cannot yet be determined from this study, a CACREP (2016) accredited program requires 60 hours of graduate training, while some school counselor education programs may be as few as 48 hours of graduate training. Therefore, it may be assumed that a more comprehensive training is provided to graduates of a CACREP accredited counselor education program. While

most branches of the counseling profession require additional certifications in order to provide supervision, school counseling does not require additional trainings. Counselor education faculty can use this information and findings to advocate for school counseling site supervisors to enroll in a supervision course for a reduced rate. This process could expand the pool of school counseling site supervisors prepared to provide adequate supervision to school CITs. Further, CACREP may consider adding supervision as a training standard for master's level school counseling students, as they will not be required to take a supervision course in order to provide supervision in the future. This training should include supervision processes and supervision models appropriate for the school counseling specialty area. Counselor education faculty would benefit from assessing school counseling site supervisors' knowledge and experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model to ensure familiarity. Then, targeted trainings at expanding vital information and updates to the ASCA (2019a) National Model should be provided to school counseling site supervisors.

Counselor education faculty and leaders in the school counseling profession should note that it is difficult to obtain training and remain current in all areas of the ASCA (2019a) National Model. Training is largely left up to state chapters and is inconsistent across states. As this study determined the importance of the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies and the ASCA (2019a) National Model, counselor education faculty and leaders in the school counseling profession should advocate for ASCA to promote trainings in these areas. All training provided to school counseling site supervisors, including program orientation, should include training on the ASCA (2019a) National Model. Further, as new resources are distributed by ASCA, counselor education faculty may benefit from providing the information to their school counseling site supervisors. Counselor education faculty could also explore the

CACREP (2016) standards that may result in school counseling site supervisors' perception of being more prepared to provide supervision after graduating from a CACREP accredited program. Results from this exploration may lead to advancements in how training is conducted to ensure all school counseling site supervisors are prepared to provide adequate supervision. Similarly, when training in supervision is made more readily available outside of post-master's studies, continued education may no longer be a statistically significant predictor of increased level of preparedness to provide adequate supervision. These findings provide extremely valuable information to the school counseling profession as well as counselor education faculty.

To advance the theme of leadership, evident in the ASCA (2019a) National Model, training in supervision models and practices relevant to profession would be beneficial and necessary to ensure the profession advances and school CITs are better prepared to enter the profession. Efforts by school counseling leadership to identify a clear distinction of appropriate roles and responsibilities of school counselors have made the frustration of evolving roles and responsibilities less challenging and provided a platform for advocacy (Erford, 2019). By understanding the application of these roles and responsibilities, an avenue to properly prepare school counselors for entering the profession is provided, which may reduce the rate of burn out.

Methodological Implications

This study defined adequate supervision of school CITs for the first time in literature. To properly define adequate supervision, ASCA (2016) ethics and ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies were utilized. Adequate supervision, for this study, is defined as supervision to develop, expand, and apply the mindsets and behaviors included in the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies that define the appropriate roles and responsibilities of the school counseling profession. The definition

promotes the ethical practice of school counseling site supervisors by encouraging training and preparedness to provide opportunities to demonstrate mastery of each of the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies. By providing a definition of adequate supervision, research can be conducted to evaluate methods of training and practice of school counseling site supervisors. With future research, the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies can be adapted into questions for site supervisors to determine their level of preparedness to provide opportunities for school CITs to demonstrate mastery of each. Results may determine training efforts of counselor education faculty, focused on filling gaps of knowledge. As professional school counselors have complex roles and responsibilities, training is most appreciated when it is targeted and relevant. Therefore, the implications of providing a definition with which to measure adequate supervision is timely and valuable to the school counseling profession and counselor education.

Implications for Research

Implications for research will now be addressed. Future research should attempt to look at the model for determining school counseling site supervisors' level of preparedness to supervise school CITs, by utilizing the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies. A more diverse and nationally representative sample might address the issue of unequal cell sizes identified in this study. A method to screen school counseling site supervisors to determine their education, experience as a school counselor, exposure and experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model, graduation from a CACREP accredited program, and level of support from supervisees' university could identify gaps in training needed for ethical and adequate supervision of school CITs to occur. Further, research to determine how varying training methods and procedures impact practice of school counseling site supervisors

may lead to more informed decisions about the delivery of training to school counseling site supervisors. Future research should also seek to determine specific areas site supervisors need support from counselor education faculty as well as what type of support is desired. Answers in this area could improve partnerships with site supervisors as well as the experiences of school CITs.

