Reported Experiences of School Counseling Site Supervisors in a Supervision Training Program

Clare Merlin-Knoblich
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Pamela N. Harris
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Sharon Y. Chung
North Carolina State University

Christopher R. Gareis
College of William & Mary

Abstract

Many professional school counselors regularly serve as site supervisors to school counselors-in-training, despite never receiving formal supervision training. Using a phenomenological approach, the researchers explored school counseling site supervisors' (N = 15) experiences in a clinical faculty school counseling university supervision training program. Findings included reported enhanced knowledge of supervision models and increased intentionality in supervision. Overall, participants' experiences suggest meaningful outcomes associated with a counselor educator-led supervision training program for school counseling site supervisors.

Keywords: supervision, school counseling, professional development

Reported Experiences of School Counseling Site Supervisors in a Supervision

Training Program

Supervision is a key element in the training of all counselors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Lambie & Sias, 2009; Luke, Ellis, & Bernard, 2011). For school counselors-in-training, school counseling site supervisors are crucial in helping to connect classroom learning with professional practice (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Smith & Koltz, 2015). These supervisors support skill development and induction to the field of school counseling (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Uellendahl & Tenenbaum, 2015).

Given this critical role, quality supervision training for site supervisors is imperative (Cigrand, Wood, & Duys, 2014; Luke et al., 2011; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Thompson & Moffett, 2010; Wilson, Schaeffer, & Bruce, 2015). Such training can enhance the preparation of future school counselors through the professional development of site supervisors (Luke et al., 2011). Without supervision training, school counseling site supervisors may lack the preparation to ensure effective supervision of school counselors-in-training (Wilson et al., 2015). This need is reflected in standards of the profession. The 2016 Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs (CACREP) Standards state that site supervisors should have a minimum of two years of professional counseling experience, as well as "relevant training in counseling supervision" (3.P.5.). The American School Counselor Association (ASCA) ethical standards (2016) similarly state that school counseling field supervisors "have the education and training to provide clinical supervision" and "regularly pursue continuing education activities on both counseling and supervision topics and skills" (Standard D.b., p. 8).

Even with these standards, evidence suggests that many school counselors serve as supervisors without receiving any supervision training (Gallo, 2013; Luke et al., 2011; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Smith & Koltz, 2015; Swank & Tyson, 2012). DeKruyf and Pehrsson (2011) found that nearly half of 147 surveyed school counseling site supervisors indicated not receiving any supervision training. In a study of 220 school counseling site supervisors, 59% of participants reported not learning about site supervision at all or only indirectly (Uellendahl & Tenenbaum, 2015). In a study of 74 school counselors across the United States, 49% of participants reported not receiving site supervision training (Cigrand et al., 2014). These studies illustrate that school counseling site supervisors consistently report a lack of training for the role (Protivnak & Davis, 2008). Despite this limited training, it appears school counselors commonly supervise school counselors-in-training. Perera-Diltz and Mason (2012) found that 41% of 1,557 school counselors surveyed regularly provided supervision.

Given that CACREP Standard 3.P.5. requires supervision training for site supervisors, it is unclear if the participants in these studies supervised students in non-CACREP accredited programs, supervised students in CACREP-accredited programs noncompliant with Standard 3.P.5, or received supervision training that was not memorable. Without supervision training, site supervisors may use a hodgepodge of techniques based on their counseling skills, knowledge of university requirements, and personal experiences in supervision (Cigrand et al., 2014). This combination of factors can be problematic if school counseling site supervisors are strictly using supervision practices they are familiar with, rather than best practices in the field (Cigrand et al., 2014; Borders et al., 2014).

Although the training of school counseling site supervisors is uncommon, one study suggests that this population appears interested in learning about supervision. Eighty-four percent of participants in Uellendahl and Tenenbaum's (2015) study reported being "very interested" or "somewhat interested" in participating in supervision training. However, few opportunities exist for school counselors to receive supervision training (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Nelson & Johnson, 1999). Even in the university setting, coursework in clinical supervision is often only available at the doctoral level (Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Roberts & Morotti, 2001).

For more than 20 years, researchers have called for increased supervision training for school counseling site supervisors, yet little research has examined such training (Uellendahl & Tenenbaum, 2015). Although scholars have developed several models of school counseling supervision (see Lambie & Sias, 2009; Luke & Bernard, 2006; Nelson & Johnson, 1999), these models provide blueprints for the process of supervision, rather than that of supervision training. A literature review on supervision training programs for school counseling site supervisors revealed only two models. Swank and Tyson (2012) outlined a school counseling supervision training program that utilized web-based training modules to provide site supervisor training. Murphy and Kaffenberger (2007) outlined a half-day training workshop for school counseling site supervisors based on the ASCA National Model. To date, no extensive research has examined the effectiveness of either of these models (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Swank & Tyson, 2012). Moreover, no research has explored the experiences of school counseling site supervisors in a supervision training program. Given this gap in the

literature, the researchers sought to study the experiences of school counselors in a site supervision training program.

