

**An Exploration of Supervision Training Opportunities for School Counselors**

Leslie Neyland-Brown  
Wright State University

John M. Laux and Jennifer L. Reynolds  
The University of Toledo

Kelly Kozlowski  
Walden University

Nick J. Piazza  
The University of Toledo

### **Abstract**

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2016) and the American School Counselor Association (2016) require supervisors to have “relevant” training in supervision, but do not specify the type of training that should be acquired. This study determines if site supervisors who have had formal training in supervision, as indicated by graduate coursework, report higher self-efficacy and receive higher ratings on evaluations from school counseling internship students than site supervisors who have not. We found no effect of supervision training on school counselor interns’ ( $n = 60$ ) supervisor ratings using the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form (Boylan, Malley, & Reilly, 2001). Supervisors ( $n = 58$ ) who had training (e.g., in-services, continuing education, modules of graduate coursework, university workshop) rated themselves higher on the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011) than supervisors who had no training and those who completed a graduate supervision course.

*Keywords:* school counseling, supervision, interns

## **Supervision Training Among School Counseling Internship Supervisors**

Practicing counselors bear an important responsibility when they agree to serve as a site supervisor for practicum and internship students enrolled in master's level counseling programs. The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) requires that counseling students receive weekly supervision throughout practicum and internship for the duration of one hour by qualified site supervisors (2016). According to CACREP, site supervisor qualifications include having a valid counseling license and a minimum of two years of experience. Supervision is critical to the practicum and internship experience in that it provides counselors-in-training with a safe environment to process counseling experiences, ethical dilemmas, and case conceptualizations. It affords students an opportunity to draw connections between what they have learned in the classroom and how it should be implemented in the field (Studer & Diambra, 2010). Bernard and Goodyear (2014) defined supervision as "an intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior colleague or colleagues who typically (but not always) are members of that same profession" (p. 9). Clinical supervision, a term typically used in reference to supervision provided to mental health professionals (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014), enhances counselor development and increases professional competency (Sutton & Page, 1994). Site supervisors in both the school and clinical settings are responsible for the services that practicum and internship students provide, and the overall protection of student/client welfare.

Experienced counselors who assume the professional responsibility of supervising novice professionals have an ethical responsibility to ensure they

themselves have achieved minimal supervision competencies. Competency in supervision includes an understanding of counselor development, supervision theories, and methods and techniques (Dye & Borders, 1990). The American Counseling Association (ACA) requires that all counseling supervisors be properly trained (2014), yet, there are currently no uniform training requirements for clinical supervisors. Many state licensure boards have their own training requirements for counselors who wish to serve as clinical supervisors for licensure candidates; however, these requirements are not consistent across jurisdictions and none exist for school counselors. The 2016 CACREP standards require that all site supervisors who supervise practicum and internship students have “relevant training in counseling supervision,” (p. 15) but do not provide any explanation on what constitutes relevant or adequate training to meet the standard. Unlike clinical mental health counselors who can turn to state licensing bodies for guidelines, school counseling site supervisors do not have an equivalent guideline and traditionally have not been held to the same expectation in regard to supervision training.

Recent studies (Dekruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Studer & Oberman, 2006) focused on the question of how to provide effective supervision and what to include in supervision training curriculum, but the field has yet to address best practices for how supervisors should be trained (Borders, 2014). Despite the fact that a master’s degree is the entry level degree to work as a field-based counselor supervisor, graduate coursework in supervision is a requirement in CACREP-accredited doctoral programs, but not in master’s level clinical or school counseling programs (CACREP, 2016). Master’s level clinicians may opt to take a graduate class in supervision to meet state

board supervision training requirements, or they can obtain supervision training through a number of continuing education sessions. Although school counselors are not required to meet any supervision training requirement, school counselors may obtain supervision training at conferences and through various professional organizations (Dekruyf & Pehrsson, 2011). Bernard and Goodyear (2014) noted that supervision trainings received by way of continuing education workshops, subunits of courses, and conferences trainings are useful, but limited in that they are unable to thoroughly cover all aspects of supervision and do not provide a means for practical application. The “Best Practices in Clinical Supervision” published by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) recommends that supervision training include didactic instruction and experiential training through supervised supervision (2011). Graduate classes in supervision are capable of providing this type of training experience.