Further research to develop a school counseling supervision model which aligns with the ASCA (2019a) National Model would also be a distinct contribution to both the counselor education and school counseling professions. Ideally, this model would include examples and methods with which to apply the model in the school setting. Also, beneficial would be exploration to determine if adequate supervision can be provided by school counseling site supervisors who rely solely on professional experiences or use a clinical mental health model of supervision. Finally, while this study provided a definition of adequate supervision for the first time, more research could provide valuable information that would inform regulatory boards in developing supervisor requirements for supervisors of school counselors, similar to those required by clinical mental health supervisors.

Limitations

Limitations for this study were identified and will be discussed next. Collecting data during a global pandemic proved difficult and resulted in a small sample size. Although my sample size was adequate to determine significance and meet power, it was only representative of school counseling site supervisors connected to their state organizations or ASCA or who had served as a site supervisor for a CACREP accredited school counselor education program. Further, data includes only school counseling site supervisors who chose to respond to the survey and does not include information about those who chose not to participate. This leads to potential

errors in generalizing to the population of school counseling site supervisors, as those who received the survey and chose to respond are likely to be heavily involved and interested in advancement and advocacy for the profession. School counselors who are not connected to their state organization or do not currently serve as a school counseling site supervisor may not be as interested in advocacy for the profession and not likely to complete the survey.

Though the use of surveys is determined to be an efficient way to collect data, there are several disadvantages to their use. Coughlan et al. (2013) described a major disadvantage of e-mailed surveys to be the low response rate, which was the case with this study. Because the procedures of dissemination relied on snowball sampling methods and postings on relevant message boards, a true response rate is difficult to determine.

Further, cell sizes were not equal and presented problems with interpreting results of the ordinal logistic regression. The overwhelming majority of participants reported themselves prepared to provide adequate supervision, leaving those in the population who perceive themselves as unprepared underrepresented in this study. The non-linear relationship found in the composite scores for the Mindset competencies and standards led to insignificant statistical analyses. This may have been remedied with a larger sample size. However, more research is necessary to determine the cause of the non-linear relationship.

A final limitation to this study is the reliance on self-report. Perceived level and actual level of preparedness to supervise school CITs may not be equal. While this study identified significant predictors of perceived level of preparedness to supervise, actual level of preparedness to provide adequate supervision should be studied to confirm the predictors significantly predict ability and preparedness to provide adequate supervision.

Conclusion

Based on a review of current literature, it appears that this study is the first to define adequate supervision and measure school counseling site supervisors' perceived level of preparedness to supervise school CITs. This study provides a step in answering calls for research in providing adequate and effective school counseling site supervision. Results of the statistical analyses and measures of statistical significance are good initial indicators that the ASCA (2019c) School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies are valid measures for adequate supervision. Further, experience with the ASCA (2019a) National Model, level of education, support from CIT university faculty, and graduation from a CACREP accredited program appear to be effective at predicting school counseling site supervisors perceived level of preparedness to provide adequate supervision. Using suggestions from this study, future research is warranted to better understand the complexity of providing adequate site supervision to school CITs, as well as develop and implement screening and training procedures counselor education faculty may use to ensure school CITs receive adequate site supervision.

References

- Akos, P., Scarborough, J. L. (2004). An examination of the clinical preparation of school counselors. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44*, 96-107.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2004.tb01863.x>
- American School Counselor Association. (2014a). *ASCA mindsets & behaviors for student success: K-12 college- and career-readiness standards for every student*. Author.
<https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/home/MindsetsBehaviors.pdf>
- American School Counselor Association. (2014b). *The school counselor and school counseling preparation programs*. Author.
https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/PositionStatements/PS_Preparation.pdf
- American School Counselor Association. (2015). *The school counselor and credentialing and licensure*. Author.
https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/PositionStatements/PS_Credentialing.pdf
- American School Counselor Association. (2016). *ASCA ethical standards for school counselors*. Author.
<https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/Ethics/EthicalStandards2016.pdf>
- American School Counselor Association. (2017). *The school counselor and school counseling preparation programs*. Author.
https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/PositionStatements/PS_ComprehensivePrograms.pdf
- American School Counselor Association. (2019a). *ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs*. (4th ed.). Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2019b). *The essential role of school counselor educators/practicum and internship supervisors*. Author.
<https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/Careers-Roles/WhySCE.pdf>
- American School Counselor Association. (2019c). *ASCA school counselor professional standards & competencies*. Author.
<https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/home/SCCompetencies.pdf>
- Baker, S. B. (1992). *School counseling for the twenty-first century*. Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Belser, C. (2017). *Strategies for site supervisors* [Webinar]. American School Counselor Association. <https://videos.schoolcounselor.org/strategies-for-site-supervisors>