School Counseling Clinical Faculty Program for Supervision Training

The Virginia Department of Education (VA DOE) defines *clinical faculty* as experienced teachers who receive extensive training in supervisory skills and contribute to the preparation of students in teacher education programs (Virginia Department of Education, Department of Teacher Education and Licensure, 2000). In 1998, faculty members at the College of William & Mary created a teacher education clinical faculty program in which experienced teachers completed a three-credit graduate-level course in the roles and responsibilities of student teaching supervisors and received status as *clinical faculty* upon completion of the program (Merlin & Brendel, 2017). In 2014, Gareis and Grant published a comprehensive study demonstrating the effectiveness of the program as indicated by several measures. First, participants' self-efficacy in understanding their roles and using mentoring strategies were significantly higher after program participation than that of cooperating teachers who did not participate in the program. Second, participant evaluations of student teachers appeared more accurate compared to those from cooperating teachers who did not participate in the program. Third, university supervisors rated the teaching performance of student teachers paired with clinical faculty members higher than that of student teachers paired with untrained cooperating teachers (Gareis & Grant, 2014).

Given the research base of this cooperating teacher clinical faculty program, this model seemed most appropriate for providing school counselors with a comprehensive understanding of supervision. In 2013, school counseling faculty members at the

College of William & Mary designed a supervision training program based on the clinical

faculty model but modified with many of the same topics recommended in Murphy and

Kaffenberger's (2007) and Swank and Tyson's (2012) training models (e.g., supervision

models, the supervisory relationship, and ethical considerations). With fiscal support

provided through a small competitive grant from the VA DOE, faculty members created

the School Counseling Clinical Faculty Program (SCCFP) (Merlin & Brendel, 2017).

The purpose of the SCCFP is to improve participants' supervision knowledge,

skills, and motivation (Merlin & Brendel, 2017). Each semester, training leaders recruit a

cohort of nine to 12 site supervisors for the program from a pool of previous site

supervisors used by the university, as well as new supervisors who express interest in

participating. Minimum participant requirements are two years of experience as full-time

school counselors and a Master's degree in counseling. Graduating from the

university's school counseling program is not a requirement for admission to the

SCCFP, although approximately one-third of clinical faculty members are alumni of the

university's program. Interested supervisors must submit an application, two

recommendation letters, and essay responses explaining interest in supervision.

Training leaders review applications and select program participants based on

supervision potential (Merlin & Brendel, 2017).

SCCFP participants receive several incentives for successfully completing the

program, including one credit for a graduate-level course, a $250 stipend, continuing

education credit, and status as a clinical faculty member at the university. This status

affords participants access to the university's library, recreational facility, and other

campus facilities. Participants have also stated that learning about supervision itself is

an incentive for participation. In exchange, school counseling clinical faculty members agree to regularly supervise school counselors-in-training from the university in internship or practicum. This arrangement allows counselor preparation faculty to consistently place school counselors-in-training with trained school counseling supervisors (Merlin & Brendel, 2017).

Each SCCFP cohort meets in a classroom on the university's campus for three 4.5-hour sessions over the course of a semester, typically on Friday mornings. School counseling faculty members and doctoral students lead the sessions, and school counseling Master's students facilitate activities in the first and last sessions. Aligning with supervision training recommendations from the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision's publication, *Best Practices for Clinical Supervision* (2011), the SCCFP content addresses five areas: supervisee development, supervision models, multicultural considerations, ethical considerations, and evaluation methods. Participants read assigned peer-reviewed journal articles about these topics for homework. Content is taught through a combination of didactic instruction, experiential learning, student panels, and group discussions. Table 1 contains an overview of the topics and learning activities. Apart from readings, participants' only homework assignment is to select their own model of supervision, which they present to peers in small groups during the final session (Merlin & Brendel, 2017).

The SCCFP represents a unique model in the training of school counseling site supervisors, in which school counseling site supervisors learn about supervision over time and complete the program with the status of school counseling clinical faculty members (Merlin & Brendel, 2017). To understand the experiences of participants in

such a program, the researchers collected and analyzed data capturing the reported experiences of SCCFP participants. The guiding research question was: What are the experiences of participants in a school counseling supervision training program?