Prior to a 2016 revision, the American School Counselor Association’s (ASCA) “Ethical Standards for School Counselors” (2010) acknowledged that school counselors have a responsibility to serve as site supervisors for school counseling practicum and internship students; however, there was no mention of supervisory competence or training requirements for school counselors to serve as site supervisors. This left school counselors with little direction on how to prepare for this important role and failed to acknowledge the importance of supervision training for the school counseling profession. For this reason, Herlihy, Gray, and McCollum (2002) claimed that many school counselors shy away from supervising practicum and internship students. Many school counselors who do accept the role as a supervisor do so with little to no training.

A study of Washington and Oregon school counselors ( $n = 147$ ) indicated that less than half of the school counseling supervisors had any formal training in counseling supervision, and of those who did have formal training, only 23% reported taking a graduate class in supervision (DeKruyf & Phersson, 2011). These findings raised questions about school counselors' credibility to serve as site supervisors, and inevitably left school counseling practicum and internship students vulnerable to the effects of inadequately trained supervisors. There are no empirical data that support the notion that a lack of training in supervision indicates impairment of supervisors; however, Magnuson, Norem and Bradley (2001) claimed that counselors who perform supervision without adequate preparation may send the message that supervision is superficial and may inadequately train their supervisees. The revised version of the "Ethical Standards for School Counselors" provides the profession with more direction as it relates to supervising practicum and internship students in the field. Section D.b of the standards explicitly states that site supervisors obtain education and training in clinical supervision and continue to seek professional development opportunities in both counseling and supervision (ASCA, 2016). Now that the profession has taken a stronger stance regarding the need for clinical supervision in the school setting, it is possible that more school counselors will be seeking training opportunities that are both relevant and accessible. A graduate course in supervision with both didactic instruction and experiential training has been the common training choice for clinical mental health counselors, but it is unknown if this has been the best training option for school counselors.

This study explores what constitutes adequate training for school counselors in supervision. School counselors who serve as site supervisors tend to lack training in supervision, making it difficult to ensure that internship students are getting quality supervision that enhances their development as counselors and maximizes their training experience. Without an understanding of appropriate training opportunities for school counseling site supervisors, school counselors may not be afforded appropriate training opportunities that will adequately prepare them for serving as site supervisors.

The impact of clinical supervision on counselor performance is difficult to measure, but relevant studies have shown that supervision has a positive correlation with increased self-awareness, self-efficacy, and a strong working alliance (Borders, 1991; Cashwell & Dooley, 2001; Leherman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001); all of which have a direct impact on counselor development. Supervision is also instrumental in helping beginning professionals develop their professional identity as counselors and how they define their role in the various settings (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). There is currently no standardized instrument to measure supervisor competency holistically, but previous studies have advocated that supervisee satisfaction, the supervisory relationship, and supervisor self-efficacy are strong contributing factors (Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Ladany, Ellis & Friedlander, 1999; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001). Competency is not ensured through self-efficacy, but Bandura (1982) asserted that self-efficacy has a direct impact on how a person perceives situations and how they respond and therefore is instrumental in producing capability. School counseling site supervisor competency was explored via student intern evaluation and site supervisor self-efficacy. School counseling internship students were surveyed using the Student

Evaluation of Supervisor form and school counseling site supervisors were surveyed using the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey. Insofar as no instruments exist to measure the effect of school counselor supervision on their supervisee's development, this study used site supervisor self-efficacy ratings and student ratings of site supervisors as outcome variables.

The purpose of this study is to add to the supervision literature and provide counselor educators with a better understanding of the training needs of school counseling site supervisors. In addition, this study may yield data that support ASCA's most recent directive regarding the ethical responsibility of school counselors to obtain training in supervision (2016) and provide CACREP with data to justify an increase in the training requirements for school counseling site supervisors. Lastly, this research will prompt further research on the supervision of school counselors, methods for evaluating supervisors, and the development of appropriate training courses for school counselors. There are two research questions:

1. Are there differences in site supervisor self-efficacy ratings between school counseling site supervisors who have (a) taken a graduate class in supervision, (b) school counselors who have received non-graduate course supervision training, and (c) supervisors who have not received supervision training?
2. Are there differences in student ratings between (a) school counseling site supervisors who have taken a graduate class in supervision, (b) school counselors who have received non-graduate course supervision training, and (c) supervisors who have not received supervision training?