- Bernard, J. M. (1979). Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*, 110-120. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1979.tb00906.x>
- Bernard, J. M. (1997). The discrimination model. In C. E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 310-327). Wiley.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2019). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Bjornestad, A., Johnson, V., Hittner, J., & Paulson, K. (2014). Preparing site supervisors of counselor education students. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 53*, 242-253. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00060.x>
- Bledsoe, K. G., Logan-McKibben, S., McKibben, W. B., & Cook, R. M. (2019). A content analysis of school counseling supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 22*(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759x19838454>
- Borders, L. D. (1991). Supervision \neq evaluation. *The School Counselor, 38*(4), 253-255.
- Bordin, E. S. (1983). Supervision in counseling: II. Contemporary models of supervision: A working alliance based model of supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*(1), 35-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000083111007>
- Brott, P. E., Stone, V., & Davis, T. E. (2017). Growing together: A developmental model for training school counseling site supervisors. *Professional School Counseling, 20*(1), 139-148. <https://doi.org/10.5330/1096-2409-20.1.139>
- Brown, C. H., Olivarez, A., DeKruyf, L. (2018). The impact of the school counselor supervision model on the self-efficacy of school counselor site supervisors. *Professional School Counseling, 21*(1), 152-160. <https://doi.org/10.5330/1096-2409-21.1.152>
- Bultsma, S. A. (2012). Supervision experiences of new professional school counselors. *Michigan Journal of Counseling: Research, Theory, and Practice, 39*(1), 4-18. <https://doi.org/10.22237/mijoc/1325376060>
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2016). *2016 CACREP standards*. Author. <https://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards/>
- Christian, D. D., & Brown, C. L. (2018). Recommendations for the role and responsibilities of school-based mental health counselors. *Journal of School-Based Counseling Policy and Evaluation, 1*(1), 26-39. <https://doi.org/10.25774/nmfk-y245>
- Cigrand, D. L., & Wood, S. M. (2011). School counseling and solution-focused site supervision: A theoretical application and case example. *Journal of School Counseling, 9*(6).

- Cigrand, D. L., Wood, S. M., & Duys, D. (2014). School counselors' use of solution-focused tenets and techniques in school-based site supervision. *Journal of School Counseling, 12*(15).
- Cinotti, D. (2014). Competing professional identity models in school counseling: A historical perspective and commentary. *The Professional Counselor, 4*(5), 417-425. <https://doi.org/10.15241/dc.4.5.417>
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2015). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Cook, K. D. (2008). *An evaluation of school counselor supervision* (Publication No. 3315928) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at San Antonio]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Coughlan, M., Cronin, P., Ryan, F. (2013). Survey research: process and limitations. *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation, 16*(1). <https://doi.org/10.12968/ijtr.2009.16.1.37935>
- DeKruyf, L., & Pehrsson, D. E. (2011). School counseling site supervisor training: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 50*, 314-327. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb01918.x>
- Devlin, J. M., Smith, R. L., & Ward, C. A. (2009). An Adlerian alliance supervisory model for school counseling. *Journal of School Counseling, 7*(42). <https://doi.org/10.22237/mijoc/129897720>
- Dimmitt, C., & Carey, J. (2007). Using the ASCA national model to facilitate school transitions. *Professional School Counseling, 10*(3), 227-232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759x0701000302>
- Dollarhide, C. T., & Miller, G. M. (2006). Supervision for preparation and practice of school counselors: Pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*, 242-252. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00001.x>
- Dollarhide, C. T., & Saginak, K. A. (2006). *Comprehensive school counseling programs: K-12 delivery systems in action*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Duncan, K., Brown-Rice, K., & Bardhoshi, G. (2014). Perceptions of the importance and utilization of clinical supervision among certified rural school counselors. *The Professional Counselor, 4*(5), 444-454. <https://doi.org/10.15241/kd.4.5.444>
- Erford, B. T. (2019). *Transforming the school counseling profession*. (5th ed.). Pearson.

- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, *41*, 1149-1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/brm.41.4.1149>
- Galassi, J. P., & Akos, P. (2012). Preparing school counselors to promote academic development. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *51*, 50-63. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2012.00004.x>
- Gibson, D. M., Dooley, B. A., Kelchner, V. P., Moss, J. M., & Vacchio, C. B. (2012). From counselor-in-training to professional school counselor: Understanding professional identity development. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory & Research* *39*(1), 17-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15566382.2012.12033879>
- Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1996). *Statistical methods in education and psychology* (3rd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Gysbers, N. C. (2010). *Remembering the past, shaping the future: A history of school counseling*. American School Counselor Association.
- Gysbers, N. C. (2016, June 21-23). *The changing role of school counselors: Past to present-from providing isolated services to becoming a valued collaborator* [Conference session]. West Virginia Department of Education School Counselor Conference, Charleston, WV, United States.
- Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2006). Comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: A rich history and a bright future. *Professional School Counseling*, *4*, 246-256.
- Hatch, T. (2014). *The use of data in school counseling: Hatching results for students, programs, and the profession*. Corwin.
- Henderson, R., & Gysbers, N. C. (2006) *Providing administrative and counseling supervision for school counselors*. <https://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/vistas/providing-administrative-and-counseling-supervision-for-school-counselors.pdf?sfvrsn=8&sfvrsn=8>
- Holloway, E. (1995). *Clinical supervision: A systems approach*. Sage.
- Hosmer, D. W., Lemeshow, S., & Sturdivant, R. X. (2013). *Applied logistic regression* (3rd ed.). Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Lambie, G. W., & Sias, S. M. (2009). An integrative psychological developmental model of supervision for professional school counselors-in-training. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *87*, 349-356. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2009.tb00116.x>
- Lanning, W. (1986). Development of supervisor emphasis rating form. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *25*, 191-196. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1986.tb00667.x>

- Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *Counseling Psychologist, 10*, 3-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000082101002>
- Luke, M., & Bernard, J. M. (2006). The school counseling supervision model: An extension of the discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*, 282-295. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00004.x>
- Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Bradley, L. J. (2001). Supervising school counselors. In L. J. Bradley, & N. Ladany (Eds.), *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, and practice* (3rd ed., pp. 207-221). Taylor & Francis.
- Mahrer, A. R. (2005). *Supervision of psychotherapists: The discovery-oriented approach*. Wiley.
- Mason, K. L., & Perera-Diltz, D. M. (2010). Factors that influence pre-service administrators' views of appropriate school counselor duties. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*(5).
- Moss, J. M., Gibson, D. M., & Dollarhide, C. T. (2014). Professional identity development: A grounded theory of transformational tasks of counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 92*(1), 3-12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2014.00124.x>
- O'Connor, P. J. (2018). How school counselors make a world of difference. *Phi Delta Kappan, 99*(7), 35-39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721718767858>
- Page, B. J., Pietrzak, D. R., & Sutton, J. M., Jr. (2001). National survey of school counselor supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 142-150. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2001.tb01278.x>
- Peterson, J. S., & Deuschle, C. (2006). A model for supervising school counseling students without teaching experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*, 267-281. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00003.x>
- Poznanski, J. J., & McLennan, J. (1995). Conceptualizing and measuring counselors' theoretical orientation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*(4), 411-422. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.42.4.411>
- Rhodes, A. R. (2010). Guidance and school counseling. In T. C. Hunt, J. C. Carper, T. J. Lasley, & C. D. Raisch (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of educational reform and dissent*. Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412957403.n193>
- Rigazio-DiGilio, S. A., Daniels, T. G., & Ivey, A. E. (1997). Systemic cognitive-developmental supervision: A developmental-integrative approach to psychotherapy supervision. In C. E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 223-245). Wiley.
- Roberts, E. B., & Borders, L. D. (1994). Supervision of school counselors: Administrative, program, and counseling. *The School Counselor, 41*(3), 149-157.

- Ronnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M. (2003). The journey of the counselor and therapist: Research findings and perspectives on professional development. *Journal of Career Development, 30*, 5-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089484530303000102>
- Shiffler, R. E. (1988). Maximum z-scores and outliers. *American Statistician, 42*, 79-80.
- Smith, A., & Koltz, R. L. (2015). Supervision of school counseling students: A focus on personal growth, wellness, and development. *Journal of School Counseling, 13*(2).
- Spence, S. H., Wilson, J., Kavanagh, D., Strong, J., & Worrall, L. (2001). Clinical supervision in four mental health professions: A review of the evidence. *Behaviour Change, 18*, 135-155.
- Stickel, S. A. (1995, March 1-4). *The internship in school counseling: A national survey of counselor training programs* [Paper presentation]. Eastern Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Hilton Head, SC, United States.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., & McNeill, B. W. (2010). *IDM supervision: An integrative developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203893388>
- Studer, J. R. (2005). Supervising school counselors-in-training: A guide for field supervisors. *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 353-359.
- Studer, J. R., & Oberman, A. (2006). The use of the ASCA national model in supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 10*, 82-87. <https://doi.org/10.5330/prsc.10.1.f82t14475451422m>
- Swank, J. M., & Tyson, L. (2012). School counseling site supervisor training: A web-based approach. *Professional School Counseling, 16*, 40-48. <https://doi.org/10.5330/psc.n.2012-16.40>
- Uellendahl, G. E., & Tenenbaum, M. N. (2015). Supervision training, practices, and interests of California site supervisors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 54*, 272-287. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12026>
- Wambu, G. W., & Myers, Charles, E. (2019). School counselor site supervisors' perceptions of preparedness and training needs. *Journal of School Counseling, 17*(14).
- Wood, C., & Rayle, A. D. (2006). A model of school counseling supervision: The goals, functions, roles, and systems model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*, 253-266. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00002.x>

Zyromski, B., Hudson, T. D., Baker, E., & Haag Granello, D. (2019). Guidance counselors or school counselors: How the name of the profession influences perceptions of competence. *Professional School Counseling, 22*(1), 1-10.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759x19855654>

Appendices

Appendix A: Informed Consent

Evaluating School Counseling Site Supervisors' Level of Preparedness to Supervise Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Principal Researcher: Amanda G. Stuckey (agstucke@uark.edu)

Faculty Advisor: Dr. David D. Christian (ddchrist@uark.edu)

Description: The purpose of this study is to collect information around supervision practices and experiences of school counseling site supervisors. This research aims to explore school counseling site supervisors perceived preparedness to provide school counselors in training with adequate supervision experiences as well as which variables predict higher levels of perceived preparedness. This research will also seek to understand which supervision models and techniques school counseling site supervisors have received training in and use when supervising school counselors in training. Enhancing counselor educator's understanding of school counseling site supervisors' perceptions of preparedness and training experiences will help to develop appropriate training opportunities and programs for school counseling site supervisors.

Participants: As a participant in this study, you are attesting that you are a current or former site supervisor for a school counselor in training. You will be asked to complete a survey composed of questions aligned with the ASCA School Counselor Professional Standards and Competencies, along with information about supervision practices and pertinent demographic information. The completion of this survey should take no more than 30 minutes.

Risks and Benefits: There are no anticipated risks to participating in this study. Benefits include learning more about school counselor supervision models, techniques, and practices. Three participants will receive a \$25 Amazon gift card through a random drawing. At the conclusion of this survey, should you wish to participate in the drawing for the Amazon gift card, you will be asked to complete a separate survey providing your name, email, and phone number.

Voluntary Participation: Participation in this research is voluntary. You may refuse to participate or stop your participation at any time during the study. Your decision to participate or NOT to participate in the study will in no way impact any relationship with your supervisee's University, nor any of its faculty or staff.

Confidentiality: Data will be collected without any personal identifying information. Results from this research may be reported as both aggregate and separate data (with no identifying information). All information collected will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law and University of Arkansas policy.

Informed Consent: I have read the description, including the purpose of the study, the procedure to be used, the potential risks, confidentiality, as well as the option to withdraw from the study at any time. The investigator has explained each of these items to me, and I believe that I understand what is involved.