Table 1

SCCFP Topics and Learning Activities

Session	Topics	Learning Activities
1	Introductions	Participant introductions
		Introduction to the SCCFP and its history via didactic presentation
	Program of study	Discussion of current course requirements for school counselors-in-training
	Defining clinical supervision	Didactic presentation about definition of clinical supervision
		Group discussion of best and worst supervision experiences
	Developmental considerations in supervision	Didactic presentation of Cognitive Developmental Theory and Hunt's stages of counselor development
		Panel discussion with current school counselors-in-training about their needs and aspirations
2	Supervision models	Didactic presentation about supervision models
		Model demonstrations by training leaders
		Participant practice using supervision models
	Supervisory relationship	Group discussion about best and worst supervisory relationships
		Didactic presentation about effective and ineffective supervisory relationships
3	Evaluation	Didactic presentation about evaluation in supervision
		Group discussion about experiences with supervision evaluation
	Ethical considerations	Didactic presentation about ethical standards related to supervision
		Group discussion about ethical case studies related to supervision
	Multicultural considerations	Group discussion about broaching multicultural considerations in supervision

| Personal Supervision Models | Presentation of participants' personal supervision models in small groups with one school counselor-in-training joining each group |
| Closing | Group discussion about experiences and takeaways in the SCCFP |

Method

The researchers selected a phenomenological approach (Moustakas, 1994) to best understand the experiences of school counselors in a supervision training program. A qualitative form of inquiry can lead to descriptions containing the essence of participants' lived experiences of the same phenomenon (Creswell, 2014); in this case, experience in the school counseling supervision training program.

Theoretical Framework

The researchers used Guskey's (2014) five-level model of professional development evaluation as the theoretical framework for this study. This program evaluation model assesses professional development experiences across five levels. Given that the present study explored experiences in a professional development program, it was a useful framework to inform the collection and interpretation of data. The five levels in Guskey's model are: (1) participant reactions to the experience; (2) participant learning, including new knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes learned; (3) organizational support and change; (4) participant application of new knowledge and skills learned; and (5) student learning outcomes (Guskey, 2005; Guskey, 2014).

Research Team

The research team consisted of three doctoral students involved in the execution of the SCCFP and an associate professor who directed the cooperating teacher clinical faculty program. The first three authors participated in data transcription, data analysis,

and the reporting of results. The fourth author did not conduct the research study, but assisted in the study conceptualization and manuscript writing process. The first three authors identify as former professional school counselors and current school counselor educators, and the fourth author identifies as a former K-12 educator and current professor of educational leadership. The first and fourth authors identify as Caucasian, the second author identifies as African American, and the third author identifies as Asian American.

Participants and Data Sources

Fifteen participants contributed to this study: five in elementary schools, four in middle schools, and six in high schools. Participants worked in four school districts, including one urban district, one rural district, and two suburban districts. Two participants identified as Black or African American, and 13 participants identified as White or Caucasian. One participant identified as male, and 14 participants identified as female. This sample is reflective of practicing school counselors' demographics, in that the majority of school counselors tend to identify as Caucasian and female (College Board Advocacy and Policy Center, 2011). Fourteen participants reported in the demographic questionnaire responses that they received no training in clinical supervision prior to the SCCFP. Eight of the participants reported supervising an intern after completing the training program, whereas seven participants had not at the time of the study.

The researchers collected data in three phases. In the first phase, they recruited participants by emailing 33 school counseling clinical faculty members who had completed the training at the time of the study. Members were invited to participate in a

one-hour, audio-recorded focus group. This group was selected for initial data collection

because participants held similar roles and were anticipated to be cooperative with one

another (Creswell, 2013). During the spring of 2014, nine participants attended the

focus group in a classroom on the university campus for approximately one hour.

Questions were about experiences in the training program, as well as supervision

knowledge, skills, and attitudes before and after the training program. The researchers

also asked focus group participants to complete a demographic questionnaire, which

included an item assessing interest in participating in a follow-up interview about their

experiences.

During the second phase of data collection, the researchers emailed an open-

ended questionnaire to school counseling clinical faculty members who did not attend

the focus group, in case individuals wanted to participate in the study but were unable to

attend the focus group. Six participants completed the questionnaire, which had the

same demographic questionnaire and questions as those asked during the focus group.

In the final phase of data collection, the researchers compiled a list of eight

participants (from the 15 who had already participated) who had indicated their

willingness to participate in one-on-one, semi-structured interviews to expound upon

their experiences in the SCCFP (Creswell, 2013). Stratified purposive sampling

representing race, gender, and school level reflective of the overall clinical faculty

members' demographics resulted in six counselors being invited to participate in 30-

minute, semi-structured interviews, of whom five agreed to participate. The third author

conducted all interviews by calling each participant, asking predetermined questions,

and recording each interview. The predetermined questions were similar to those used

in the focus group and open-ended questionnaire, but participants were prompted to expand further on their responses. The overall response rate of participants ($N = 15$) in the focus group ($n = 9$) and the open-ended questionnaire ($n = 6$) includes the five participants who also participated in individual interviews and represents 45% of the target population. Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006) asserted that a minimum of 12 participants is typically needed for saturation of themes in qualitative research, a guideline exceeded in this study.