An exploration of site supervisor training will contribute to the supervision literature and provide counselor educators with a better understanding of the training



needs of site supervisors. In addition, this study will yield data that can be used by ASCA to promote the importance of training in supervision for school counselors and CACREP to justify an increase in the training requirements for school counseling site supervisors. Lastly, this research will hopefully prompt further research on the supervision of school counselors, methods for evaluating supervisors, and the development of appropriate training courses for school counselors.

## Method

### Participants

Participants included 58 site supervisors and 60 school counseling internship students from ten CACREP accredited programs in the state of Ohio. Two site supervisors were currently supervising two internship students at the time of this study. Table 1 presents the supervisors' demographic data.

**Table 1**  
*Supervisor Demographics*

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Sex		
Female	52	89.7
Male	5	8.6
Not Identified	1	1.7
Ethnicity		
European American	52	89.7
African American	5	8.6
Not Identified	1	1.7
Age		
25-34	6	7.1
35-44	28	32.9
45-54	11	12.9
55-64	13	15.3

The mean number of years of experience working full time as a school counselor was 12.4 ( $SD = 6.06$ , range = 2 – 37). Forty-seven percent ( $n = 27$ ) of site supervisors had supervised four or more interns over the course of their careers. A total of 95% of site supervisors reported being a licensed school counselor ( $n=55$ ) and 5% reported being a licensed professional counselor ( $n=3$ ). Twenty-four (41.4%) worked in high schools. Fifteen (25.9%) worked in multi-level school buildings. Eleven (19%) worked in middle schools. Seven (12.1%) worked in elementary schools. In addition, one (1.2%) worked at an alternative school. Years of experience working full time as a school counselor varied from 2 years to 37 and 47% of site supervisors had supervised four or more interns over the course of their careers ( $n = 27$ ). Fifty-five (95%) of site supervisors reported being a licensed school counselor and three (5%) reported being a licensed professional counselor. Thirty-two (55.1%) school counselor supervisors reported that they had received no supervision training. Fifteen (25.9%) received training in supervision (in-service, conference sessions, university workshop, or unit of a course) but did not take a graduate supervision course. The remaining 11 (19%) completed a graduate course in supervision.

The students' demographic information is presented in Table 2. Thirty-nine (65%) interns completed between 301-600 hours of internship. Twenty-one (35%) completed between 1-300 hours of internship. The students' primary areas of placement were elementary school ( $n = 10$ , 16.7%), middle school ( $n = 12$ , 20%), high school ( $n = 21$ , 35%), multiple levels ( $n = 15$ , 25%), an alternative school ( $n = 1$ , 1.7%), and "other" ( $n = 1$ , 1.7%).

**Table 2**  
*Student Demographics*

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>%</b>
Sex		
Female	52	86.7
Male	8	13.3
Ethnicity		
European American	52	86.7
African American	5	8.3
Hispanic	1	1.7
Not Identified	2	3.3
Age		
20-24	4	23.3
25-34	41	68.3
35-44	3	5.0
45-54	1	1.7
55-64	1	1.7

## **Materials**

School counseling site supervisors' self-efficacy was assessed with the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey. DeKruyf and Pehrsson (2011) created the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey to explore the self-efficacy of site supervisors in relation to specific training in supervision. The survey includes 30 questions divided into three sections. The first section includes 15 items regarding self-efficacy scored on a 6-point scale where 1 indicates strongly agree and 6 indicates strongly disagree. Site supervisors' self-efficacy raw scores can range from 15-90. The second section includes six items requiring participants to identify training received in supervision various settings, including: in-service training, state or national conference, training at intern's university, unit or module in a master's program course, graduate level course

in supervision and other. The third section obtains demographic information including age, gender, race/ethnicity, grade level of students serviced, number of years as a school counselor, number of interns the supervisor has supervised, and current certificates and licenses (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011). The instrument's authors created self-efficacy items based on the supervision standards and guidelines (ACES, 1990; Borders et al., 1991; Studer, 2006). Face and content validity of the instrument was established by use of an expert panel and was piloted with site supervisors who did not participate in the study prior to conducting the research study (DeKruyf & Pehrsson). This study's use of the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey found Cronbach's alpha (.92) reliability estimate to be acceptable.

The Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form (Boylan, Malley, & Reilly, 2001) was used to assess school counseling internship students' ratings of site supervisors. Two students under the supervision of Dr. Harold Hackney created the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form. The students created items based on the work of Hackney and Nye (1973). The form includes 27 questions regarding the supervisor's competence. Each item is scored on a scale of 1-6 where one is "poor" and six is "good." Site supervisors can receive raw scores ranging from 27-162. The Student Counselor Evaluation form has not been tested for validity or reliability; however, it has been used in counselor education programs for the purpose of evaluating site supervisors. Items on the form align with supervisor responsibilities identified by ACES (2011). The form was originally published by Dimick and Krause (1980). This study's use of the *Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor* form found Cronbach's alpha (.97) reliability estimate to be acceptable.

## Procedure

The study used a convenience sample of school counseling internship students from CACREP-accredited school counseling programs in the North Central ACES region, and their current site supervisors. A recruitment email requesting permission to visit internship classes was sent to each of the school counseling program coordinators at 14 universities. The email detailed the study's purpose and the amount of class time needed to collect data. Of the 14 programs contacted, two declined permission to recruit participants, two did not respond to the email request, and ten programs arranged a time to collect data in their respective internship classes. The first author traveled to each school to invite school counseling internship students to participate. The first author explained the purpose of the study to school counseling internship students during their scheduled class time. School counseling internship students who agreed to participate in the study were given consent forms prior to completing the evaluation forms. Students who participated in the study were required to provide the researcher with contact information for their site supervisors. Students wrote the email address for their site supervisors on the bottom of the demographic section form. The researcher distributed the Student Counselor Evaluation of Supervisor form in person in order to increase participation rate of school counseling internship students. A total of 104 (90%) students who were asked to participate consented to do so.

The respective site supervisors ( $n = 102$ ) were contacted via email, the addresses for whom were provided by the students. The supervisor recruitment email explained the purpose of the study, invited the supervisors to participate, and included a link to the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey to be completed online through an online

survey hosting company. Supervisor recruitment emails were sent a total of three separate times. Five emails came back as undeliverable and two site supervisors sent back an email declining to participate. The total number of site supervisors who agreed to participate was 58, which represents a return rate of 57%.

An *a priori* power analysis was conducted using Cohen's (1988) small, medium, and large effect sizes for one-way analysis of variance (.10, .25, & .40). Based on the sample sizes obtained, we were 69% confident that we would detect group differences if the magnitude of this difference between the groups was small, 96% confident if the difference was medium, and 99% confident that large differences would be detected.

## Results

A one-way between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of supervision training on school counselor supervisors' supervision self-efficacy ratings. Levene's test for homogeneity of variances (.21) was not significant ( $p = .81$ ), which allowed the researcher to assume equal variances. The Shapiro-Wilk statistic was not statistically significant ( $p = .51$ ), which indicated that the self-efficacy rating data were normally distributed. As such, these data met assumptions necessary to run an ANOVA. There was a significant effect of supervision status on supervisors' supervision self-efficacy ratings at the  $p < .05$  level for the three conditions [ $F(2, 55) = 4.96, p = .01$ ]. Post hoc comparisons using the Scheffe test indicated that the mean score for the no supervision training group ( $M = 66.25, SD = 9.95, \text{range} = 46-85$ ) was significantly lower than the training but no supervision course group ( $M = 75.87, SD = 10.82, \text{range} = 52-90$ ). However, the graduate supervision course group's supervision self-efficacy score ( $M = 71.55, SD = 8.88, \text{range} = 54-81$ ) did not significantly differ from the other two

groups' scores. The magnitude of the difference in supervision self-efficacy scores between the no supervision and the supervision training but not graduate coursework was large ( $d = .93$ ) (Cohen, 1988).