Questions: If you have any questions about the research, please feel free to contact the primary researcher or faculty advisor listed above. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the University's IRB Coordinator, Ro Windwalker, 109 MLKG Building, Fayetteville, AR 72701-1201, 479-575-2208, irb@uark.edu

_____ I have read and understand all of the information above, and I am consenting to participate in this research.

_____ I do **NOT** consent to participate in this research.

Appendix B: IRB Approval



To: Amanda Georgeann Stuckey
BELL 4188

From: Douglas James Adams, Chair
IRB Committee

Date: 03/16/2020

Action: **Exemption Granted**

Action Date: 03/16/2020

Protocol #: 2002249976

Study Title: Evaluating School Counseling Site Supervisors Level of Preparedness to Supervise

The above-referenced protocol has been determined to be exempt.

If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol that may affect the level of risk to your participants, you must seek approval prior to implementing those changes. All modifications must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have any questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact the IRB Coordinator at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

cc: David D Christian, Investigator

Appendix C: Survey

Q1: Informed Consent (see Appendix A)

Q2: Gender _____

Q3: Ethnicity

- a) White
- b) Black or African American
- c) American Indian or Alaskan Native
- d) Asian
- e) Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- f) Latinx
- g) Other (please specify): _____
- h) Prefer not to answer

Q4: Highest degree obtained:

- a) Master's degree (specify area): _____
- b) Second Master's degree (specify area): _____
- c) Doctoral Degree (specify area): _____
- d) Other (please specify): _____

Q5: Are you a graduate of a CACREP accredited program?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Unsure (specify which University): _____

Q6: Have you supervised a school counselor in training from a CACREP program?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Unsure (specify which University): _____

Q7: State where you work as a school counselor (ex: Alaska): _____

Q8: Please provide the number of years you have worked in the various settings and situations below. (Note: If no experience, put 0)

- a) Total years worked as a school counselor: _____
- b) With school counselor certification/licensure: _____
- c) Current school site: _____
- d) Elementary/primary school site: _____
- e) Middle school site: _____
- f) High school site: _____
- g) Combined sites (specify): _____
- h) Public School: _____
- i) Private School: _____
- j) Rural Setting: _____
- k) Urban/Suburban Setting: _____

Q9: Number of different school sites in which you have served as a school counselor: _____

Q10: Licenses and Certifications currently held (select all that apply)

- a) Certified School Counselor (specify state(s) certified): _____
- b) Licensed Professional Counselor
- c) Licensed Professional Counselor – Supervisor
- d) Licensed Clinical Social Worker

- e) Licensed Clinical Social Worker – Supervisor
- f) Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist
- g) Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist – Supervisor
- h) Licensed Alcohol/Drug Abuse Counselor
- i) Licensed Alcohol/Drug Abuse Counselor – Supervisor
- j) School Psychologist
- k) Registered Play Therapist
- l) Registered Play Therapist – Supervisor
- m) Other (specify): _____

Q11: What is your experience with the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model?

- a) I have never heard of the ASCA National Model.
- b) I have heard about the ASCA National Model.
- c) I learned about the ASCA National Model in my Master's program.
- d) I use some of the ASCA National Model concepts in my work as a school counselor.
- e) I am helping my school work towards a Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP).
- f) I use my school's Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) in my work as a school counselor.

Q12: I am prepared to help supervisees develop the following mindsets:

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly disagree (4)
Every student can learn (1)				
Every student can succeed (2)				
Every student should have access to and opportunity for a high-quality education (3)				
Every student should graduate from high school prepared for postsecondary opportunities (4)				
Every student should have access to a comprehensive school counseling program (5)				
Effective school counseling is a collaborative process involving school counselors, students, families, teachers, administrators, other school staff, and educational stakeholders (6)				

School
counselors are
leaders in the
school (7)

School
counselors are
leaders in the
district (8)

School
counselors are
leaders in the
state (9)

School
counselors are
leaders in the
nation (10)

Comprehensive
school
counseling
programs
promote student
academic
outcomes (11)

Comprehensive
school
counseling
programs
promote student
career outcomes
(12)

Comprehensive
school
counseling
programs
promote student
social/emotional
outcomes (13)

Comprehensive
school
counseling
programs
enhance student
academic
outcomes (14)

Comprehensive
school
counseling
programs
enhance student
career outcomes
(15)