Study data were comprised of one focus group transcript, five interview transcripts, six open-ended questionnaire responses, and 15 demographic questionnaires. Of the 15 participants who contributed data to the study, four participants completed both the open-ended questionnaire and a one-on-one interview, and one participant contributed to both the focus group and a one-on-one interview.

Data Analysis

Prior to beginning data analysis for this study, the researchers bracketed their experiences, the first step in phenomenology data analysis (Moustakas, 1994). They journaled separately about assumptions of participants' experiences in the SCCFP, then met and discussed the assumptions, which centered on positive experiences in the SCCFP. The researchers agreed that these assumptions came from observations of participants while leading the SCCFP, anecdotal feedback from participants, and their own lack of supervision training prior to beginning work as school counselors.

Next, researchers conducted horizontalization, the second step of phenomenology data analysis (Moustakas, 1994). In this process, the researchers individually examined the data and noted repetitive statements across data (Moustakas,

1994). The researchers then met as a group to discuss their findings and compare derived themes. Next, the researchers grouped meaning units together and created textural descriptions that represented the depth of participants' experiences (Moustakas, 1994). The researchers first grouped meaning units independently, then met and discussed the groupings together. The researchers met as a group for a third time and conducted structural description by examining each textural description for additional meanings (Moustakas, 1994). Finally, the researchers synthesized their findings through the lens of the selected guiding theoretical framework: Guskey's (2014) five-level model of evaluation.

Trustworthiness

The researchers addressed trustworthiness according to three of Lincoln and Guba's (1985) requirements. First, they built credibility through triangulation, the use of multiple sources to collect corroborating evidence of themes (Creswell, 2013). By collecting data from a focus group, interviews, and open-ended questionnaires, the researchers could corroborate themes and increase the validity of the findings. Second, they engaged in member checking by sending results to 13 of the 15 participants (Creswell, 2013). Two participants completed the open-ended questionnaire anonymously and therefore could not be contacted. No participants responded to the member check with revisions, thus contributing to the credibility of the findings (Creswell, 2013). Third, the researchers addressed confirmability by keeping an audit trail of transcripts, questionnaire responses, codes, and bracketing notes.

Results

Researchers identified seven themes in their analysis of participants' experiences in a school counseling supervision training program. These themes demonstrate the essence of participants' experiences and represent four of the five levels of Guskey's evaluation model.

Level 1: Participants' Reactions to Activities – Program Enjoyment

When asked to describe their experiences in the supervision training program, all study participants commented on their enjoyment. Participants indicated overall program enjoyment using positive language to describe their experiences. For example, one participant shared, "It was excellent and I wished I had had it years earlier." Another said, "The training was fantastic … I had nothing but positive experiences."

Multiple participants indicated specifically enjoying the learning process in which they participated. Two participants noted appreciation for the SCCFP because it kept them abreast of the latest information about school counseling and supervision. Another participant explained that it had been many years since completing her master's degree in school counseling, so she enjoyed being in a learning setting again. She stated, "I hadn't been in class in a very long time, so that was nice. I enjoyed the class. I enjoyed the professors."

Several participants further indicated that camaraderie formed with other school counselors contributed to their enjoyment of the SCCFP. One participant explained:

> It was really nice to just to be able to come together with other school counseling colleagues from different systems and … get their take on their supervision experiences. It was refreshing to be able to bond with other school counselors, but also be learning with other school counselors.

According to Guskey's (2005) model of professional development evaluation, overall positive reactions suggest that positive outcomes are possible in other levels as well.

Level 2: Participants' Learning of New Knowledge and Skills

Awareness of supervision models. Supervision models are one of the five content areas emphasized in the SCCFP. Participants in this study noted that learning about supervision models and how to implement them was a key aspect of their participation in supervision training. Most participants indicated that the concept of supervision models was entirely new. One participant stated, "The fact that there is a model to begin with was something that was completely new to me." Another participant said, "I had no idea that there were models of supervision." In addition, participants noted that learning how to implement the specific models and selecting a personal model of supervision were important parts of their training experiences. For example, one participant stated the following:

> I'll say my most beneficial piece—the biggest takeaway I had from [the SCCFP]—was when we were asked to develop our own style of supervision. …. I just discovered a lot about myself and my [supervision] style—how it works and how it can't work and what I need to work on. By being asked to do that and compile that [supervision model] using the research that you guys had given us was probably my biggest takeaway.

Selecting a personal supervision model appeared to be a culminating experience for this participant, as well as for others who described the supervision model assignment as beneficial. By highlighting the supervision models as a central part of their learning experience, participants validated that they learned new knowledge in the training.