The counselor interns' ratings of their supervisors did not meet the assumptions underlying ANOVA. Specifically, Levene's test for homogeneity of variances (3.78) was significant ( $p = .03$ ) and the number of students ( $n = 29$ ) in the largest group more than exceeded the 1.5:1 ratio of the number of students in the smallest group ( $n = 11$ ). As such, the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was used to answer the second research question. The Kruskal-Wallis test failed to show that there was a statistically significant difference in student ratings of their supervisor between the three training categories [ $\chi^2(2) = 4.608, p = .10$ ], with a mean rating score of 25.83 for the no supervision training group, 36.24 for the training but no supervision course group, and 26.18 for the graduate supervision course group. The mean scores for student rating of supervisors for the no supervision, supervision training but not a graduate course, and the graduate course in supervision were 121.43 ( $SD = 25.43$ , range = 62-160), 132.70 ( $SD = 26.88$ , range = 79-162), and 131.09 ( $SD = 22.03$ , range = 89-159), respectively.

### **Discussion**

This project sought to determine if training in supervision is associated with competency of school counseling site supervisors. The research findings indicated supervisors who received supervision training were more self-efficacious about their supervision skills than were those supervisors who had not received any supervision training. No self-efficacy differences were noted between those who had a course in

supervision and those who did not. Likewise, no differences surfaced between the three groups of supervisors when evaluated by their students.

### **Differences between Graduate Course and No Graduate Course**

The absence of any difference in competency between site supervisors who have taken a graduate course in supervision and those who have not could be explained by the following. Graduate coursework in supervision is typically required by counselor education doctoral programs and primarily focuses on clinical supervision or on those counselors seeking independent licensure (CACREP, 2016). Although supervision models and counselor development do not discriminate between counselor work settings when training school counseling interns, it is possible that even after taking a graduate course in supervision, school counseling site supervisors may have not received information germane to a school setting. According to ASCA, school counseling site supervisors have a responsibility to provide internship students with appropriate opportunities to develop and implement a comprehensive school counseling program (2010). Understanding the ASCA National Model and the school counselor's role are critical when addressing the counselor development and professional identity of school counseling internship students. It is unknown whether graduate coursework in supervision currently addresses these issues or any other developmental needs that may be relevant to school counselors. The specific content found in these courses should be assessed for applicability to the school setting.

### **Differences Between Supervision Training and No Supervision Training**

Differences between site supervisors who have received supervision training and those who had no training suggest that training sought by the practicing supervisor



provided them with greater sense of efficacy about their supervision abilities. Compared with content provided in a graduate course on supervision, supervision training sought by practicing school counselors may have been selected based on the relevancy of the trainings to their respective schools. Further, in-service training provided by school districts are the most accessible professional development opportunities available to school counselors. These training programs are free, provided during normal work hours, and are typically required for school personnel. It is probable that any training on supervision provided through an in-service for school employees would focus on supervising professionals within the context of the school. This information may be beneficial for school counselors when learning the foundation of providing supervision and addressing professional and ethical issues in a school. Alternatively, the recency effect may explain why supervisors who had training after then left their graduate programs reported higher self-efficacy than those who took a course while in graduate school.

Professional conferences also provide school counselors with professional development opportunities that may be more accessible and efficient than taking a graduate course in supervision. Professional conferences may even be more likely to provide school counselors with supervision training sessions that are geared more towards the school setting. If training provided through conferences provides supervisors with ways to apply supervision models and best practices for working with school counselors in-training, then it seems that school counselors who have received training at professional conferences would have higher self-efficacy than those who have not. In the absence of graduate coursework that may not currently address the

supervisory needs of school counselors, in-services and professional conferences are alternatives for school counselors to receive applicable training. This notion that graduate coursework in supervision may not meet supervising school counselors' needs could be investigated using qualitative methods and, if found to be supported, university-based supervision professors may wish to augment their curriculum to become more inclusive of school supervision content and practice.