Comprehensive
school
counseling
programs
enhance student
social/emotional
outcomes (16)

Q13: What information, if any, would you like to add to clarify your responses above? _____

Q14: I am prepared to help supervisees develop the following behaviors:

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly disagree (4)
Apply developmental theories (1)				
Apply learning theories (2)				
Apply counseling theories (3)				
Apply education theories (4)				
Demonstrate understanding of educational systems (5)				
Demonstrate understanding of legal issues affecting school counselors (6)				
Demonstrate understanding of policies affecting school counselors (7)				
Demonstrate understanding of research and trends in education (8)				
Apply legal and ethical principles of the school counseling profession (9)				

Apply school
counseling
professional
standards and
competencies,
outlined by
ASCA (10)

Utilize ASCA
Mindsets and
Behaviors for
Student Success
to inform
implementation
of a
comprehensive
school
counseling
program (11)

Demonstrate an
understanding of
the impact
cultural
influences on
student success
and opportunities
(12)

Demonstrate an
understanding of
the impact social
influences on
student success
and opportunities
(13)

Demonstrate an
understanding of
the impact
environmental
influences on
student success
and opportunities
(14)

Demonstrate leadership through the development of a comprehensive school counseling program (15)

Demonstrate leadership through the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program (16)

Demonstrate advocacy in a comprehensive school counseling program (17)

Demonstrate an understanding of how to create systemic change through the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program (18)

Q15: What information, if any, would you like to add to clarify your responses above? _____

Q16: I am prepared to help supervisees develop the following behaviors:

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly disagree (4)
Design instruction aligned to ASCA Mindsets and Behaviors for Student Success in classroom settings (1)				
Design instruction aligned to ASCA Mindsets and Behaviors for Student Success in small-group settings (2)				
Design instruction aligned to ASCA Mindsets and Behaviors for Student Success in individual settings (3)				
Implement instruction aligned to ASCA Mindsets and Behaviors for Student Success in classroom settings (4)				
Implement instruction aligned to ASCA Mindsets and Behaviors for Student Success in small-group settings (5)				

Implement instruction aligned to ASCA Mindsets and Behaviors for Student Success in individual settings (6)

Provide appraisal in classroom settings (7)

Provide appraisal in small-group settings (8)

Provide appraisal in individual settings (9)

Provide advisement in classroom settings (10)

Provide advisement in small-group settings (11)

Provide advisement in individual settings (12)

Provide short-term counseling in small-group settings (13)

Provide short-term counseling in individual settings (14)

Make referrals to
appropriate
school resources
(15)

Make referrals to
appropriate
community
resources (16)

Provide
consultation to
support student
achievement and
success (17)

Collaborate with
families for
student
achievement and
success (18)

Collaborate with
teachers for
student
achievement and
success (19)

Collaborate with
administrators
for student
achievement and
success (20)

Collaborate with
other school staff
and stakeholders
for student
achievement and
success (21)

Q17: What information, if any, would you like to add to clarify your responses above? _____

Q18: I am prepared to help supervisees develop the following behaviors:

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly disagree (4)
Create school counseling program beliefs, vision, and mission statements aligned with the school (1)				
Create school counseling program beliefs, vision, and mission statements aligned with the district (2)				
Identify gaps in student achievement (3)				
Identify gaps in student attendance (4)				
Identify gaps in student discipline (5)				
Identify gaps in student opportunities (6)				
Identify gaps in resources for students (7)				
Develop annual student outcome goals based on student data (8)				

Develop action plans aligned with annual student outcome goals and student data (9)

Implement action plans aligned with annual student outcome goals and student data (10)

Assess school counseling program results (11)

Report school counseling program results to the school community (12)

Use time appropriately according to national recommendations and student/school data (13)

Participate in establishing agreement with the principal and other administrators about the school counseling program (14)

Participate in the establishment and/or meeting of an advisory council for the school counseling program (15)

Use appropriate school counselor performance appraisal processes (16)

Q19: What information, if any, would you like to add to clarify your responses above? _____

Q20: Number of school counselors in training for whom you have served as a site supervisor: ____

Q21: Supervision models you have received some type of training in implementing (select all that apply)

- a) Discrimination Model
- b) Events-Based Supervision Model
- c) Hawkins & Shoet Model
- d) Systems Approach to Supervision Model
- e) Integrated Developmental Model
- f) Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth Model
- g) Systemic Cognitive-Developmental Supervision Model
- h) Reflective Developmental Model
- i) Ronnestad and Skovholt Lifespan Developmental Model
- j) Theoretical Orientation Specific Supervision (specify theory)
- k) Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems Model
- l) School Counseling Supervision Model
- m) Other (specify): _____
- n) I have not received training in any supervision model.