Understanding evaluation. Another theme across participants was an increased understanding of the evaluation process in supervision. Participants

explained that they disliked evaluation prior to supervision training. One participant described evaluation as "kind of a weakness of mine." Another participant noted that before the supervision training, she avoided giving "any feedback that might be construed as negative." However, participants explained that they felt more comfortable giving feedback after the training. One participant stated that she views giving constructive feedback to supervisees as a newly recognized responsibility. Another participant acknowledged a new understanding that evaluation could help her "actually help this person [her supervisee] grow into the counselor that they want to be." Participants further reported learning in the SCCFP that supervisees needed both formative and summative feedback throughout their practica and internships.

Participants' enhanced understanding of supervision evaluation appeared to emerge from activities with current school counselors-in-training during the SCCFP. Participants stated that during the training, school counselors-in-training discussed wanting regular and honest feedback. As a result, participants reported feeling as though they had permission to regularly provide feedback during future supervision.

Level 3: Organizational Support and Change

Reflection. Participants also noted reflection as central to their experiences in supervision training. Participants explained that the SCCFP provided a context for reflection on their supervision practice and school counseling work. One participant explained that the training program provided an opportunity to reflect on her counseling practices because supervision is so closely related to counseling. She said:

> I found [the SCCFP] to not only show me good practices as a supervisor and challenge me to think in that world, and read on it, and develop my own techniques, but it also kind of asked me to reflect on the kind of counselor I am. It

had me go back to what I learned in my program and how that can be
incorporated in my supervision style.

This theme indicates that participants' experiences in the SCCFP were not limited to knowledge and skill acquisition, but they also appreciated support for reflection. Another participant explained that the training "gave that opportunity to be reflective on what [I've] been doing and what could be different."

Support. Beyond support for reflection, participants noted that the program made them feel supported in their professional development. Participants expressed gratitude for learning from faculty members and speaking with current school counselors-in-training. One participant described this support by explaining that the SCCFP was more meaningful than her typical professional development. She said:

It just kind of warms my heart or just really excites me that school counseling is being considered for such a program to begin with. I know that there's so much going on for teachers, which is important, too, but again, we do have a craft here. We do have a role in the building that's super unique to any other role in the building … And so to be able to provide more support to better our career, and better our field, it just makes me feel like really good about where we're going.

This quote demonstrates the participant's belief that school counseling ought to be as valued as teaching and that relevant professional development made her feel supported.

Level 4: Participants' Use of New Knowledge and Skills

Intentionality in supervision. A common word participants used when explaining the influence of the training on their supervision was *intentional.* Nearly all participants described increased intentionality in their approaches to supervision, general supervision behaviors, and behaviors during designated supervision sessions.

Many participants explained that having completed supervision training, their general approach to supervision is or would be more purposeful. One participant likened the clinical faculty experience to parenting and the importance of being intentional:

> At home, my husband and I sometimes fall away from what we call purposeful parenting. And we're just kind of reactive more than of proactive. And like that, I think that this class, this group [the SCCFP] is kind of more of a constant reminder to not just let things happen, but do it purposefully.

Multiple participants noted intentional supervisory behaviors that they planned to use or were already using, which they did not previously incorporate into supervision. They included modeling counseling behaviors, designating a consistent time and place for supervision, encouraging reflection, explaining their own counseling behaviors, and reviewing supervisee evaluation standards at the beginning of the school year. One participant explained, "The program put in the forefront of my mind to make sure that I modeled certain behaviors [with supervisees], talked about the reason why certain things occurred with students and why I said certain things to students." Several participants noted that they planned to increase their supervisees' autonomy by allowing them to begin counseling K-12 students sooner and without their supervisor present to maximize time for independently practicing counseling skills, a notion grounded in developmental models of supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014).

Lastly, several participants spoke about being intentional during supervision time with supervisees each week. They described structuring this time to best benefit supervisee learning. One participant explained, "I was even thinking to prepare for that supervision time. …. I'll have my interns and then have myself really be reflective on certain things ahead of that supervision time." Another participant explained that the

specific questions she asked in supervision sessions had changed after participating in supervision training: "I guess in the past, I would just ask [supervisees] very general questions …. This time I asked questions where she needed to reflect more on the process." These examples highlight how participants are or plan to be more intentional in multiple areas of supervision due to participation in the SCCFP.

Motivation to supervise. The final theme researchers found was participants' self-described enhanced motivation to supervise. Although one participant said that her supervision motivation was high before and after the SCCFP, all other participants stated that motivation to supervise increased because of the training. Given their new knowledge of supervision, they were more excited to supervise than in the past. One participant explained, "I'm a little more motivated [to supervise] because I have an actual manual now. I like to read things. I like to have information in front of me, and that was helpful." By giving participants a supervision "manual" (the assemblage of professional literature provided through the training), the training increased participants' desire to want to apply new knowledge and skills in supervision.

Discussion

The researchers identified seven themes comprising the essence of participants' experiences in a school counseling supervision training program. These themes align with four of Guskey's (2014) five levels of professional development evaluation: reactions to the experience, learning of skills and knowledge, organizational support and change, and use of new knowledge and skills. They found no themes that corresponded to the fifth level, learning outcomes for K-12 students. This absence is likely because the research question regarded the experiences of participants in the

program, rather than the experiences of their supervisees. Further, at the time of the study, half of the participants had not yet supervised an intern after participation in the SCCFP; thus, student outcomes would not have been possible to obtain. Guskey (2014) asserted that each of the levels in his model build upon the one before it and increase in complexity. Success at one level is a foundation for success at another level. The findings in the present study confirm Guskey's evaluation model, as the themes correspond sequentially to levels one through four.

Supervision Content

The themes across participants' supervision training experiences reflected previous school counseling supervision training research in several ways. For example, participants' awareness of supervision models emerged as an aspect of learning new knowledge and skills during their experiences. Without training in clinical supervision, school counseling site supervisors may not use formal supervision models because they are unaware of these models (Roberts & Morotti, 2001; Smith & Koltz, 2015). Previous research indicates that supervision models comprise a content area in which school counseling site supervisors need training, as it is "unlikely that untrained school counseling site supervisors would have had exposure to the literature on supervision models" (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011, p. 323). DeKruyf and Pehrsson (2011) found that participants rated their self-efficacy with supervision models with the second to lowest mean score of all supervision areas. In the present study, participants reported increased knowledge of supervision models, suggesting that supervision models are an important content area for school counseling site supervisor training experiences.

Another content area that emerged in the present study, evaluation in supervision, also aligns with previous research suggesting that counseling supervisors are reluctant to conduct adequate evaluation, perhaps due to a lack of experience or training (Hoffman, Hill, Holmes, & Freitas, 2005; Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, & Wolgast, 1999). Cigrand and colleagues (2014) found that evaluating interns was one of the top concerns school counseling site supervisors had about the supervision process. Given that the process of counseling does not involve an evaluation component, school counseling site supervisors may find evaluation in supervision to be a new and uncomfortable experience (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014).

Two additional supervision topics with the lowest mean scores in DeKruyf and Pehrsson's (2011) study were stages of counselor development and the supervisory relationship, suggesting that these topics may be appropriate for supervision trainings. Both topics were included in the SCCFP, yet did not emerge as significant themes in participants' experiences. This discrepancy may reflect differences in the participants studied or the nature of each study (i.e., quantitative versus qualitative).

Supervision Motivation and Use of New Skills

Participants reported increased motivation for supervision because of their participation in the SCCFP. These findings provide tentative support for DeKruyf and Pehrsson's (2011) research, indicating that more supervision training predicts higher supervisor self-efficacy, a factor of motivation (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; Bandura, 1997). DeKruyf and Pehrsson found that participants with more than 40 hours of training in supervision reported the highest supervision self-efficacy scores, whereas participants with less than 40 hours of training had more variable levels of self-efficacy.

However, in the present study, participants received only 12 hours of supervision training, yet reported increased motivation to supervise as a result. Though participation incentives (e.g., continuing education credit, stipend) may have served as motivation to participate in the SCCFP, participants reported increased motivation towards supervision itself. This finding may indicate that if a threshold of supervision training hours exists (at which point most school counseling site supervisors' motivation or self-efficacy increases), that threshold may be lower than DeKruyf and Pehrsson found. Understanding this threshold and the relationship between school counseling site supervisors' motivation and supervision training is important, as higher self-efficacy predicts more skillful behaviors (Bandura, Reese, and Adams, 1982).

Organizational Support

Reflection and support emerged as two themes representing perceptions of organizational support. Organizational support is the perception that an individual's organization or place of work values that individual's contributions and well-being (Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart, & Adis, 2015). Participants' recognition of organizational support as seminal to their experiences in the SCCFP may suggest that participants acknowledge the role that schools play in supporting their professional development. Although no previous research has explored reflection and support in school counseling site supervisor training, Konstam et al. (2015) found that organizational support of educational growth is a significant contributor to school counselors' expected growth in professional expertise. Thus, the emergence of reflection and support in this study suggests that participants may not only feel supported, but also expect to improve their professional growth in the future.

Clinical Faculty Model Research

In addition to aligning with previous research on school counseling supervision training programs, the themes in the present study align with findings from Gareis and Grant's (2014) study of a clinical faculty program for teacher preparation. Both studies found evidence that teacher and school counseling clinical faculty members alike experienced an enjoyment of the training program, new knowledge and skills in supervision and evaluation, and increased motivation for serving in the role of field-based supervisor (Gareis & Grant, 2014). Findings also align with previous pilot study data on SCCFP participants. Merlin and Brendel (2017) surveyed 19 school counseling site supervisors who completed the SCCFP and found that all participants agreed that the SCCFP improved their supervision skills, increased their supervision knowledge, and would make them better site supervisors. These findings align with those in the present study, such as participants' enjoyment of the SCCFP and reported benefits in supervision knowledge. Overall, findings in the present study indicate that participants had positive SCCFP experiences. These included enjoying the learning experience and participant camaraderie in the program, learning new knowledge and skills, sensing organizational support, and applying new knowledge and skills in the future. Such findings suggest value in school counseling supervision training for the participants.

Considering the reported value of such a supervision training program, school counseling site supervisors without clinical supervision training may want to contact local school counselor educators to inquire about creating a supervision training program. If counselor educators learn about a need for supervision training directly from their school counseling site supervisors, they may be inclined to collaborate and design

a program that is mutually beneficial for school counseling site supervisors and school counselors-in-training. In light of the findings of this study, school counselors may want to specifically request training programs that include content about supervision models and evaluation in supervision, as well as reflection components.

School counselor educators may benefit from considering how they can create supervision training programs like the SCCFP that meet the needs of school counseling site supervisors. If funding is limited, counselor educators can design similar training programs without grant funding. For example, counselor educators can offer a series of supervision training workshops rather than formal course credits to bypass the need for tuition funding. They can also use electronic journal articles for readings to avoid printing costs. Finally, they can recruit participants by offering continuing education credits and selling the benefits of learning about clinical supervision to eliminate the need for participant stipends. School counselor educators will want to examine their program and community needs when designing supervision training programs. Such needs may dictate the frequency of training sessions, training locations, and content. School counselor educators may benefit from conducting a supervision needs assessment with their school counseling site supervisors to inform the design and content of a training program.

Limitations

As a phenomenological study with 15 participants, the purpose of the study was to explore the essence of participants' experiences in a supervision training program. Thus, the results are only representative of the participants in this study and not intended to be generalized. In addition, the researcher is the primary instrument for data

collection and analysis in qualitative research (Atieno, 2009). In the present study, the researchers helped implement the SCCFP, so they were familiar with participants and the training program model. Although this familiarity had its benefits (e.g., increased familiarity for participants), the researchers' roles in the SCCFP may have led to unintended bias in the research process. Potential bias was monitored through bracketing experiences and collaborative data analysis.

Future Research

More research is needed to better understand the SCCFP and the training of school counseling site supervisors. Researchers would be wise to conduct expanded studies with trained site supervisors examining observable supervision behaviors before and after supervision training. Studies are also needed to measure the potential impact of supervision training on school counselors' supervision motivation, as well as the impact of supervision training on student outcomes. Research is needed to understand whether school counselors-in-training supervised by clinical faculty members have improved counseling skills compared to those supervised by untrained site supervisors. Furthermore, research is needed to understand if the K-12 students with whom the school counselors-in-training work benefit in enhanced ways.

Effective supervision is essential to developing competent professional school counselors (Studer, 2006); yet, school counseling site supervisors trained in supervision appear uncommon (Luke et al., 2011; Page et al., 2001). Considering the long-standing call for school counseling supervision training, yet minimal response to this call, counselor educators may be the most likely individuals to create change in this area (Uellendahl & Tenenbaum, 2015). School counselor educators are encouraged to

consider implementing their own supervision training programs to ensure that all school

counselors-in-training receive adequate supervision from trained site supervisors.

References

American School Counselor Association (2016). *ASCA ethical standards for school counselors.* Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from https://www.school counselor.org/asca/media/asca/Ethics/EthicalStandards2016.pdf

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (2011). *Best practices for clinical supervision.* Retrieved from www.saces.org/Resources/Documents/ aces_best_practices.doc

Atieno, O. P. (2009). An analysis of the strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century, 13,* 13-18.

Baggerly, J., & Osborn, D. (2006). School counselors' career satisfaction and commitment: Correlates and predictors. *Professional School Counseling, 9,* 197-205. doi:10.5330/prsc.9.3.547188866k76qg76

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: W. H. Freeman.

Bandura, A., Reese, L., & Adams, N. E. (1982). Microanalysis of action and fear arousal as a function of differential levels of perceived self-efficacy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*, 5-21. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.43.1.5

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2014). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Borders, L. D., Glosoff, H. L., Welfare, L. E., Hays, D. G., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., & Page, B. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Evolution of a counseling specialty. *The Clinical Supervisor, 33*, 26-44. doi:10.1080/073252 23.2014.905225

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), 1-33.

College Board Advocacy and Policy Center, National Office for School Counselor Advocacy (2011). National survey of school counselors: Counseling at a crossroads. Retrieved from http://www.civicenterprises.net/MediaLibrary/Docs/ counseling_at_a_crossroads.pdf

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2016). *2016 CACREP accreditation manual.* Alexandria, VA: CACREP.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* (3rd Ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* (4th Ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

DeKruyf, L., & Pehrsson, D. (2011). School counseling site supervisor training: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 50*, 314-327. doi:10.1 002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb01918.x

Dollarhide, C. T., & Miller, G. M. (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

Gallo, L. L. (2013). The need for developmental models in supervising school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 11*(19), 1-15.

Gareis, C. R., & Grant, L. W. (2014). The efficacy of training cooperating teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 39*, 77-88. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2013.12.007

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An

experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods, 18*(1), 59-82.

doi:10.1177/1525822X05279903

Guskey, T. R. (2005). Taking a second look: Strong evidence reflecting the benefits of

professional development is more important than ever before. *Journal of Staff*

Development, 26, 1-18.

Guskey, T. R. (2014). Planning professional learning. *Educational Leadership, 71*(8),

10-16.

Hoffman, M. A., Hill, C. E., Holmes, S. E., & Freitas, G. F. (2005). Supervisor

perspective on the process and outcome of giving easy, difficult, or no feedback

to supervisees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 3-13. doi:10.1037/0022-

0167.52.1.3

Konstam, V., Cook, A. L., Tomek, S., Mahdavi, E., Gracia, R., & Bayne, A. H. (2015).

What factors sustain professional growth among school counselors? *Journal of*

School Counseling, 13(3), 1-40.

Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C.

S. (2015). Perceived organizational support: A meta-evaluation of organizational

support theory. *Journal of Management, 43*, 1854-1884. doi:10.1177/014920631

5575554

Lambie, G. W., & Sias, S. M. (2009). An integrative psychological developmental model

of supervision for professional school counselors-in-training. *Journal of*

Counseling & Development, 87, 349-356. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2009.

tb00116.x

Ladany, N., Lehrman-Waterman, D., Molinaro, M., & Wolgast, B. (1999). Psychotherapy
  supervisor ethical practices: Adherence to guidelines, the supervisory working
  alliance, and supervisee satisfaction. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *27*, 443-475.
  doi:10.1177/0011000099273008

Lincoln, Y S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Luke, M. & Bernard, J. M. (2006). The school counseling supervision model: An
  extension of the discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*,
  282-295. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00004.x

Luke, M., Ellis, M. V., & Bernard, J. M. (2011). School counselor supervisors'
  perceptions of the discrimination model of supervision. *Counselor Education &
  Supervision, 50*, 328-343. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb01919.x

Merlin, C., & Brendel, J. (2017). A clinical faculty supervision training model for school
  counseling site supervisors. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *36*, 1-20. doi:10.1080/07325
  223.2017.1328629

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA:
  Sage.

Murphy, S., & Kaffenberger, C. (2007). ASCA National Model: A foundation for
  supervision of practicum and internship students. *Professional School
  Counseling*, *10*, 289-296. doi:10.5330/prsc.10.3.d4t0g103013n88t6

Nelson, M. D., & Johnson, P. (1999). School counselors as supervisors: An Integrated
  approach for supervising school counseling interns. *Counselor Education and
  Supervision, 39,* 89-100. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.1999.tb01220.x

Page, B., Pietrzak, D., & Sutton, Jr., J. (2001). National survey of school counselor

    supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 142-150. doi:10.1002/

    j.1556-6978.2001.tb01278.x

Perera-Diltz, D. & Mason, K. (2012). A national survey of school counselor supervision

    practices: Administrative, clinical, peer, and technology mediated supervision.

    Journal of School Counseling, 10(4), 1-34.

Protivnak, J. J., & Davis, T. E. (2008). The impact of the supervision relationship on the

    behaviors of school counseling interns. *Journal of School Counseling, 6*(19), 1-

    22.

Roberts, W. B., & Morotti, A. A. (2001). Site supervisors of professional school

    counseling interns: Suggested guidelines. *Professional School Counseling, 4,*

    208-215.

Smith, A., & Koltz, R. (2015). Supervision of school counseling students: A focus on

    personal growth, wellness, and development. *Journal of School Counseling,*

    13(2), 1-34.

Studer, J. R. (2006). *Supervising the school counselor trainee: Guidelines for practice*.

    Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Swank, J. M., & Tyson, L. (2012). School counseling site supervisor training: A web-

    based approach. *Professional School Counseling, 16,* 40-48. doi:10.5330/

    PSC.n.2012-16.40

Thompson, J., & Moffett, N. (2010). Clinical preparation and supervision of professional

    school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*(30), 1-24.

Uellendahl, G. E., & Tenenbaum, M. N. (2015). Supervision training, practices, and interests of California site supervisors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 54,* 274-287. doi:10.1002/ceas.12026

Virginia Department of Education, Department of Teacher Education and Licensure (2000). *Guidelines for mentor teacher programs for beginning and experienced teachers.* Richmond, VA: Author.