### **Implications**

#### **Counselor Educators**

The results of this study provided no indications that graduate coursework in supervision increased the self-efficacy of school counselors when providing supervision. This finding may serve to motivate counselor educators to consider modifying current graduate classes in supervision or creating an additional course specifically for supervising school counselors if coursework is not sufficient. Supervision curricula does not need to be completely revamped. Instructors should emphasize: (a) classroom discussions of supervision delivery strategies, (b) practice of supervision skills, (c) reviews of relevant research, and (d) discussion of specific roles and responsibilities of school counselors. School counselors provide students with brief therapeutic interventions, crisis intervention, consultation with parents and other professionals, appropriate classroom guidance lessons, and leadership and advocacy. These responsibilities make up the delivery system of the ASCA National Model (2012). Graduate coursework for school counselors should include methods and techniques to increase skill development and self-efficacy in interns in these areas. If current graduate coursework allowed for the integration of supervision needs specific to school

counselors, having a graduate course in supervision may have had a greater impact on site supervisor self-efficacy and student evaluation scores than found in this study. In addition, addressing school counselor supervision more explicitly in graduate coursework may make these courses more appealing for school counselors who regularly supervise interns and encourage those who have not supervised interns to become site supervisors.

Our results indicate site supervisors receive supervision training after graduate school. Therefore, counselor educators could consider increasing the number of supervision training opportunities for school counselors. Bernard and Goodyear (2014) argued that supervision training at workshops and conferences does not provide an opportunity for supervisors-in-training to practice skills and gain supervised supervision experiences. They also noted that it limits the opportunity to spend much needed time learning about different models and processing issues that may occur during supervision. Our findings provide an alternative view than that of Bernard and Goodyear's. Due to the time and cost efficiency of attending professional conferences for school counselors, paired with the findings from this study, conference sessions at minimum should cover counselor development, models of supervision, and methods and techniques. Another option would be for supervision training to be offered through learning institutes during conferences in order to have more time to practice skills and process potential issues. Counselor educators and practicing school counselors with experience providing supervision to interns could be invited to submit proposals for presentations on school counselor supervision.

Only 11% of site supervisors received supervision training at a workshop provided by the intern's university. It is recommended that counselor educators provide yearly opportunities for site supervisors who agree to take on school counseling interns to obtain supervision training at a university. Counselor educators are responsible for ensuring that site supervisors have had relevant training in counseling supervision and are expected to provide site supervisors with professional development opportunities (CACREP, 2016). Providing site supervisors with training opportunities in supervision would allow counselor educators to confirm that site supervisors who take on interns have received quality training and demonstrate their commitment to ensure that interns have optimal training experiences. Counselor educators could provide continuing education units (CEUs) as an incentive for school counseling site supervisors to register for supervision training workshops, or it could be a program requirement in order to supervise interns. Making supervision training an expectation for site supervisors sends the message that training is important.

### **Practicing School Counselors**

The findings demonstrated that supervision training increased site supervisor's self-efficacy. Thus, it is recommended that school counselors who supervise interns should be required to have supervision training. In the absence of feasible graduate coursework that is applicable for school counselors, training should be pursued at conferences and in-service training to continue learning new skills.

Site supervisors are responsible to help interns develop skills, solidify their professional identity as school counselors, and become confident professionals who can make ethical decisions. Having a working knowledge of counselor development

allows site supervisors to recognize what interns need from them as supervisors and areas in which interns may need improvement. Interns may not be comfortable expressing their needs during the internship process, making it critical that the supervisory relationship supports this type of disclosure. It is equally important that supervisors understand those needs that may not be verbally communicated, but evident in interns' behavior. Having a theoretical framework for how supervision is delivered makes supervision more intentional and ensures supervision time is focused on the needs of the intern. School counselors are responsible for obtaining continuous professional development in both counseling and supervision (ASCA, 2016). School counselors who would like to serve as site supervisors should advocate to administrators for opportunities to attend conferences and workshops provided by counseling organizations and universities that will have supervision training opportunities. Site supervisors can request that universities provide supervision training, if they agree to supervise interns.

### **Limitations**

The study's limitations include, (a) sampling, (b) instrumentation, (c) design, and (d) response bias. The use of convenience sampling limits the generalizability of the findings to the entire population. The sample for this study only included participants from CACREP-accredited programs in the North Central ACES region. Site supervisors from this region may not accurately represent site supervisors from CACREP-accredited programs across the United States. This limits the researcher's ability to assume these findings would be consistent in other regions.