Q22: In what ways have you received training in the indicated supervision models or supervision practices? (select all that apply)

- a) Graduate level coursework
- b) Self-study
- c) Conference session
- d) Webinar
- e) Workshop
- f) Seminar
- g) Other (specify): _____
- h) I have not received any training in supervision models or practices.

Q23: Which model(s), if any, do you utilize while supervising a school counselor in training?

- a) Discrimination Model
- b) Events-Based Supervision Model

- c) Hawkins & Shohet Model
- d) Systems Approach to Supervision Model
- e) Integrated Developmental Model
- f) Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth Model
- g) Systemic Cognitive-Developmental Supervision Model
- h) Reflective Developmental Model
- i) Ronnestad and Skovholt Lifespan Developmental Model
- j) Theoretical Orientation Specific Supervision (specify theory)
- k) Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems Model
- l) School Counseling Supervision Model
- m) Other (specify): _____
- n) I do not use a model when supervising a school counselor in training.

Q24: Which supervision techniques, if any, do you utilize while supervising a school counselor in training? (select all that apply)

- a) Self-Report
- b) Process Notes / Case Notes
- c) Live Observation
- d) Audio/Video Recordings
- e) Written Feedback
- f) Interpersonal Process Recall – (Kagan & Kagan, 1997)
- g) Subtle Messages – (Borders, 2009)
- h) Socratic Questioning
- i) Journal Writing
- j) Thinking-aloud
- k) Sand-tray
- l) Creative Arts
- m) Use of metaphor
- n) Other (specify): _____
- o) I do not use any techniques while supervising a school counselor in training.

Q25: What is the level of communication with your supervisee's university faculty?

- a) Daily
- b) Weekly
- c) Monthly
- d) Once or twice a semester
- e) No communication with faculty

Q26:

	Strongly agree (18)	Agree (19)	Disagree (20)	Strongly disagree (21)
I have been adequately supported by my supervisee's university faculty? (1)				

Q27:

	Strongly agree (20)	Agree (21)	Disagree (22)	Strongly disagree (23)
I am prepared to supervise a school counselor in training? (1)				

Thank you for participating in our survey!

Appendix D: Recruitment Materials

Recruitment Email Scripts

SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM COORDINATORS

Dear School Counseling Program Coordinator,

For my dissertation, I am exploring how prepared school counseling site supervisors think they are to provide supervision to school counselors in training.

You are receiving this email because I need your help in reaching site supervisors of current CACREP accredited school counseling programs. Please consider forwarding this email to any current or past site supervisors for school counselors in training. I have included the email script for you to copy and paste into your email.

Please contact Amanda Stuckey, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], should you have any questions about this research study.

SCHOOL COUNSELING SITE SUPERVISORS

Dear Site Supervisor,

You are receiving this email because you are a site supervisor of a school counselor in training from a CACREP accredited program. I am conducting research to explore how prepared school counseling site supervisors think they are to provide supervision to school counselors in training. To participate in this study, you have to be a site supervisor of a school counselor in training from a school counseling program, which holds a current CACREP accreditation.

There will be a drawing for three (3) \$25 Amazon gift cards for those who are eligible and participate in the survey. The survey will take approximately 45-60 minutes to complete.

Please contact Amanda Stuckey, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], should you have any questions about this research study or are unsure if you qualify for participation in this study.

ASCA SCENE OR PROFESSIONAL LISTSERV

Are you a school counseling site supervisor or do you know a school counseling site supervisor? For my dissertation, I am exploring how prepared school counseling site supervisors think they are to provide supervision to school counselors in training.

To participate in this study, you must be or have been a site supervisor for a school counselor in training from a school counseling program.

There will be a drawing for three (3) \$25 Amazon gift cards for those who are eligible and participate in the survey. The survey will take approximately 45-60 minutes to complete.

Please contact Amanda Stuckey, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], should you have any questions about this research study or are unsure if you qualify for participation in this study.