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

Limitations within the research design included the inability to predict if the dependent variable (site supervisor competency) was impacted solely by the independent variable (history of graduate class in supervision). This limitation was created through the pre-selection of groups. Future research should exhaust all demographic identifiers that could rule out extraneous or confounding variables.

Response bias posed an additional threat to the reliability of the findings. The Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey relied solely on the self-report data from the site supervisors. A limitation associated with self-report data includes the inability to determine if a participant is being truthful in their responses. This could not be controlled because self-efficacy can only be reported through self-report. Response bias is also a limitation with the Student Evaluation of Supervisor form. It is possible that interns may have rated their site supervisor higher if they felt uncomfortable by implying that they were currently receiving poor supervision. They may have rated their site supervisor lower if they had any issues with the site or supervisor that did not end favorably.

### **Future Research**

Future research could explore instruments used to evaluate site supervisors in school counseling. There are currently no published instruments used to evaluate site

supervisors that have been tested for reliability and external validity. Researchers may explore the specific training opportunities that are available to school counselors at professional conferences and in-services. Future research could also explore current supervision training curriculum that can be modified for implementation through conference workshops and in-services within school districts. Graduate coursework in supervision should be evaluated on its ability to provide school counselors with supervision training that is applicable in the school setting.

Future research could also evaluate if there are differences in self-efficacy and student evaluation of site supervisors who have received any training and those who have received none. Studies may also investigate other variables that could impact the competency of site supervisors. Some other variables may include years of experience as a school counselor, number of interns supervised and their own personal experiences as a supervisee. Qualitative research could be employed to gain insight into site supervisors' understanding of supervision and the variables they believe have impacted how they deliver supervision.

Researchers could explore the effectiveness of various models of supervision when providing supervision to school counseling interns in order to provide site supervisors with models that are applicable for supervising in the school. Researchers may continue to explore school counselors' attitudes about supervision and their training needs. Qualitative designs could investigate site supervisors understanding of counselor development, supervision models and how supervision is delivered to interns.

## References

- American Counseling Association. (2014). *ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. (1990). Standards for counseling supervisors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 69, 30-32. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1990.tb01450.x
- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. (2011). Best practices in clinical supervision. Retrieved from <https://www.acesonline.net/sites/default/files/ACES-Best-Practices-in-clinical-supervision-document-FINAL.pdf>
- American School Counselor Association. (2010). *Ethical standards for school counselors*. Retrieved from <http://ethics.iit.edu/ecodes/sites/default/files/ASCAEthicalStandards.pdf>
- American School Counselor Association. (2016). Ethical standards for school counselors. Retrieved from <https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/Ethics/EthicalStandards2016.pdf>
- American School Counselor Association. (2012). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2014) *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Borders, L. D. (1991). Developmental changes during their supervisees' first practicum. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 8(2), 157-167. doi:10.1300/J001v08n02\_12



- Borders, L. D. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Another step in delineating effective supervision practice. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 68*(2), 151-162. doi:10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.2014.68.2.151
- Borders, L. D., Bernard, J. M., Dye, H. A., Fong, M. L., Henderson, P., & Nance, D. W. (1991). Curriculum guide for training counseling supervisors: Rationale, development, and implementation. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 31*(1), 58-80.
- Boylan, J. C., Malley, P. B., & Reilly, E. P. (2001). *Practicum and internship: Textbook and resource guide for counseling and psychotherapy*. Philadelphia, PA: Routledge.
- Cashwell, T. H., & Dooley, K. (2001). The impact of supervision on counselor self-efficacy. *The Clinical Supervisor, 20*(1), 39-47. doi:10.1300/J001v20n01\_03
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2016). *2016 Standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/2016-Standards-with-Glossary-7.2017.pdf>
- DeKruyf, L., & Pehrsson, D. E. (2011). School counseling site supervisor training: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 50*, 314-327. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb01918.x
- Dimick, K., & Krause, F. (Eds.). (1980). *Practicum manual for counseling and psychotherapy*. Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.

- Dollarhide, C., & Miller, G. (2006). Supervision for preparation and practice of school counselors: Pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 45, 242-252. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00001.x
- Dye, H. A., & Borders, L. D. (1990). Counseling supervisors: Standards for preparation and practice. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69, 27-32. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1990.tb01449.x
- Fernando, D. M. & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2005). The relationship of supervisory styles to satisfaction with supervision and the perceived self-efficacy of master's level counseling students. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 44(4), 293-304. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2005.tb01757.x
- Hackney, H. and Nye, L.S. (1973) *Counseling strategies and objectives*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Herlihy, B., Gray, N., & McCollum, V. (2002). Legal and ethical issues in school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, 6, 55-60.
- Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., & Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy, and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 77, 447-455. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02472.x
- Lehrman-Waterman, D. & Ladany, N. (2001). Development and validation of the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory [Special issue]. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48, 168-17. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.48.2.168
- Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Bradley, L. J. (2001). Supervising school counselors. In L. J. Bradley & N. Ladany (Eds.), *Counselor supervision: Principles process and practice* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 207-221). Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.

- Sutton, J. M., & Page, B. J. (1994). Post-degree clinical supervision of school counselors. *School Counselor, 42*(1), 32-40.
- Studer, J. R. (2006). *Supervising the school counselor trainee: Guidelines for practice*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Studer, J. R., & Diambra, J. F. (2010). *A guide to practicum and internship for school counselors-in-training*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Studer, J., & Oberman, A. (2006). The use of ASCA National Model in supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 10*(1), 82-87. doi:10.5330/prsc.10.1.f82t14475451422m

## Biographical Statements

Leslie Neyland-Brown received her Ph.D. in counselor education and supervision from the University of Toledo. As a dually licensed counselor in the state of Ohio, Dr. Neyland-Brown has years of experience working with children and adolescents in both the school and clinical settings. Her research interests include supervision, mental health issues in the school setting, and school counselor training. Dr. Neyland-Brown is an assistant professor at Wright State University where she currently serves as the school counseling graduate program director. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Leslie Neyland-Brown, Human Services, 3640 Colonel Glenn Hwy, Wright State University, Dayton, OH. Email: [leslie.neyland@wright.edu](mailto:leslie.neyland@wright.edu)

John Laux received his Ph.D. in counseling psychology from the University of Akron. John is a PCC-S, a LICDC, and a psychologist. His areas of clinical and research interest include dual-diagnosis, personality disorders, and personality assessment. He has clinical experience in a variety of treatment settings including the Cincinnati VAMC, a community mental health center, a campus counseling center, and an inpatient chemical dependence treatment center. John Laux currently serves as an associate dean of student affairs at the University of Toledo.

Dr. Kozlowski is a core faculty member in the counselor education and supervision program. She has been a counselor educator since 2010, supported by more than 10 years as a school and mental health counselor. Her practice includes school counseling and work with children and adolescents, with focus on play therapy, sand tray therapy, and creativity in counseling practices. She is a licensed professional counselor, national certified counselor, and licensed school counselor. Dr. Kozlowski

has served on the board of the Ohio Counseling Association and on the executive board of the Texas Counseling Association. She is past president of several counseling organizations and has received many counseling awards, including the American Counseling Association's Ross Trust award, a Chi Sigma Iota fellowship, and TSCA school counselor of the year. She publishes scholarly writings for professional counseling journals and newsletters on a regular basis.

Dr. Jennifer Reynolds is a state of Michigan and nationally certified school psychologist, who received two bachelor's degrees from Michigan State University, and master's and doctoral degrees in school psychology from Central Michigan University. Jennifer practiced as a school psychologist and has worked with children with disabilities in several settings (public schools, universities, and multidisciplinary clinics) at the elementary, middle, and high school level, as well as with undergraduate and graduate students. Her current research interests include academic and behavioral interventions at the individual and systems level, intervention efficiency, and comparison of specific learning disability eligibility models. Jennifer Reynolds currently serves as the program director of the school psychology program at the University of Toledo.

Dr. Nick Piazza is a licensed professional clinical counselor with supervisory endorsement (PCC-S), a licensed psychologist, and a professor emeritus in the counselor education program at the University of Toledo. Dr. Piazza has worked in the mental health and substance abuse fields since 1975, has been a counselor educator since 1984, and holds national certification as a clinical mental health counselor and as a master addictions counselor through the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC).