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The American School Counseling Association’s (ASCA) National Model has been recognized in the field of professional school counseling as an effective framework for the training and supervision of school counselor interns. Despite this recommendation, school counselor supervision models which incorporate the ASCA model have until recently been rare and are still in the early stages of development. This qualitative study describes the supervision experiences of six pairs of school counselor supervisors and their interns (at the elementary, middle, and high school levels) as they employed an ASCA-based school counselor specific supervision model in their internship practices. The supervision model utilized in this study is entitled the Professional School Counselor Supervision Model (PSCSM) and is accompanied by a reflective log on which interns recorded their activities, questions, concerns, strengths, and, once supervision had occurred, their understandings gained from their supervision sessions.

Participants were trained on the model and used the model and log for a minimum of 6 weeks. Individual, audiotaped interviews were conducted with each participant, followed by a conjoint interview with the supervision-intern pair. Within-
cases and cross-case qualitative analyses were performed, and a devil’s advocate was used to enhance the trustworthiness of the findings.

One of the key findings from this study was the positive influence that the use of the model had on participants’ formal supervision sessions. Use of the PSCSM and log increased participants’ self-reflections; encouraged in-depth discussions; added structure; provided opportunities for interns to ask questions and receive answers; increased the frequency of formal supervision sessions; assisted supervisors in the processing of intern strengths, weaknesses, and on-site problems; and encouraged more intern input and sharing. These positive influences also served to strengthen the supervisee/supervisor relationship. Study findings suggest that use of the PSCSM and log positively enhanced participants’ professional development and served to educate participants on the ASCA National Model. Participants also provided feedback on the model and log.

Implications of the findings for school counselor educators and for professional school counselors are presented. Additionally, limitations of the study are described and recommendations are made for future research related to the supervision of school counselor interns.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In this qualitative study, a developmental school counseling supervision model was utilized in the supervision of school counselor interns. To fully comprehend the supervision process in this unique school context, one needs to consider a range of factors. This introduction will briefly touch on these variables and delineate how each has affected the profession of school counseling as a whole and the supervision of school counselors and school counselors in training (SCIT) specifically.

The profession of school counseling has experienced a metamorphosis since its inception early in the 20th century, transforming over time from a social reform effort to the complex, comprehensive program approach of today (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). A brief look at the history of school counseling is enlightening as it illustrates the changing landscape of the profession. School counselors' roles and duties have fluctuated and become more divergent, variously being asked to be directive, client-centered, administrative, and/or comprehensive. Target populations have ranged from White males to the gifted, disadvantaged, disabled, and special education and minority students. Duties have included delivering career guidance, providing personal/social interventions, raising achievement levels, and ameliorating underlying student problems. This transformation in the school counseling profession and its attendant role changes and additions has created role ambiguity for school counselors who work with staff and administrators who
themselves often hold divergent views of counselor responsibilities and program goals (Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Paisley & Borders, 1995).

It is no surprise, given this history, that school counselors and their programs may vary greatly from school to school and that role ambiguity would be a persistent and recurring problem. How then do counselor educators locate quality internship sites for SCIT? More to the point, once interns are assigned and the internship is underway, how do counselor educators verify that interns are receiving quality supervision in all of the many facets of the school counselors’ varied duties and responsibilities?

School Counseling Supervision

According to available research, 45% to 80% of practicing school counselors do not receive clinical supervision and 6% to 37% see no need for it (Borders & Usher, 1992; Page, Pietrzak, & Sutton, 2001; Roberts & Borders, 1994; Sutton & Page, 1994). Many do not understand what constitutes clinical supervision (Portman, 2002) given that they are typically supervised by their principals who have no clinical supervision training and who are likely to use teaching supervision models (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Lambie & Williamson 2004; Roberts & Borders, 1994). Other obstacles to obtaining quality supervision for school counselors include a lack of expectation or mandate for supervision, a lack of administrative support and funding, and a lack of trained supervisors and multiple time constraints (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Benshoff & Paisley, 1996; Borders, 2005; Herlihy, Gray, & McCollum, 2002; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Magnuson, Black, & Norem, 2004; Roberts & Borders, 1994; Sutton & Page, 1994).
Inadequate school counselor supervision is problematic given that these same professional school counselors serve as supervisors for SCIT. This is disquieting given the critical importance of the internship experience (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; Brott & Myers, 1999; Studer & Oberman, 2006) and the fact that the supervisor, who typically has not received supervision training (Studer, 2005), is, in all probability, the most critical factor in the internship experience (Magnuson et al., 2004; Magnuson, Norem, & Bradley, 2001).

Perhaps more alarming is the fact that, although supervision of intern students is an expected professional duty for master's level school counselors (Nelson & Johnson, 1999), supervision training is usually not made available to them at the master's level (Association for Counselor Education and Supervision [ACES], 1995; Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP], 2001). School counselors find themselves risking the violation of ethical standards by providing supervision without such training (Herlihy et al., 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004). This lack of supervision training, coupled with a lack of personal supervision, could explain why SCIT reported a greater number of supervisory related ethical infractions than counselors in other settings (Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, & Wolgast, 1999). The resulting poor supervision experiences create an entrenched cyclical problem as site supervisors unknowingly communicate and model poor supervision practices along with a lack of appreciation for its benefits (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Herlihy et al., 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001).

Site supervisors may find that their university training was in more traditional remedial reactive counseling models that lacked a focus on student achievement and
outcomes (Akos & Galassi, 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Studer, 2005; Studer & Oberman, 2006). They may experience role confusion given the call for a broader, more comprehensive approach to school counseling and a subsequent lack of clarity regarding their professional identity (Herlihy et al., 2002). SCIT may find themselves more knowledgeable in current practice than their site supervisors (Studer, 2005), and may struggle to effectively translate their knowledge into practice in schools that have not yet implemented comprehensive developmental models.

Site supervisors, in addition to the above noted challenges, also struggle with a lack of in-depth models and theories of supervision which directly apply to school counselors and the unique setting in which they work (Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Herlihy et al., 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001; Studer, 2005). Clinical/mental health models are inadequate as they do not take into account the diverse roles, complex tasks, and multiple groups of individuals with whom the school counselor must work (Magnuson et al., 2001; Wood & Rayle, 2006). Practical information on school counselor supervision is limited in the professional literature (Getz, 1999; Goodyear & Bernard, 1998; Studer, 2005) and no common set of supervisory guidelines for supervisee internship experiences has been agreed upon by professional school counselors or counselor educators (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Studer, 2005).

Finally, the American School Counseling Association (ASCA), as the principal national organization for professional school counselors, has provided a national model which school counselors are urged to use as a framework for their comprehensive program, their role within that program (ASCA, 2005) and to properly train SCIT in current best practices (Murphy & Kaffengerber, 2007). The ASCA Model and the ASCA
Standards have been recommended as structures for the supervision of SCIT (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Perusse, Goodnough, & Noel, 2001); however, supervision models that incorporate these structures have been nonexistent until very recently (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Studer & Oberman, 2006; Wood & Rayle, 2006). One benefit of using the ASCA model in supervision practices could be the facilitation of program transformation for on-site supervisors, a distinct benefit to the profession (Miler & Dollarhide, 2006; Studer, 2005).

Statement of Problem

School counselors who serve as on-site supervisors for SCIT, do not as a rule receive authentic clinical supervision themselves, have not been trained in supervision practices, and do not typically have access to applicable supervision models or guidelines that accurately address the complex nature of the school setting and the current roles and responsibilities of school counselors. Additionally, their university training may have occurred prior to the initiation of current models of school counseling, and their sites may not have fully implemented comprehensive school counseling programs, making it likely that they participate in at least some non-counseling related duties. A supervision model applicable to the school setting and up-to-date with the current views of effective school counseling programs and practices is called for as is a venue for training school counselors in its use. Such a model could benefit the on-site supervisor, the SCIT, and the university supervisor as the model provides a structure for the internship experience that ensures effective use of both supervisors’ and supervisees’ time.
Purpose and Benefits of the Study

In this study, pairs of school counselor site supervisors and school counseling interns were trained in the use of a developmental school counseling supervision model. This particular model incorporates aspects of the ASCA National Model which, as was previously mentioned, has been recommended in the field as an effective framework for comprehensive school counseling programs and as a recommended structure for the supervision of school counseling interns. Using a qualitative approach, each pair was interviewed separately and together after their use of the model to explore with them their supervisory experiences with the model.

The purpose of the study is to explore participants' experiences with this model and how use of the model and accompanying log impact various aspects of the supervisory process and relationship. Multiple benefits for all participants are possible from the study. The participating school counselors could benefit from the training in and use of a supervision model that is up-to-date with current school counseling initiatives. Use of such a model could effectively facilitate the supervising school counselors in their own professional development and in the transformation of their school counseling programs. It could also allay their fears regarding supervision due to a lack of training in this area, giving them a sense of confidence through the provision of a structure and guidelines for facilitating supervisee growth.

Interns might benefit from a relevant supervision model which structures their internship experience, ensuring that they will participate in all aspects of school counseling and that they will perform a variety of duties which reflect current views of
what is considered best practice in the school counseling field. This opportunity will help them prepare adequately for their future professional roles as school counselors. University supervisors would benefit in that they could feel more confident in the effectiveness of the internship experience and in the competence and confidence of site supervisors as they use the developmental model.

Delineation of the Research

This qualitative study is phenomenological in nature. The researcher endeavored to describe and elucidate the lived experiences of professional school counselors and their school counseling interns as they participated in the supervision process using a school counselor specific supervision model. The proposed model is entitled the Professional School Counselor Supervision Model (PSCSM) and includes a log to facilitate use of the model during the weekly supervision sessions (see Appendix B and Appendix C for copies of the model and log, respectively).

In this qualitative research study, the researcher invited six supervisor/supervisee pairs (one in elementary, two in middle school, and three in high school settings) to participate in the following activities: (1) an initial 30- to 60-minute training in the use of the model and log, (2) a brief phone contact with the researcher after approximately 2 weeks of use of the model and log to ensure accurate understanding of the model framework, (3) a 30- to 60-minute individual interview with the researcher after a minimum of 6 weeks of use of the model and log, (4) an approximately 30- to 60-minute combined interview with supervisor and supervisee after the individual interview was conducted, and (5) a possible follow-up contact for clarification of findings if deemed
necessary. The individual interview and the combined interview were each audio-recorded. In addition, the researcher had access to the intern’s supervision log as an additional source for data collection. Although there were six pairs that participated in the study, there were actually 11 individuals since one of the interns agreed to participate at two of her internship sites (with different supervisors at each site). This particular situation was allowed because of the difficulties the researcher had in finding study participants at the elementary level. Inclusion of the pair allowed the researcher to obtain some findings (although limited) from this level. The study was conducted during the 2008-2009 school year.

Research Questions

This qualitative research study sought to discover answers to the following questions:

Both Supervisor/Supervisee:

1. What was the supervision experience using the PSCSM and log like for participants?
2. How did the use of the PSCSM and log affect participants’ relationship with one another?
3. What, according to the participants, were the strengths and/or weaknesses of the supervision process using the PSCSM and log?
4. If supervision with the same supervisor/supervisee pair had occurred without the model prior to use of the PSCSM and log, how did the two experiences compare?
Supervisee:

5. As a result of participation in the supervision process using the PSCSM and log, what changes did participants note in their professional growth and development as school counselors?

Supervisor:

6. As a result of participation in the supervision process using the PSCSM and log, what changes did participants note in their professional growth as supervisors and as school counselors?

Importance of the Study

Recognition of the importance of clinical supervision for school counselors and SCIT is more than evident in the literature (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Luke & Bernard, 2006; Miller & Dollarhide, 2006; Peterson & Deuschle, 2006; Wood & Rayle, 2006). Supervision models that are designed explicitly for the school setting and specifically related to school counselors’ varied roles and responsibilities have been rare until recently and are still in the very early stages of development (Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Herlihy et al., 2002; Luke & Bernard, 2006; Magnuson et al., 2001; Peterson & Deuschle, 2006; Studer, 2005; Wood & Rayle, 2006). School counselor specific supervision is a new field of inquiry with room for the growth and development of existing and new models.

This qualitative study is a contribution to that endeavor and has the potential to add the voices of the supervisor and supervisee to this important discussion. Because supervision models that incorporate the ASCA National Model have been nonexistent
until very recently (Bultsma, Parfit, Hedstrom, & Glaes, 2006; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Studer & Oberman, 2006; Wood & Rayle, 2006), this study offers an attempt at an amalgamation of specific aspects of the ASCA National Model and a supervision model. Consequently, the developmental school supervision model that is proposed in this study provides a framework to the internship experience that is up-to-date and ensures that time is spent on best practice activities. Such school counselor specific supervision models offer the possibility of unifying internship experiences. As such, this study contributes to the search for a set of established supervisory guidelines for appropriate and effective supervisee internship experiences.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following terms will be defined as follows:

1. The term supervisory as it is used throughout this study is based on a definition offered by Bernard and Goodyear (2004, 2009). Supervision is described as an intervention whereby more experienced members of a profession pass on their knowledge and expertise to individuals just getting started in the same profession. This monitoring of junior members’ performance in order to augment their professional development occurs over a period of time, is evaluative and hierarchical in nature, serves to monitor the services offered to clients, and provides a gatekeeping mechanism for the profession.

2. Administrative supervision as it is referred to in this study occurs in the school setting and is typically provided by school principals. This type of supervision focuses mainly on work ethics; attendance; use of time; relationship skills
with staff, students, and parents; and oversight of school policies and procedures (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Magnuson et al., 2001).

3. **Clinical supervision** is typically provided by experienced and licensed counselor supervisors and is focused on case conceptualization and the provision of counseling services (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Henderson & Lampe, 1992). Akos and Scarborough (2004) point out that, because school counseling is unique in its context compared to other counseling milieus, there is a need for “an expanded or reconstructed view of what ‘clinical’ training is for school counselors” (p. 106). For purposes of this study, clinical supervision will encompass this expanded view, in that it will include all of the complexities of school counselors’ roles and duties. Support for this broader view can be found in five articles published in a special issue of *Counselor Education & Supervision* (June, 2006), which highlights supervision in the schools (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Luke & Bernard, 2006; Miller & Dollarhide, 2006; Peterson & Deuschle, 2006; Wood & Rayle, 2006).

4. **Developmental supervision** refers to the supervisees’ professional growth and development and issues related to program management and accountability (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Magnuson et al., 2001). In this study a developmental supervision model is presented which focuses on the developmental stages that school counselors move through as they grow professionally. In this sense, the supervision that occurs is developmental in
nature; however, for the purposes of this study, supervision will be identified as clinical in nature.

5. *Formal supervision* refers to more intentional supervision sessions in which supervisor and intern set aside a designated time to sit down and talk about issues directly related the internship experience, as opposed to short conversations which occur throughout the day in which intern activities are briefly discussed.

6. *Supervisors* are those experienced individuals who are qualified in their profession through licensure or certification to teach, guide, and mentor those wishing to gain membership in that profession (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick, & Tilbury, 2001).

7. *On-site supervisors* are the professional school counselors who provide direct, consistent contact in the school setting, observing and evaluating the intern throughout the internship experience (Roberts et al., 2001).

8. The title of *professional school counselor* refers to individuals fulfilling the role of school counselor in elementary, middle, or senior high school settings.

9. *Intern* refers to those individuals who are provided with supervision for the entry into the profession (Roberts et al., 2001). These individuals, usually in the final year of their graduate program of study, are required to spend extensive time at their internship sites working with students, parents, teachers, administrators, and support staff. This term is used interchangeably in this study with *School Counselor(s) in Training (SCIT).*
10. The term role refers to "a set of expectations placed on an individual occupying a particular position (e.g., school counselor) in an organization (e.g., school) (Culbreth et al., 2005).

In conclusion, this study is an attempt to provide the professional field of school counseling with important information regarding school counselor supervision practices. The supervision provided to SCIT during their internship training is of vital importance to their development as school counselors. Because supervision models that are school counselor specific are in the very early stages of development, there is room for the growth and development of new models. The model put forth in this research study, which incorporates the ASCA National Model into its supervisory framework, is current and seeks to ensure that SCIT spend time engaged in appropriate school counselor-related activities. The importance of this research study lies in its potential to add the voices of the supervisor and supervisee to the process of developing an appropriate school counselor specific supervision model. Counselor educators and school counselor training programs could potentially benefit as well, as the study serves to inform the practice of providing effective internship training experiences for future school counselors. The following chapter will provide an in-depth review of the literature regarding relevant topics.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Historical Overview of the School Counseling Profession

In order to better understand the current state of affairs regarding school counselor supervision, it is important to review the history of the profession as a whole. The changing perceptions of school counselors' roles and duties since the inception of the profession in the early 1900s (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Herr, 2001; Paisley & Borders, 1995), is the narrative lens which has shaped our views of school counseling as a whole (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). A review of the historical foundations of school counseling, and the subsequent progression of the professional development of the field, sheds light on our current status in regards to role ambiguity and the complex nature of school counseling. This, in turn, elucidates some of the relevant issues affecting the supervision of school counselors and school counselors in training.

In the beginning of the 20th century, the Industrial Revolution was in full swing, as was the Progressive Movement, which sought to correct the ills created by rapid industrial growth. Guidance and counseling were products of the social reforms of this era. In the first two decades of the 20th century, teachers, while continuing in their regular teaching duties, served as vocational guidance counselors, without financial compensation or the presence of an organizational structure (Gysbers & Henderson,
2001). These individuals were primarily career counselors whose principal task was to assist young White men into appropriate employment placements.

In the ensuing years, counselors were influenced by contrasting philosophies, including use of a directive approach where counselors were to inform and gather facts, and, in contrast, a non-directive approach where they were taught to listen to and empathize with their clients as they focused on fostering personal growth (ASCA, 2005). Early concerns were voiced regarding the fact that guidance and counseling in the schools was more of a "position" with no unifying program (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001).

The organization and inception of relevant professional organizations has had an important role to play in the development of the school counseling profession, and it was in 1952 that the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) arrived on the scene, becoming a member of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA), which ultimately became the American Counseling Association (ACA) after merging with several other organizations. ASCA provided the School Counselor professional journal as well as other support to the profession such as professional development strategies, advocacy for school counselor identity, and professional resources and research (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Also in the 1950s, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) worked with ASCA to develop and refine school counselor training, advocating for quality education and supervision.

Up until the late 1950s, the number of practicing school counselors was still small due to a lack of training opportunities (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). After the 1957 launch of Sputnik by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 was passed in order to allocate funds to schools to
support school counseling services for all high school students, and to universities to support school counseling training programs. In the 1960s and 1970s, amendments to the NDEA, along with several additional acts, provided funds for elementary school counseling services, career guidance for disadvantaged students and students with disabilities, and an expansion of school counselors’ roles to include work related to special education students and their parents. These acts resulted in the replacement of teacher-counselors with full-time guidance personnel. Also, guidance and counseling were no longer seen as a position, but as part of an organizational system called pupil personnel services. However, even with this new perception, the services provided by school counselors kept the emphasis on the person, not the program, causing the work to be seen as ancillary and “remedial-reactive” (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001).

In the 1970s, decreasing student enrollment meant the elimination of many school counselor positions. This necessitated that counselors become more visible and accountable, moving to roles that were more administrative in nature. At this same time, the idea emerged to conceptualize school guidance from a person who provided ancillary services, to a comprehensive developmental model framework. This push for a comprehensive model continued into the 1980s and 1990s. It was during these two decades that more sophisticated comprehensive school counseling models began to be implemented in the schools, quickly becoming the most widely used organizational framework with a majority of states formally adopting some form of comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP) (Green & Keys, 2001; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Sink & MacDonald, 1998). In a study investigating the current status of the development of school counseling models in individual states, Martin, Carey and DeCoster (2009)
found that 17 states had established models, 24 states were progressing in model implementation, and 10 states were at the beginning stages of model development. This is 20 more states than were found to have models in a 1998 study (Sink & MacDonald, 1998).

Comprehensive models are credited to the work of Gysbers and Henderson (2006) and Myrick (2003) and a growing body of empirical research supports their efficacy (Borders & Drury, 1992; Lapan, Gysbers, & Petroski, 2001; Sink & Stroh, 2003). In a comprehensive school counseling model, counselors are involved in four domains: classroom guidance lessons, responsive services, individual planning, and systems support (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). The comprehensive model transformed the role and function of school counselors as it focused on prevention rather than crisis intervention, de-emphasized clerical and administrative tasks, and shifted the focus from the school counselor as an individual to a programmatic focus that was an integral part of the school program involving all students (ASCA, 2005).

In the 1980s, the publication of the National Commission of Excellence in Education’s report, *A Nation at Risk* (1983), which verified declining student achievement, created an era of reform initiatives and a focus on testing and accountability, again influencing the role and focus of the school counselor. Also in the same decade, the *Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984* authorized programs, planned and delivered by certified school counselors, to improve and expand career guidance services with the intent of eliminating discrimination against minorities and disadvantaged students. The 1990s continued the emphasis on comprehensive models, support for career counseling in the schools, and more federal legislation encouraging
accountability and raising student achievement. In 1990, the American School Counseling Association (ASCA, 2005) recommended the use of the term school counseling rather than guidance counseling, reflecting the broader scope of the comprehensive school counseling model.

The reform initiatives enacted in the 1980s, 1990s, and in the first part of the 21st century did not include school counselors as essential contributors for promoting student achievement (Dahir, 2001; Herr, 2002; House & Hayes, 2002). In an effort to position school counselors as critical players in contemporary school improvement plans, two initiatives were introduced in 1997. The first was the Education Trust’s Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) (Education Trust, 1997), which proposed a working definition of the New Vision School Counselor. This definition emphasized the support of academic achievement while still assisting students with their social/emotional growth; closing the achievement gap and promoting educational equity for all students (especially for racial minority youth); and a shift in focus from the individual to the system as counselors become systematic change agents who employ the skills of leadership, advocacy, collaboration and the use of data and technology (Dahir & Stone, 2006; Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan, & Jones, 2004). Also initiated in 1997 and in direct response to the omission of school counselors in the educational reform movement, ASCA created the National Standards for School Counseling Programs, which include three key areas of focus: (1) Academic Development, (2) Career Development, and (3) Personal/Social Development. Each standard is accompanied by student competencies for learning outcomes (Dahir, 2001).
In 2001, the *No Child Left Behind Act* continued the emphasis on educational reforms begun in the 1990s. This act requires educators be held accountable for student academic success by setting clearly defined benchmark scores on standardized tests. ASCA, in order to assist and support school counselors in their own efforts to provide comprehensive school counseling programs that address educational reform initiatives, developed *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* (ASCA, 2005). This model incorporates both the National Standards and the New Vision School Counseling from the TSCI, integrating them with the comprehensive program model. The ASCA National Model includes the four essential components of successful and effective comprehensive school counseling programs: Foundation, Management System, Delivery System, and Accountability. The transformed skills of leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change are included in the model. ASCA has been called the flagship national organization for professional school counselors (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007) and, as such, school counselors are urged to become familiar with the ASCA model (Dollarhide & Saginak, 2008) in order to provide quality school counseling programs. School counselors are also exhorted to play a greater role in supporting students' academic achievement and to be able to document their success in this endeavor (Akos & Galassi, 2004; Jackson et al., 2002).

As school counselors are incorporated increasingly into school reform efforts with an emphasis on promoting the academic success for all students, they must also assist students with any crisis or personal issue which may create a hindrance to their education. As Herr (2002) describes,
But in many schools they have also been expected to take on a large array of problems that are not academic in nature but do mediate student learning. They include identifying, treating, and supporting children who experience psychological as well as physical neglect or loss within changing and sometimes dysfunctional family circumstances—single parents and blended families, disintegrating families, loss of a parent, or incarcerated or ineffective parents. School counselors also are expected to deal with problems of chemical dependency and recovery, school violence and bullying, grief and bereavement, suicide, physical and sexual abuse, conflict resolution, anger management, learning disabilities, and, often high-stakes testing. (pp. 230-231)

Criticisms have been raised in the literature regarding the appropriateness of increased school counselor attention to academics to the detriment of students’ mental health and the conflicts created for counselors as they try to attend to both (Akos & Galassi, 2004; Borders, 2002; Paisley & McMahon, 2001; Whiston, 2002). Dahir and Stone (2006) state that the New Vision for School Counselors represented in TSCI and the ASCA National Model are not intended to lessen the attention paid to students’ mental health needs and that new ways of working within the system can provide balance in the support of academic, career, and personal/social development. Debate has also occurred regarding the appropriateness of promising gains in students’ academic achievement through fully implemented comprehensive school counseling programs and whether there is support in the research to make such claims (Brown & Trusty, 2005). Sink (2005) argues that although direct causal links are not realistic, causal inferences can be tentatively offered.

As Lambie and Williamson (2004) point out, a review of the historical evolution of the school counseling profession highlights several salient themes. These include the fact that the role of the school counselor has continued to expand over the decades, with no corresponding reduction in duties or responsibilities. Over the years, school
counselors' roles have included vocational guidance, supporting personal growth, encouraging individual development, identifying and supporting gifted students, supporting disadvantaged students and students with disabilities, testing and administrative duties, implementing comprehensive developmental school counseling programs, and most recently becoming systemic change agents to promote students' academic achievement (Galassi & Akos, 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Herr, 2001; 2002; Lambie & Williamson, 2004). This complex picture adds exponentially to the difficulties apparent in the training and supervision of school counselors and SCIT.

The Supervision of School Counselors

Research on Supervision Practices in School Counseling

To what degree do school counselors, who often serve as supervisors for SCIT, actually receive supervision themselves and, perhaps more importantly, to what degree do they see a need for clinical supervision? Several studies have documented that the actual number of school counselors receiving supervision is quite low. Sutton and Page (1994), in a survey of school counselors in Maine, found that 20% of school counselors received individual clinical supervision, 63% expressed a desire for supervision, and 37% stated they had no need for clinical supervision. In North Carolina, 37% of school counselors reported receiving clinical supervision and 79% indicated that they wanted counseling supervision (Roberts & Borders, 1994). In a survey of National Certified Counselors (NCCs), 45% of the school counselor respondents reported having received no post-degree supervision (Borders & Usher, 1992), while only 5.8% stated they did not want
supervision (Borders, personal communication, as cited in Page et al., 2001). Page et al.
(2001) surveyed 267 members of ASCA and found that 24% were receiving clinical
supervision, 67% expressed a desire for either continued supervision (10%) or
supervision in the future (56%), and 33% stated they had no need for supervision. In
summary, the available research studies indicate that between 45% and 80% of school
counselors receive no clinical supervision. Perhaps more disturbing is the realization that,
although the majority of school counselors want supervision, there are still approximately
6% to 37% of school counselors who see no need for this support. How then, are these
school counselors able to provide competent supervision to SCIT?

Obstacles to Supervision Practices in the School Setting

Numerous obstacles are cited in the literature to explain the discrepancy between
school counselors’ desires for clinical supervision and the numbers of practicing school
counselors who actually receive adequate supervision. A lack of any expectation or
mandate for clinical supervision in the school setting (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Borders,
2005; Herlihy et al., 2002; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Magnuson et al., 2004), coupled
with a lack of trained clinical supervisors on staff (Benshoff & Paisley, 1996; Borders,
2005; Sutton & Page, 1994) create a challenge for school counselors who do not know
how to go about finding supervision.

Most school counselors are supervised by their principals who are unlikely to have
counseling backgrounds or clinical supervision training and who will likely use teaching
supervision models when supervising counselors (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Lambie &
Williamson, 2004; Roberts & Borders, 1994), making it highly unlikely that school
counselors will receive substantive clinical supervision. Principals may not value clinical supervision for their school counselors as they may have a poor understanding of comprehensive school counseling models, instead expecting school counselors to perform non-counseling duties such as scheduling and academic advising (Herlihy et al., 2002; Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Lack of administrative support creates a burden for school counselors when financial support for supervision is lacking (Magnuson et al., 2001; Sutton & Page, 1994). Time restraints are also an issue for counselors and for principals who do not want time taken away from direct services to students (Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Crutchfield, Price, et al., 1997; Herlihy et al., 2002; Sutton & Page, 1994).

Additionally, as has been noted above, many school counselors themselves do not see a need for supervision, perhaps due to a failure on the part of the counseling profession to effectively relay its value (Sutton & Page, 1994). The need for supervision may not be evident as many school counselors experience role confusion due to an overabundance of non-counseling duties and a lack of clarity regarding professional identity (Herlihy et al., 2002). Never having had one’s work scrutinized nor having experienced the benefits of effective feedback may also cause resistance to supervisory activities (Borders & Usher, 1992; Henderson & Lampe, 1992). School counselors may also be confused about what constitutes clinical supervision and may believe they are receiving clinical supervision when in actuality it is administrative in nature (Portman, 2002). Miller and Dollarhide (2006) suggest that school counselors in training should receive supervision training, hypothesizing that this practice would instill an appreciation for supervision, making it more likely that graduates would seek out supervision in their professional lives.
Support from the Counseling Field for the Practice of School Counselor Supervision

Supervision for counselors in general has been recognized as critical for professional development (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998, 2009; Magnuson & Wilcoxon, 1998). The call for supervision of school counselors specifically has also been consistently and clearly evident from early in the profession’s history, making the continued lack of school counseling supervision practices all the more puzzling. In the 1920s, Brewer (as cited in Magnuson et al., 2001) expressed concern over the lack of coordination and supervision of school counselors. In the 1930s, Fitch (as cited in Magnuson et al., 2001) predicted that school counselors’ roles could not be stable if their sole source of supervision was from building principals. Years later, Boyd and Walter (1975) compared a school counselor to a cactus, maintaining that both must grow and thrive with minimal sustenance. Others, in the same general time period, challenged the counseling profession as a whole to make counseling supervision a priority and to establish national standards for the supervision of counselors in all settings, with special emphasis on systematic supervision of school counselors (Aubrey, 1978; Barret & Schmidt, 1986).

Contemporary authors continue to highlight the supervisory needs of school counselors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Crespi, 2003; Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Herlihy et al., 2002; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Luke & Bernard, 2006; Magnuson et al., 2004; Magnuson et al., 2001; Miller & Dollarhide, 2006; Sutton & Page, 1994). In a review of clinical supervision articles published by ACA and in several international counseling journals from 1999 to 2004, Borders (2005) found that
in terms of counseling specialties, school counselor supervision received the most attention for several reasons, including the fact that school counseling is a foundation of the counseling field, that school counseling graduates are highly represented in proportion to other specialties, and that the school setting provides unique challenges in regards to the provision of clinical supervision.

Magnuson et al. (2001) point out that community agency counselors in most states are required to receive from 2,000 to 3,000 hours of supervised experience post graduation, whereas recent school counselor graduates are expected to be immediately competent counselors who supervise school counseling interns just a few short years into their new school counseling positions, without clinical supervision support. Magnuson et al. (2004) question this disparity, which could suggest that school counselors need less sophisticated skills when in fact, due to the broad scope of responsibilities and multiple roles in which they are engaged, school counselors may be more in need of supervisory support than their counterparts in agency settings. Others in the field have pointed to the increased need of school counselors for supervision given the wide-ranging and challenging cases that they encounter (Crespi, 2003; Paisley & McMahon, 2001) and the fact that many completed their training at a time when these more present day problems were not addressed in their university programs (Crutchfield & Borders, 1997).

Herlihy et al. (2002) assert that school counselors need supervision to assist them in maintaining and enhancing competence levels, thereby avoiding possible legal and ethical problems. These authors believe that supervision improves competence levels through the provision of several key ingredients, including consultation on legal and ethical issues, professional support, which can alleviate burnout, and opportunities for
clinical skill development. When supervision is not available, the increased stress and isolation can result in less effective services to students (Crutchfield & Borders, 1997). The legal and ethical issues that may arise under these circumstances can indeed be a concern for school counselors as they are more likely to practice without supervision than counselors in other settings (Borders & Usher, 1992).

It has been noted that supervision assists master’s level counseling students in the development of a professional identity (Auxier, Hughes, & Kline, 2003). Supervision facilitates the emergence of a coherent professional identity through engagement in a professional acculturation process (O’Byrne & Rosenberg, 1998). Supervision has been termed a “rite of passage” where novice counselors learn the values, mores, and scope of practice of the profession, develop their skills and problem solving abilities, and bridge the gap between theory and practice as they are inducted into their new profession (Brott & Myers, 1999; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006).

When clinical supervision is absent, professional identity problems have been noted (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; McMahon & Patton, 2000) and consequently school counselors, who typically do not receive clinical supervision, have historically struggled with professional identity issues (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Herlihy et al., 2002). Not surprisingly, in a chicken or egg scenario, a lack of professional identity coupled with school counselor role confusion, creates a situation where there is a lack of significance placed on supervision for school counselors who do not see its benefit (Herlihy et al., 2002). As professional identity contributes to defining the school counselor role, it thereby also shapes the counseling program and how services are delivered (Brott &
Myers, 1999; Jackson et al., 2002). Thus, a lack of clinical supervision can lead to compromised school counseling service delivery (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006).

The professional organizations in the counseling field are also in support of the practice of supervision. In 1989, the American Association of Counseling and Development School Counseling Task Force (AACD, now ACA), declared a need for the supervision of practicing school counselors. In 1990 the AACD developed standards for counseling supervisors. In the most current ACA Code of Ethics (2005), supervision is not mandated; however, counselors are told to engage in professional activities only after they have received training and supervised experience (C.2.a., C.2.b., C.2.c.). ACES (1995) offers guidelines for the supervision of student counselors in all academic and clinical settings; however, it does not offer a model of supervision, leaving this critical decision up to the on-site supervisor.

ASCA has been criticized for not providing more clearly stated supervision requirements for school counselors (Magnuson et al., 2004). Dollarhide and Miller (2006) note that although supervision is referred to in the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2005) and in the ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselors (2004), it is unclear what kind of supervision (administrative, programmatic, or clinical) is recommended. The ASCA National Model mentions supervision on two occasions, recommending that school counseling programs be evaluated by a counseling supervisor, and that the school counseling team develop forms to facilitate the supervision and evaluation of school counselors. In the ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselors, school counselors are warned to avoid harm to others through “informed consent, consultation, supervision and documentation” (ASCA, 2004, A.4.). Also, these standards recommend that school
counselors only "accept positions for which they are qualified by education, training, and supervised experience" (ASCA, 2004, D.1.e.).

It is clear that the issue of supervision in the school setting has been and still is at the forefront of concerns in the school counseling profession. In 2006, Counselor Education & Supervision, the official journal of ACES, presented a special section on supervision in the schools in which many of the pertinent issues pertaining to this topic were highlighted ("Special Section: Supervision in Schools," 2006). In this issue, Dollarhide and Miller (2006) state,

> It is our hope that renewed interest in, and commitment to, clinical supervision of both professional school counselors and school counselors-in-training will result in a consistent professional identity, improved service delivery consistent with the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2005), and a transformed profession. (p. 243)

**Empirical Evidence of the Benefits of Supervision for School Counselors**

Empirical evidence that supervision results in positive gains for school counselors is somewhat limited (Borders & Usher, 1992; Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Roberts & Borders, 1994; Sutton & Page, 1994). Researchers who have documented benefits include Wiley and Ray (1986), who found that school counselors improved with clinical supervision experiences and showed little growth without it. In a later study, school counselors found that clinical supervision led to professionally relevant dialogue with supervisors and that the experience was professionally invigorating (Henderson & Lampe, 1992). Agnew, Vaught, Getz, and Fortune (2000), in an evaluation of a peer group clinical supervision program, found that 97% of the participants attributed positive counseling skills, professional gains, and personal gains and changes such as increased
confidence, comfort with the job, and professional validation to participation in the program. Participants also experienced high job satisfaction and significantly low burnout levels. Findings from a study conducted by McMahon and Patton (2000) indicate that participants found supervision beneficial for a variety of reasons including alleviation of professional isolation, stress and burnout, increased self confidence to try new ideas and techniques; increased sense of support, and an increased sense of accountability. Participants noted a lack of professional development when there was no clinical supervision occurring, a finding noted decades ago by Boyd and Walter (1975).

School Counselors as Supervisors

_Critical Importance of Internship Experience for School Counselors in Training_

School counselors often serve as supervisors for SCIT (Borders, 2005). This is true even though it is likely that they have not received clinical supervision themselves since they were interns (a time period of anywhere from 2 to 30 or more years), nor are they likely to have received training in how to be an effective supervisor (Studer, 2005).

This is a disturbing fact given the agreement found in the professional literature for the significance of the internship experience for SCIT. Many authors have noted that internship experiences are critical as they are the students’ first opportunity to try out their newly learned skills in an actual school setting (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; Brott & Myers, 1999; Jackson et al., 2002; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Studer & Oberman, 2006; Sutton & Page, 1994). In fact, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), which provides guidelines for the training of future
school counselors, identified supervised opportunities as the “most critical experience elements in the program” (CACREP, 2001, Section III). Jackson et al. (2002) urge that now is the time to recognize the importance of this early induction period into the profession. Roberts et al. (2001) argue the case succinctly,

In sum, the on-site experiential components of the counselor education program should be the apex of the intern learning experience, wherein student competencies, program teaching, skills acquisition, and site supervisor mentoring merge to mold the novice counselor into the best that one can be at the conclusion of that stage of professional development. (p. 208)

Unfortunately, there is a paucity of research related to the internship experience and clinical supervision of SCIT (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Jackson et al., 2002; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Roberts & Borders, 1994).

Critical Importance of Site Supervisor’s Role

The supervising school counselor is, in all probability, the most critical factor in the SCIT’s internship experience (Magnuson et al., 2004; Magnuson et al., 2001). According to Akos and Scarborough (2004), 66% of 59 internship syllabi studied listed the on-site school counselor supervisor as the sole person accountable for the SCIT supervisory experiences. This creates a situation where the on-site supervisor becomes the “sole voice of the profession” (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Site supervisors have also been referred to as, “the role models for the future of the profession” (Roberts et al., 2001, p. 211) and as “key gatekeepers to the profession” (Studer, 2005, p. 358). On-site supervisors are in a position to determine the model of supervision employed, often based on their own supervision experiences, which could be minimal and/or outdated (Murphy & Kafftenberger, 2007).
Given that the internship for SCIT is considered a critical learning experience, and that the on-site supervisor's role is of paramount importance, it would follow that supervision training should be provided for practicing school counselors, either in their own university training or subsequently during their professional life. This, however, is unfortunately not the case (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Herlihy et al., 2002; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Roberts et al., 2001). In a study of 73 practicing school counselors, 60% reported no supervision training (Studer & Oberman, 2006). Regardless of this fact, supervising intern students is an expected duty for professional school counselors (Nelson & Johnson, 1999). Counselors are told that it is their obligation to share their expertise with future school counselors to further the profession, and refusal to do so implies a lack of understanding for how professions grow and develop (Roberts et al., 2001). ASCA states that school counselors need to “provide support and mentoring to novice professionals” (ASCA, 2004, F.2.c.), presumably school counseling interns.

This charge creates quite a conundrum for school counselors who are also told that if they provide supervision without training and education in supervisory practices, they may be practicing outside of their areas of competence, risking a violation of ethical standards (Herlihy et al., 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004). According to the ACA Code of Ethics, counselors must have adequate preparation in supervision methods and techniques if they are to supervise (ACA, 2005, F.2.), and in the 1993 Ethical Guidelines for Counseling Supervisors, it is stated that supervisors must have training in supervision before they undertake supervisory practices (ACES, 1995, 2.01). The CACREP 2001
Standards for school counseling programs did not include a requirement for developing skills as a supervisor despite the fact that professional school counselors are more often than not the sole site supervisors for school counselor interns. The latest edition of the CACREP Standards (CACREP, 2009) requires that school counseling site supervisors have “relevant training in counseling supervision” (p.14); however, this training is not explained or described.

Typically, school counselors will not have had access in their university training to such relevant counseling supervision training. Most school counselor supervisors are master’s level practitioners (Borders & Usher, 1992) and supervision training is not usually available at the master’s level, as until recently it has strictly been a doctoral level requirement (ACES, 1995; CACREP, 2001). Future school counselors will be more prepared to provide supervision, at least in CACREP accredited programs, due to changes in the standards. The most recent CACREP Standards (CACREP, 2009) now include a requirement that master’s level students engage in studies that provide an understanding of “counseling supervision models, practices, and processes” (p. 9). It will be several years before this affects the supervision of interns however, since supervisors must have at least 2 years of experience prior to providing supervision.

There are other factors that could prove to be obstacles to obtaining supervision training for current practicing school counselors. School counselors who did not receive supervision training in their counselor education programs are not likely to obtain it post graduation due to the same constraints they encounter in obtaining clinical supervision. Cost, time, availability, and lack of district support are all inhibiting factors in acquiring supervision training. Unfortunately, there is also little assistance found in the literature for
school counselors who are looking for practical information to utilize when supervising others (Getz, 1999; Goodyear & Bernard, 1998; Studer, 2005). All of the above factors may explain why there are low numbers of professional school counselors who are willing to act as supervisors (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Page et al., 2001). There is also some evidence that the lack of personal supervision experiences, coupled with a lack of supervision training could lead to less effective supervision in the school setting. Ladany et al. (1999) found that school counselors-in-training reported a greater number of supervisory related ethical infractions than counselors in other settings.

Unfortunately, poor supervision experiences could create a cycle perpetuating this practice. Site supervisors poorly trained in supervision may be unknowingly communicating and modeling poor supervision practices along with a lack of appreciation for its benefits (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Herlihy et al., 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001). These SCIT will, in time, become supervisors themselves and will likely repeat the poor supervision practices they experienced in their own internships.

Use of a model such as the PSCSM, the focus of this study, could be a distinct advantage for site supervisors who have received no supervision training. The PSCSM and log could possibly provide the following: informing supervisors about activities supervisees need to be participating in, instructions on how to structure supervision sessions to reflectively discuss the supervisees’ experiences, and the provision of an evaluative tool to discuss supervisee developmental progress. Additionally, the PSCSM has the potential to afford supervisors a sense of confidence regarding their supervision practices.
Site Supervisors Trained in Out-Dated Practices

Beyond the lack of personal supervision experiences after graduation, as well as the absence of training in supervision practices, site supervisors struggle with several other hurdles as they attempt to provide supervision for SCIT. Often, their university training was more traditional, emphasizing a remedial reactive approach that lacked a focus on student achievement and outcomes, and was based largely on services or functions rather than on the role of the school counselor (Akos & Galassi, 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Studer, 2005; Studer & Oberman, 2006). Professional school counselors who received their training prior to the Education Trust’s Transforming School Counseling Initiative (Education Trust, 1997), the development of the National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Dahir, 2001), and The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs (ASCA, 2005) are unlikely to have the knowledge necessary to provide an internship site that is fully transformed into a developmental model (Jackson et al., 2002).

Studer and Oberman (2006) found that school counselors who had been in the field 6 years or less were significantly more likely to have taken a course in the ASCA National Model than those who had 7 or more years of professional experience. Jackson et al. (2002) contend that as modifications to counselor preparation programs occur to correspond to a transformed developmental school counseling model, students’ practicum and internship experiences must do the same. SCIT could find themselves in the difficult position of having more knowledge about current best practices in the field than their site supervisors (Studer, 2005). Use of a model such as the PSCSM may ensure that
supervisors and supervisees are on the same page and using the same language to describe appropriate school counselor roles and activities that are consistent with the current best practices of the profession.

*Internship Sites Offer Out-Dated School Counseling Models*

Even if site supervisors are knowledgeable about the transformed school counseling model, they may struggle to effectively translate their knowledge into practice. ASCA has termed the degree to which a school counseling program is consistent with the National Model as the program’s *degree of transformation* (ASCA, 2005). Depending on the school counselor’s knowledge and skill level, along with the internship site’s degree of transformation, interns may find themselves in a situation where they are not given opportunities to apply what they are learning in their counselor education programs.

School counseling has been referred to as a “minority profession” (McMahon & Patton, 2000) as school counselors are often the only counseling professionals assigned to their school buildings (Herlihy et al., 2002; Page et al., 2001). This sense of isolation may be the primary cause for novice school counselors to adopt teachers and administrators as their primary professional referents along with the fact that they are expected to function “as seasoned veterans from their first day” with minimal support or supervision (Matthes, 1992). Professional identity issues ensue when school counselors lack frequent contacts with their fellow school counselors and make it difficult for them to provide the right milieu for the professional identity development of interns placed under their tutelage.

Research indicates that school counselors are not always involved in activities identified as best practices (Brott & Myers, 1999; Perusse et al., 2004) due in large part to
the fact that they are accountable to and have their roles defined by a wide variety of individuals who maintain differing philosophical and procedural principles, have their own agendas, and possess little understanding of the profession or capabilities of the school counselor (Culbreth et al., 2005; Johnson, 2000; Paisley & Borders, 1995). These individuals include lawmakers, school board members, administrators, teachers, parents, and students.

School counselor role confusion and ambiguity has historically been a significant issue, and is one that continues to challenge the profession today (Akos & Galassi, 2004; Brott & Myers, 1999; Fitch, Newby, Ballester, & Marshall, 2001; Paisley & McMahon, 2001). Building principals, the individuals who are more than likely the most influential regarding how school counselors spend their time, are not in agreement with school counselors about what tasks are appropriate (Perusse et al., 2004). Principals continue to sanction tasks such as discipline, class scheduling, test administration, and record keeping as appropriate for their school counselors, all tasks not supported in the National Standards (Fitch et al. 2001; Perusse et al., 2004). Lack of knowledge of what is deemed appropriate for professional school counselors may be part of the problem. In a study which examined the impact of information on principal’s perceptions of school counselors, Leuwerke, Walker, and Shi (2009) found that 70% of the study participants, all practicing school principals, reported little or no exposure to the ASCA model. In a national study which examined high school teachers’ perceptions of the professional school counselor’s role as defined by ASCA, Reiner, Colbert, and Perusse (2009) found that teachers were in agreement that counselors should engage in 13 of 16 appropriate responsibilities. This is an encouraging finding; however, these same teachers also
indicated that they agreed with 5 out of 12 inappropriate activities and that they believed school counselors were engaged in these activities. These non-counseling related duties are an impediment for school counselors as they attempt to transform their programs into fully developmental models as prescribed by ASCA (2005) and the Education Trust (1997). Role stress is also evident as counselors are confronted with conflicts between job realities and training or professional association standards and guidelines (Brott & Myers, 1999; Culbreth et al., 2005).

School counselors who are not up-to-date in best practices, who work in isolation and lack a consistent professional identity, who have their roles and duties defined by non-counselors, and who do not work in transformed developmental school counseling settings are in a difficult position when attempting to offer an effective internship experience to school counselor trainees. Counselor education programs are also in a dilemma as they seek appropriate internship sites that will provide valuable experiences for their students. SCIT are required to involve themselves in all aspects of school counseling during their internship experience (CACREP, 2009) and are expected to perform a variety of duties (Wood & Rayle, 2006). There is a consensus in the literature that clinical experiences for SCIT need to change to reflect current views of what constitutes best practices in the school counseling profession (Jackson et al., 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Studer, 2005; Wood & Rayle, 2006). The PSCSM provides a structure that may promote the participation of SCIT in such best practice activities. Even if a particular site is not considered "transformed," the model and log may provide a venue for discussion related to what a transformed school counseling
model would look like and how an intern could prepare to develop such a program in the future.

Supervision Models

Overview

Clinical supervision has been a presence in the mental health field since late in the 19th century (Goodyear & Bernard, 1998). The earliest models of supervision relied mainly on psychotherapeutic processes, assuming that clinicians who were skillful in their chosen therapeutic approach would also be skillful in supervision practices (Haynes, Corey, & Moulton, 2003; Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Delworth, 1998). In these models, supervision is considered more as an add-on to therapy rather than a distinct endeavor. Supervision was eventually seen as its own process with unique skill sets and issues, and by the late 1970s and early 1980s models were developed to address these, including legal, racial, and social class concerns (Bernard, 2005; Haynes et al., 2003). The field of supervision has expanded dramatically between 1992 and the present, developing a solid conceptual and empirical foundation (Bernard, 2005; Goodyear & Bernard, 1998). Even so, it is a relatively new field of study and current supervision models are still in the developmental stages.

Murphy and Kaffenberg (2007) categorize supervision models or approaches to supervision into three basic types, including psychotherapy-based models, which utilize the basic tenets of a particular theoretical orientation within the supervision process; developmental models, which highlight novice counselors’ stages and processes of
development as they evolve; and social role models, which focus mainly on the various roles that the supervisor engages in during supervision. There is not universal agreement in the literature on the categorization of supervision models, evidence of the early developmental stage of supervision as a field of study. Haynes et al. (2003) in an overview of supervision models, categorizes them as developmental, psychotherapy-based, and integrative. Integrative models are based on a combination of techniques and theories selected to fit the supervisor’s unique style and personality. Regardless of the approach, Bradley and Gould (2001) contend that all models incorporate a collaborative relationship between supervisor and supervisee, a focus on the individuality of the supervisee, and a structure that facilitates supervisee growth and autonomy.

Recommendations for Effective Models and Supervision Practices

Because the field of supervision is relatively new, the literature on effective practices and models is somewhat limited (Goodyear & Bernard, 1998). Haynes et al. (2003) state that effective supervision models should explain a considerable amount of information in a succinct manner and take into consideration the following factors:

• The ways in which learning and development take place for individuals, often influenced by supervisors’ philosophy of therapy and the change process.

• The multicultural differences in supervisees and whether or not a different approach is needed.

• Supervision goals.

• Supervisors’ roles such as teacher, consultant, counselor, etc.
• The intervention strategies supervisors will use to accomplish the supervision goals.

• The role evaluation will play in the supervision process.

Effective models have been described in the literature as having four ingredients: (1) utility, (2) verifiability, (3) comprehensiveness, and (4) simplicity (Munson, 1993).

Regardless of the model used, supervisors must possess certain competencies for supervision to be successful. Key supervisor competencies that are mentioned in the literature include a conceptual knowledge of the supervision process, appropriate implementation of intervention skills, investment and commitment to the supervision process, the ability to be a mentor and a model in professional development, openness and accessibility, recognition of supervisee needs and individuality, and good communication skills (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Borders & Leddick, 1987). O’Byrne and Rosenberg (1998) recommend a sociocultural approach to supervision where supervisors and supervisees engage in a continuing dialogue to negotiate meaning and co-construct their understandings of professional issues. When this is not able to occur, Woodside, Ziegler, and Paulaus (2009) assert that it impedes interns’ ability to perform their duties with confidence. Certainly, supervision training is necessary for the development of supervisor competencies, and for successful supervision to occur (Barrett & Barber, 2005; Herlihy et al., 2002; Magnuson, Wilcoxon, & Norem, 2000; Studer, 2005).

When poor supervision experiences occur, supervisees report that supervisors disregard their strengths (Wulf & Nelson, 2000) and misjudge or fail to recognize or respond sufficiently to their changing needs (Magnuson et al., 2000; Najavits & Strupp,
1994). Discussion of supervisee needs is difficult if the supervisor fails to ask for such input, especially since trainees tend not to communicate their needs adequately (Barrett & Barber, 2005; Reising & Daniels, 1983). Barret and Barber suggest that supervisors could comprehend trainee needs better if they had a systematic process for evaluating the cognitive and emotional maturation of the supervisee in order to provide the most appropriate interventions. These authors also point out that many models do not address supervisee maturation or cognitive and emotional development, focusing rather on the development of technical skills.

Finding guidance from the literature on best practices specifically related to school counselor supervision is difficult to procure. As noted previously, there is a paucity of information in the literature on both practical information for school counselor supervisors (Getz, 1999; Goodyear & Bernard, 1998; Studer, 2005) and on the internship experiences and clinical supervision of SCIT (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Jackson et al., 2002; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Roberts & Borders, 1994). Roberts et al. (2001) maintain that school counseling supervisors face circumstances very different from other professional counselors and offer seven guidelines to accommodate these differences. These guidelines include the following:

1. The site supervisor must understand and agree to the counseling education program's site requirements and have the necessary patience and commitment to the supervision process. There must be adequate time and space; appropriate opportunities for the intern's professional growth; and administrative, staff, and community support for interns.
2. Site supervisors need supervision training, either from the counselor education institutions they work with, or from professional organizations.

3. Site supervisors must be willing to share their expertise and knowledge to help interns develop professionally in a "real-life" experience.

4. Site supervisors must be knowledgeable and up-to-date on all ethical and legal issues related to the profession of school counseling and be willing to share this knowledge with their supervisees.

5. Communication must occur between the site supervisor and the counselor education program sponsoring the intern. On-site visits from program supervisors can be beneficial for the internship experience. Roles of program supervisors and on-site supervisors need to be clear and collaboration between the two is seen as beneficial.

6. Site supervisors need to communicate concerns they have about the intern's professional development to the program supervisors early in the process.

7. Site supervisors need to meet weekly with supervisees for face-to-face one-hour sessions to facilitate personal reflection and to enhance skill development.

There is support by CACREP (2009) and various authors for the necessity of weekly, face-to-face supervision sessions, suggesting that such meetings can relieve supervisor anxiety and resolve weekly concerns so they do not become overshadowed by upcoming concerns; (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Peterson & Deuschle, 2006). In fact, supervisees feel let down, put off, and unsupported when supervisors appear to be too busy to mentor them (Nelson & Friedlander, 2001). In addition to weekly face-to-face
meetings, there is also support for supervision sessions that are carefully planned. Well structured supervision sessions help supervisors feel more comfortable, competent and purposeful, allowing them to address both personal and professional issues (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006). Miller and Dollarhide (2006) recommend that supervisors be trained in a “concrete, sequential process that outlines the actions of the supervisor, provides a means of evaluating and documenting outcomes of supervision, and provides accountability for supervision time” (p. 301). An understanding of this systematic supervision practice gives the supervisor confidence to supervise effectively and could offset a reportedly ineffective supervision practice in which sessions were considered by supervisees as unbalanced, with a focus on too much or too little of all elements of the supervisory experience (Magnuson et al., 2000).

The PSCSM attempts to address many of the issues discussed in the above section. As recommended by Barret and Barber (2005), this developmental model provides a systematic process for supervisors to evaluate supervisees’ cognitive and emotional development. The model and log also provide an avenue to recognize supervisee strengths and supervisory needs, as pointed out earlier, two problems present in poor supervision experiences (Magnuson et al., 2000; Najavits & Strupp, 1994; Wulf & Nelson, 2000). Weekly supervision sessions, as have been stated previously, are supported in the literature (CACREP, 2009; Murphy & Kaffengerber, 2007; Peterson & Deuschle, 2006). The use of PSCSM formalizes and offers structure to these sessions, potentially alleviating supervisor anxiety and possibly making such sessions more likely to occur. The organization and structural framework provided in the PSCSM could also serve to help supervisors feel more comfortable, competent, and purposeful as they are
able to address both personal and professional supervisee issues as recommended by Peterson and Deuschle. Supervisees may benefit as well through the use of the model and log as they are unlikely to feel put off or unsupported by supervisors (Nelson & Friedlander, 2001) as the pair engage in well structured, carefully planned, in-depth supervision sessions.

_School Counseling Supervision Models_

School counseling as a profession has been plagued with a host of difficulties which have been discussed above, all of which contribute to the complexities of the supervision of school counselors and SCIT. Role transformation and ambiguity, the complex nature of school counselors' roles and setting, a continually changing vision of the goals and mission of the profession, the lack of support for supervision both professionally and by school district personnel, professional identity issues, and a lack of importance placed on supervision by school counselors themselves all add to the obstacles in the provision of quality supervision for both school counselors and SCIT.

An additional challenge has been a lack of in-depth models and theories of supervision which apply directly to school counselors and which take into account the uniqueness of counseling in the school setting (Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Herlihy et al., 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001; Studer, 2005). The most frequently used clinical/mental health models are inadequate for use with school counselors as they do not take into account the diverse roles and complex tasks, or the multiple systems of groups, including parents, teachers, students, administrators, and staff members in which school counselors are required to participate (Magnuson et al., 2001; Wood & Rayle, 2006). Site supervisors
are in dire need of direction as they typically have not had supervision training and there has been no agreement in the profession on a common set of supervisory guidelines for the experiences that supervisees must have in their internship training, (Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Studer, 2005). In fact, in a study examining internship syllabi for pedagogical practices for clinical preparation, Akos and Scarborough (2004) found marked variability related to student expectations during internship.

Akos and Scarborough (2004) have suggested that the term “clinical” supervision be expanded or reconstructed when related to school counseling due to the uniqueness of the setting. Others have agreed with this assessment, recommending that an appropriate school counselor supervision model should include attention to counseling and consultation, the development, implementation and coordination of a comprehensive school counseling program, and the development of professional maturity (Magnuson et al., 2001). Additional recommendations have been to focus on more current school counselor roles such as leadership, advocacy, collaboration, systemic change, and educational reform, especially given the fact that until very recently, there have been no supervision models that incorporated the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2005; Wood & Rayle, 2006) or the Transforming School Counselor Initiative (Education Trust, 2002; Wood & Rayle, 2006), both of which encourage these new roles. Other school counselor roles that would be overlooked in a traditional clinical supervision model are teaching guidance curriculum in the classrooms, academic planning, program implementation and evaluation, consultation with parents and teachers, and advocating for the profession (Wood & Rayle, 2006). The PSCSM attempts to address these omissions in traditional clinical/mental health supervision models by taking into account the unique setting, roles,
and responsibilities typical in the school counseling profession. School counseling supervision models which have been found more recently in the professional literature are described below.

**Integrative Psychological Developmental Supervision Model**

Lambie and Sias (2009) introduced the integrative psychological developmental supervision model (IPDSM) which was designed to support the psychological development of school counseling interns. The theory behind the IPDSM is that individuals functioning at higher levels of psychological maturity are personally and professionally more functional in complex environments. Thus the goal of this model is to support and enhance the psychological development of school counseling interns through challenging “students’ existing cognitive schema, promoting disequilibrium, (and) fostering an accommodative response” which leads to psychological growth. Interns experience new roles in their practicum and internship experiences which create disequilibrium for them. Through journaling, reflection and self-appraisal of videotaped sessions, supervisors support the interns’ processing of these new experiences. One of the unique contributions of this model is its inclusion of opportunities for interns to use journaling and reflection. It also addresses, to some degree, the fact that the SCIT will need tools to deal with a complex environment. This model, however, does not address the specifics of the complexities of the school setting including the multiple roles and responsibilities of the school counselor. It also does not address some of the more current issues discussed so frequently in the professional school counseling literature, such as the
themes and components of the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2005). The PSCSM strives to include these issues as well as the opportunity for self reflection.

Northside Independent School District System

Somody, Henderson, Cook, and Zambrano (2008) describe a performance improvement system developed in a large school district in Texas beginning in the 1980s when the Comprehensive Guidance Program was first implemented. This system, which has been called the Northside Independent School District (NISD) system, has been evolving since that time and currently involves the assessment of school counselors’ level of professionalism in the areas of competence and commitment. Based on the findings from this assessment, administrative and clinical supervisors determine the counselor’s level of performance from a four-quadrant matrix and subsequently provide both clinical and administrative supervision based on identified goals.

In this system, school counselor competence is assessed according to eight domains identified by the Texas Counseling Association, including: program management, guidance, counseling, consultation, coordination, student assessment, professional behavior, and professional standards. Commitment is assessed by examining school counselors’ attitudes and values such as personal motivation, work habits, professional ethical valued, respect for others, and advocacy. Although the authors do not refer to this performance improvement system as a model, it appears to offer a systematic design for the supervision of school counselors which takes into account the complex roles and responsibilities that counselors engage in when providing a comprehensive school counseling program. It also appears to offer some focus on other recommended
themes from the ASCA National Model (i.e., advocacy). Because this system, as described, assumes the availability of a "Director of Guidance" to provide clinical supervision to the school counselors, it is unlikely that smaller districts would have the ability to provide this service. However, the system itself perhaps could be used by principals as a more appropriate evaluation of school counselor activities. It is also possible that the system could be adapted for use by school counselor supervisors with SCIT.

School Counselor Supervision Model

In the 2006 Counselor Education & Supervision special edition on school counselor supervision, two new school counselor supervision models were introduced (Luke & Bernard, 2006; Wood & Rayle, 2006). Luke and Bernard's School Counselor Supervision Model (SCSM) merges Bernard's (1979, 1997) Discrimination Model with the Delivery System of the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2005): large group interventions; counseling and consultation; individual and group advisement; and planning, coordination, and evaluation. Luke and Bernard have developed a model matrix that combines these four delivery system domains with Bernard's supervisor roles (teacher, counselor, and consultant) and supervisor foci (intervention, conceptualization, and personalization). Luke and Bernard's model offers an important contribution to the school counseling supervision literature in that it addresses the unique context within which school counselors function. The PSCSM expands on this by including more components of the ASCA model including leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change. Luke and Bernard's model also does not provide a method for
monitoring supervisee progress through developmental levels as is provided in the PSCSM. Another benefit of the PSCSM (and one that is not found in other current models) is the provision of a supervision log, a unique management tool which facilitates implementation of the model.

**Goals, Roles, Functions, and Systems Model**

Wood and Rayle's (2006) Goals, Roles, Functions, and Systems Model (GRFS) draws from three supervision models: the Working Alliance Model of Supervision (Bordin, 1983), the Discrimination Model (Bernard, 1979), and the Systems Approach to Supervision Model (SAS) (Holloway, 1995). Wood and Rayle assert that goal setting is a critical component for effective supervision of SCITs. Eight goal areas are outlined in the model including: leadership, advocacy, collaboration, assessment and use of data, system support, individual planning, guidance curriculum, and responsive services. Supervisor functions that are described in the model include: monitoring/evaluating, instructing/advising, supporting/sharing, modeling, and consulting. Additionally the model ascribes five primary roles for the school counselor supervisor that include evaluator, adviser, coordinator, teacher, and mentor. The GRFS model considers each of the aforementioned goals, roles, and functions as they are enacted within the context of the systems found in the school setting, namely interactions with parents, students, teachers, and administrators. The GRFS is another example of a promising school counselor supervision model which takes into consideration the school context. The GRFS goes beyond Luke and Bernard's (2006) SCSM in its attention to ASCA model components. The GRFS lacks, as mentioned in regards to the SCSM, a means to monitor
supervisee developmental growth as well as a management tool such as the PSCSM supervision log.

*Developmental Stage Model*

Protivnak (2003) presented a school counselor supervision model that offers various supervision modalities linked to the four developmental stages proposed by Littrell, Lee-Borden, and Lorenz (1979): dependent, pseudo-dependent, interdependence, and independence. Protivnak asserts that most interns will function in the dependent stage which is characterized by feelings of anxiety and reliance on supervisor directives (Stoltenberg, 1981). Protivnak recommends that supervisors utilize a structured approach in this stage, providing concrete feedback and focusing on skill development. In the pseudo-dependent stage, counselors wish for more independence while still needing and wanting supervisor direction. Protivnak recommends the Northside Independent School District (NISD) Model (Henderson & Lampe, 1992) as beneficial for this second stage as it provides a highly structured supervision format including: pre-observation, observation, data analysis, post-observation, and analysis of post-observation. The interdependence stage is characterized by counselors who wish to work consultatively and equally with others. Protivnak recommends peer group supervision as appropriate for this stage. In the final stage, independence, counselors are self-sufficient and autonomous and Protivnak recommends continued peer supervision, self-supervision, or continuing education. Protivnak's work is laudable in its attention to the developmental stages of counselor growth, however it lacks a clear and effective means of monitoring the many roles and functions of school counselors in the unique school setting. Also lacking is a link to the
ASCA National Model’s current recommendations for school counselor focus including, leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change. The PSCSM, through inclusion of the four delivery systems (responsive services, individual planning, guidance curriculum, and system support), the ASCA themes (leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change), and use of the supervision log addresses each of these factors.

Prior to this special edition, only a few school counselor supervision models existed (Henderson & Lampe, 1992; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; O’Byrne & Rosenberg, 1998). Alternative supervision modalities have been presented including peer supervision models (Agnew et al., 2000; Benshoff & Paisley, 1996; Crutchfield & Borders, 1997) and group supervision models (Crutchfield, Price, et al., 1997). Clearly school counselor specific supervision is a new field of inquiry with room for the growth and development of existing and new models.

**Developmental Supervision Models**

Because school counselors are involved in a number of varied tasks and duties, a supervision model is called for that is “clear, concise, practical, and provides concrete direction regarding their roles and the supervision process” (Nelson & Johnson, 1999, p. 91). It has been suggested that a model based on developmental principles is a suitable choice for the school setting (Kaufman & Schwartz, 2003; Magnuson et al., 2001; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Stoltenberg et al., 1998; Studer, 2005). Developmental models are based on a principle of emergent stages in supervisees’ continuous professional growth, coupled with commensurate supervision methods applied by discerning supervisors to match these developmental stages. Developmental models have been recommended for
use as an overarching framework highlighting on-going individual skill development (Borders, 2005; Kaufman & Schwartz, 2003).

Developmental models have the potential to address the dilemma noted earlier of supervisors misjudging or not responding appropriately to supervisees’ changing needs (Barrett & Barber, 2005). Supervisees have different supervisory expectations depending on their developmental level (Goodyear & Bernard, 1998). Beginning level counselors prefer a supervisor-teacher who offers more support and structure, intermediate level counselors desire a supervisor-counselor who addresses self-awareness and personal relationship dynamics, and advanced counselors are more interested in a supervisor-consultant who is more collegial (Borders & Brown, 2005; Borders & Usher, 1992; Shechtman & Wirzberger, 1999; Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Crethar, 1994). Developmental supervision models provide supervisors with a structure to match their supervisory practices with the developmental level of supervisees.

In a 5-year review of literature from 1999-2004, Borders (2005) found only two empirical investigations of developmental models. Although general support for the basic tenets of a developmental framework were found, the accurate measurement of supervisee developmental levels, and the complexities of matching the supervisee’s developmental level to the appropriate supervisory approach both presented challenges. Others have also contributed to the literature base giving credence to the basic tenets of developmental models (Stoltenberg et al., 1994; Worthington, 1987); however, most of the research has focused on early stages of development occurring during training and internship.

The Integrated Developmental Model (IDM), based on 10 years of research, has been described as well-conceived and “one of the most useful developmental models”
(Haynes et al., 2003). The IDM was developed by Stoltenberg et al. (1998) and the most current version describes four levels of supervisee development each of which defines levels of supervisee autonomy, motivation, and self- and other awareness. Also included in the IDM are eight specific domains of practice, including intervention skills competencies, assessment techniques, interpersonal assessment, client conceptualization, individual differences, theoretical orientation, treatment plans and goals, and professional ethics. Supervisors tailor their supervisory practices to the developmental level and specific activity presented by the trainee. Although this model is seen as useful and well-conceived, and while its basic principles are compatible and appropriate for the supervision of school counselors, there are some inherent limitations to its use in the school setting. Specifically, the eight domains identified do not take into account the varied roles and functions of the school counselor. The PSCSM is adapted from the IDM and, in a revision of the eight original domains, offers a developmental model that corresponds more effectively with the world of school counseling.

The Role of Counselor Educators in School Counselor Supervision

School counselor preparation programs play a critical role in facilitating a successful internship experience for SCIT. CACREP offers some guidelines to this end by requiring that such programs offer “orientation, assistance, consultation, and professional development opportunities” (CACREP, 2009, Standard III.D., p. 15). Specifics about these offerings are not spelled out, and since many school counseling programs are not CACREP-accredited, internship experiences for those students are determined by state regulations or individual school counselor education programs
(Holloway, 1995). In fact, studies evaluating expectations for students in school counseling internships reveal that there are numerous discrepancies in on-site internship requirements with no or very few required activities (Akos & Scarborough, 2004: Stickel, as cited in Akos & Scarborough, 2004). Studer (2005) calls for a common set of supervisory expectations for trainee experiences and refers to the lack of such as one of two “carefully guarded professional secrets” (p. 353), the second secret being the lack of supervision training that site supervisors receive.

Counselor educators are placed in a challenging situation with no discernable normative training experience in place for SCIT. It becomes an ethical responsibility for program supervisors and counselor educators to search for internship sites which provide optimal learning experiences for SCIT, including qualified supervisors and transformed sites which model a comprehensive developmental school counseling program (Hoffman, 2001; Magnuson et al., 2001; Studer, 2005). The difficulty of this task becomes compounded when school counseling programs can vary in form depending on the state, district, or school (Herr, 2002; House & Hayes, 2002).

Perhaps of greater concern, however, is the fact that 4 years after ASCA’s presentation of the National Standards for School Counseling, which were meant to provide a model for consistent practice nationwide, a study by Perusse et al. (2001) found that these same standards were not used in any consistent fashion in school counselor preparation programs. This fact was corroborated by Akos and Scarborough (2004) who examined internship syllabi from 59 school counseling programs and found that clinical training reflected little in the way of current national guidelines such as Comprehensive Developmental Guidance Programs (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000), ASCA National
Standards (Campbell & Dahir, 1997), ASCA National Model (2005), or Transforming School Counseling Initiative (Education Trust, 2002). The question is then raised, if school counselor preparation programs are not promoting current practice recommendations, how likely is it that counselor educator program supervisors will endeavor to locate internship sites that are also abreast of best practice in the school counseling field?

Several recommendations for counselor education programs and the improvement of internship experiences for SCIT are found in the literature. In regard to counselor educator practices in general, McMahon, Mason, and Paisley (2009) recommend that school counselor educators embrace the “new vision” approach in their own practices, modeling for their students appropriate leadership behaviors in the areas of systemic change, advocacy, collaboration, and the use of data. In regard to internship experiences, Peterson and Deuschle (2006) recommend that campus supervisors provide site supervisors with clear expectations, guidelines, support, and structure, including specific suggestions for their weekly supervision meetings with SCIT, thus reducing site supervisor anxiety. Additionally, counselor educators are urged to provide site supervisors with training in supervisory practices as well as in the critical elements necessary to provide a comprehensive developmental school counseling program model (Jackson et al., 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001; Miller & Dollarhide, 2006; Peterson & Deuschle, 2006; Roberts et al., 2001). Several authors advocate for a blending of supervision from program supervisors and site supervisors (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; Brott & Myers, 1999). Additionally, better communication between the internship site and the university program is recommended, as is a written contract signed by the site
supervisor, intern, campus supervisor, and the principal, which defines required and recommended experiences (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; Brott & Myers, 1999; Jackson et al., 2002; Studer, 2005).

Use of school specific supervision models such as the PSCSM could go a long way in providing supervisory guidelines and expectations for internship experiences, with the possibility of ensuring more uniform practices. Use of such a model could alleviate anxiety for both counselor educators and site supervisors as it could provide a mutual understanding of what constitutes required and recommended internship experiences. Additionally, counselor educators could become more knowledgeable of supervisees’ internship experiences if supervisees were required to turn in their logs to their university supervisors.

Rationale for Use of ASCA National Model in a School Counselor Supervision Model

As the principal national organization for professional school counselors, ASCA has provided many supports to the profession, including the ASCA Standards (Campbell & Dahir, 1997), the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2005), and the ASCA School Counselor Competencies (2008). The ASCA Model was developed to “provide a framework for the program components, the school counselor’s role in implementation, and the underlying philosophies of leadership, advocacy, and systemic change” (ASCA, 2005, p. 9). Professional school counselors are urged to rely on ASCA’s direction to effectively manage their school counseling programs and to properly train SCIT in current best practices (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007).
In particular, the ASCA Model and the ASCA Standards have been recommended as structures for the supervision of SCIT (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Perusse et al., 2001). As noted earlier, supervision models that incorporate the ASCA model or ASCA Standards have been few and, in fact, nonexistent until very recently (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Studer & Oberman, 2006; Wood & Rayle, 2006). Additionally, on-site school counselor supervisors are in need of training in the ASCA National Model as they supervise SCIT who may well begin their internship experience with more knowledge of the model than their site supervisors (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Studer & Oberman, 2006). Additionally, use of the ASCA model in supervision practices could facilitate program transformation for on-site supervisors, a distinct benefit to the profession (Miller & Dollarhide, 2006; Studer, 2005).

The basic structure of the ASCA National Model includes four major components: Foundation, Delivery System, Management System, and Accountability coupled with four overarching themes: leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change (ASCA, 2005). Several authors have made initial attempts to outline supervisory practices which address some of these eight elements of the ASCA National Model (Jackson et al., 2002; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Studer, 2005; Wood & Rayle, 2006). The literature supports the importance of these components and the overarching themes to the successful implementation of a transformed school counseling program and each has a place in the development of an effective internship experience. SCIT could develop a portfolio in which to keep samples and examples of these ASCA Model components and the overarching themes.
The Foundation component of the model provides the groundwork for the school counseling program, delineating the beliefs, philosophies, assumptions and vision of the primary stakeholders, and a listing of student competencies. School counselors are encouraged to develop school counseling mission statements that are consistent with the school’s mission statement and that incorporate the ASCA Standards and ASCA Model, thereby making themselves essential players in the school reform process (House & Hayes, 2002; Perusse et al., 2001). House and Hayes state, “In fact, if school counselors do not relate their work and programs to the mission of schools and document success, they are at risk of extinction” (p. 255). It has also been suggested that for successful induction into the school counseling profession, visioning and community building skills need to be incorporated into the internship experience (Jackson et al., 2002). Suggestions for integrating the Foundation component from the ASCA Model into the internship experience include requiring interns to write a school counseling mission statement and role statement, analyze the current school counselor mission statement, and integrate the ASCA standards with the on-site school’s student competencies (Murphy & Kafflenberger, 2007; Studer, 2005). These efforts could be included in the intern’s portfolio.

The Delivery System component of the ASCA Model includes the four activities that school counselors are involved in when implementing a comprehensive school counseling program. As has been stated earlier, traditional supervision models fail to take into account the fact that school counselors are involved in a broader range of activities than counselors in other settings including, Individual Student Planning, School Guidance Curriculum, Responsive Services, and System Support. CACREP standards (CACREP,
2009) require that SCITs involve themselves in all aspects of school counseling during their internship experience. Consequently, in order to have a successful internship experience, it is imperative, first, that they have opportunities to participate in each of the four types of activities noted above, and second, that a broad supervision model be employed which can facilitate mentorship of interns in each.

The Management System component of the ASCA Model addresses the when and why of program implementation and includes calendars, action plans, management agreements, advisory councils, and the use of data for systemic change. In this component of the model, school counselors use disaggregated data to reveal equity and access issues. It has been suggested that on-site supervisors teach aspects of this component through example; however, interns can be asked to look for evidence of elements of the Management System at their sites (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007). Interns can also investigate ways to use data to substantiate the need for a particular service (group counseling, or a particular classroom guidance lesson, for example) or to determine the effectiveness of a particular intervention they employed.

The Accountability System component provides information on the effects of the school counseling program on students and includes results reports, school counselor performance standards and a program audit (ASCA, 2005). The data that have been collected in the Management System are used to determine program improvement and prepared for dissemination, thereby substantiating continuous enhancement of the program and ensuring that this information is communicated to all stakeholders. The importance of conducting school counselor and program accountability practices has been clearly stated in the professional literature over the past several decades (Borders, 2002;
Brown & Trusty, 2005; Dahir & Stone, 2003; Erford, 2007; Gysbers & Henderson, 1994; Myrick, 2003; Sink, 2009; Stone & Dahir, 2007). Interns need to be aware and look for evidence of accountability practices at their site. They can also evaluate their own progress in relation to the School Counselor Performance Standards.

The four themes delineated in the ASCA National Model (Leadership, Advocacy, Collaboration, and Systemic Change) were aptly selected by ASCA as each of these skills has been addressed in current school counseling literature. They have also been included in the latest edition of the CACREP (2009) standards for school counseling preparation programs as well as in the ASCA (2008) school counselor standards and competencies. Several authors recommend written plans or contracts for SCIT which include a description of how the intern will be involved in using each of these skills (Jackson et al., 2002; Studer, 2005; Wood & Rayle, 2006). In order to be properly trained to enter the school counseling profession prepared and equipped to provide a transformed program, interns need to observe these skills in action and to have personal opportunities for involvement, even if it is in a limited manner.

The primary thrust of a school counselor’s Leadership role, as described in the ASCA National Model (2005), is to engage in system wide change to promote academic success for all students by “closing the existing achievement gap whenever found among students of color, poor students or underachieving students, and their more advantaged peers” (p. 24). Increasingly and in a variety of ways, school counselors are urged in the professional literature to become leaders in their schools (Dollarhide, Gibson, & Saginak, 2008; Erford, 2007; House & Hayes, 2002; House & Martin, 1998; Mason & McMahon, 2009; Paisley & McMahon, 2001). In fact, McMahon et al. (2009) claim that leadership is
a foundational skill that is a prerequisite for employing other important skills such as advocacy or using data as a systemic change agent. Leadership venues suggested in the literature include program managers, human resource leaders, political leaders, and, most emphatically, systemic change agents who are full participants in school reform effort, working for the academic success of all students (Adelman & Taylor, 2002; Dollarhide, 2003; House & Hayes, 2002). Dollarhide and Saginak (2008) suggest that school counselors must exhibit leadership skills in a variety of ways, including demonstrating effective implementation of their program as they stay current in their counseling skills, innovative new school counseling program components, student issues, and new approaches to teaching and learning. Other skills include positively influencing students, families, and colleagues by being available, encouraging, and able to empower others; being able to politically influence, for the benefit of students, those who have formal and informal positions of power; and becoming a symbolic leader representing mental health, the counseling profession, and the welfare of the students. When school counselors choose not to take on a leadership role, resulting in programs that are poorly thought out and administered, they lose the support and confidence of their teachers and administrators (O’Dell, Rak, Chermonte, Hamlin, & Waina, 1996). Interns need to observe and practice good leadership skills during their internship experience. More to the point, they need to be mentored by their supervisors in the development of leadership skills in the school setting.

The ASCA National Model (2005) describes the Advocacy role of the school counselor as one in which school counselors actively work to remove systemic barriers through the effective use of data. They must also ensure that all students have access to a
rigorous curriculum to adequately prepare them for a broad range of worthwhile post secondary options. The call for school counselors to be advocates is well documented in the literature and there is wide agreement for the inclusion of this role in school counselors’ repertoires (Akos & Galassi, 2004; Education Trust, 1997; Lee, 2001; Lee & Walz, 1998; Trusty & Brown, 2005).

It has been pointed out by several authors that although advocacy has been highlighted as an important role for school counselors, neither ASCA nor the literature have articulated clearly how to effectively accomplish advocacy goals (Colbert, Perusse, Bouknight, & Ballard, 2006; Trusty & Brown 2005). In response to this paucity of direction, Trusty and Brown have developed a comprehensive structure for the conceptualization and development of advocacy competencies specific to the school counselor, including the development of dispositions, knowledge, and skills. Trusty and Brown then follow up with a step-by-step model of the advocacy process which includes: develop advocacy dispositions, develop advocacy relationships and advocacy knowledge, define the advocacy problem, develop action plans, implement action plans, make an evaluation, and celebrate and regroup.

Akos and Galassi (2004) also propose a strengths-based approach to advocacy, asserting that school counselors should not only advocate against inequitable school policies but should also identify characteristics of resilient minority students and promote these individual and system assets. House and Hayes (2002) emphasize the need for school counselors to advocate for impoverished students and students of color as these students have a greater need for advocates and mentors than do their more advantaged peers. Bemak and Chung (2008) warn that advocacy efforts are thwarted by a
phenomenon called the "nice counselor syndrome." The nice counselor syndrome occurs when school counselors value their reputations for promoting harmony and being mediators more than they value the hard work of multicultural/social justice advocacy, which is likely to create conflicts with colleagues. Bemak and Chung offer recommendations for moving beyond this syndrome, including (1) aligning multicultural/social justice advocacy with school mission and goals, (2) use of data driven strategies, (3) refusal to take negative reactions personally, and (4) taking risks, to name a few. As with the leadership role, interns will benefit from observing advocacy in action and having the opportunity to practice these skills as part of their internship experiences.

According to the ASCA National Model (2005), the theme of Collaboration refers to school counselors not only working mutually with all stakeholders in and out of the school setting, but ASCA also encourages school counselors to be leaders who facilitate the collaboration between all school staff, parents, students and community members to promote the good of all students. The call for school counselors to work collaboratively with all stakeholders is clearly evident in the literature (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Galassi & Akos, 2004; Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; House & Hayes, 2002; Jackson et al., 2002; Wood & Rayle, 2006). Because school counselors are dealing with a variety of increasingly complex issues that students bring to the table, it is imperative that intervention techniques also become more comprehensive, necessitating strong school-community partnerships. School counselor participation in these endeavors has been strongly promoted in the professional literature (Bemak, 2000; Bryant & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Porter, Epp, & Bryant, 2000; Taylor & Adelman, 2000). It has been suggested that school counselors must work collaboratively within the school, with
outside community agencies and with families (Bemak, 2000). Interns will benefit greatly from learning through observation and practical experience how to collaborate effectively in all three of these areas.

The final theme in the ASCA National Model (2005), Systemic Change, refers to school reform efforts whereby stakeholders collaboratively examine data and make changes to school policies and procedures in order to eliminate barriers to success for all students. School counselors are encouraged to become leaders in these efforts. According to Dollarhide and Saginak (2008), systemic change is the culmination of school counselor leadership, advocacy, and collaboration efforts and is visible when these efforts begin to bear fruit. Dimmitt, Cary, and Hatch (2007) recommend that school counselors become either active participants or leaders of school improvement efforts that employ a data-based decision-making model. Several models specific to school counseling programs are noted in the literature (Dahir & Stone, 2003; Isaacs, 2003). When interns have opportunities to define problems, set goals, and target interventions to make systemic changes in the school environment that positively affect student success, they have become systemic change agents.

Wood and Rayle (2006) suggest that interns could be involved in activities that combine multiple goal areas. For example, an intern may conduct a needs assessment, present the resulting data to staff with recommendations for intervention options, collaborate with staff, and with their approval and support, provide the intervention suggested. This activity would help an intern develop skills in leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and as systemic change agents.
The PSCSM is an attempt to incorporate the ASCA National Model into a supervision model pertinent to the school setting. Although the model does not reflect all aspects of the ASCA model, as knowledge of some parts of the model may be more appropriately and efficiently learned in the university setting, the intent was to incorporate all facets that could be "experienced" in the on-site training. As discussed earlier, the ASCA National Model's four components (Foundation, Delivery System, Management System, and Accountability) and four overarching themes (leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change) are well represented and supported in the professional literature. Consequently, it would make sense that these elements should be represented in school counselor supervision models.

Origins of the PSCSM

The PSCSM is a revision of the Professional School Counselor Developmental Model (PSCDM) originally designed by Bultsma, Hedstrom, Hedstrom, and Parfit (2006) and described by Bultsma, Parfit, et al. (2006). The PSCDM was adapted from the Integrated Developmental Model (IDM) designed by Stoltenberg, McNeill, and Delworth (1998) and incorporates the use of a supervision log to facilitate the organization and structure of the supervisory experiences. Although IDM has been found to be useful for supervision in the clinical setting, its sole focus on clinical behaviors has limited its use for the supervision of school counselors.

Prior use of the PSCDM by the researcher on three separate occasions served to inform the present study and the development of the supervision model (PSCSM) which was used in this study. These include a pilot study conducted as part of the researcher's
doctoral studies, an ongoing research project in which supervisor/supervisee pairs used the model for a 10-week period, and finally, the researcher, who worked as an elementary school counselor, used the model to supervise an intern. This final example was written up as a professional work sample for a comprehensive exam in partial fulfillment of the researcher’s doctoral program requirements (Glaes, 2007; see Appendix A for an overview and summary of this experience).

Although the PSCDM incorporates certain aspects of the ASCA National Model in its framework, it is this researcher’s opinion that the PSCDM could be enhanced through the incorporation of several other of the ASCA National Model components. With this in mind, the PSCDM has been expanded to include several more elements found in the ASCA National Model.

Reflectivity in the Supervision Process

The benefits of reflection to one’s professional development have been noted in the training and supervision of teachers, occupational therapists and businesspeople (Neufeldt, Kamo, & Nelson, 1996). In the fields of psychology and counseling, these same benefits have also been observed (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993; Shapiro & Reiff, 1993; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992). Neufeldt et al. (1996), in an attempt to form an integrated theory of reflectivity occurring in clinical supervision experiences, posit that the reflective process is a search for understanding of the counseling experience and that the reflective supervisee uses active inquiry, openness, vulnerability, and risk taking, as opposed to defensiveness and self-protection to foster their professional growth as counselors. The authors recommend that supervisors provide a safe environment where,
instead of offering readymade answers to a counseling impasse, they model reflectivity and encourage supervisee openness, vulnerability, and personal reflection.

Skovholt and Ronnestad (1992) found that one major method of counselor professional development across all stages was continuous professional reflection. Included in this process were three essential elements, including intense professional and personal experiences; an open and supportive work environment that values the open searching process as opposed to the promotion of narrow, fixed views; and opportunities for a reflective stance, which includes time and energy spent processing, both alone and with others, these intense experiences. Use of reflective experiences has also been suggested for supervision in the school environment (Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Studer, 2005), including the use of opportunities for both oral and written self-reflection (Peterson, Goodman, Keller, & McCauley, 2004).

One of the most unique aspects of the PSCSM and corresponding log is the opportunity that it provides for supervisee self-reflection. As supervisees complete their logs prior to the supervision session, they are prompted to record their thoughts regarding their strengths, weaknesses, concerns, and questions related to their weekly internship experiences. They also evaluate where they believe their level of performance would fall on a developmental scale. Consequently, they come to their supervision sessions having already done some of the difficult work of processing their experiences. This has the potential to facilitate the supervision process in a number of ways. First, pairs do not have to spend time trying to recall situations that had occurred over the week. The supervisees’ preparatory work allows them to focus only on what are the most pertinent issues, questions, and concerns. Additionally, supervisees will have thought about their strengths
and recorded them, giving supervisors an opportunity to recognize and comment on positive aspects of the supervisees’ growth. Supervisees will also have conducted some self-evaluation in each of their activities, giving supervisors important information on how supervisees see themselves, as well as an opportunity to focus more comfortably on areas in need of improvement. If supervisees’ self-evaluations seem inaccurate, the supervisor becomes aware of this fact and can gently address areas that may be in need of improvement. Finally, the log may provide a vehicle for discussing situations and circumstances that could be uncomfortable for supervisees including multicultural issues, inter- and intrapersonal issues, and ethical issues.

Multicultural Competence and Supervision

As schools are becoming increasingly more diverse, school counselors are urged to become multiculturally competent as they facilitate the development of a widely diverse student body (Peace, 2000; Pedersen & Carey, 1994). School counselors must be culturally sensitive, exhibiting respect for a diversity of cultures in the school setting, and should be able to facilitate the professional development of school staff members in culturally competent relationship building (Akos & Galassi, 2004; Lee, 2001). In the supervisory relationship, the cultural beliefs of supervisors and supervisees influence all facets of the internship experience (Helms & Cook, 1999) and it is the supervisors’ responsibility to determine if supervisees are culturally competent counselors (Murphy & Kaffenger, 2007). When multicultural issues are addressed in supervision sessions, it can result in increased awareness, knowledge, confidence, multicultural sensitivity, and
efficacy in dealing with multicultural issues (Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, & Pope-Davis, 2004).

As noted earlier, the PSCSM and log provide a structure which requires that supervisors and supervisees address multicultural issues. Each week supervisees have the opportunity to reflect and respond to multicultural issues with which they are dealing. This opens the door for supervisors to assess supervisees' multicultural competence and to address multicultural differences within the supervisory relationship.

Summary

In conclusion, this chapter has explored many topics pertinent to school counseling supervision, including: a historical perspective of school counseling as a profession, the current state of affairs regarding the supervision of school counselors and school counselor interns, an overview of supervision and effective models and practices, a review of current school-based and developmental supervision models, the role of the counselor educator in the supervision of SCIT, use of the ASCA National Model in school counselor supervision, use of reflectivity in supervision practices, and multicultural competence in supervision practices. The PSCSM to be applied in this study is offered as a comprehensive school counseling supervision model that draws on the ASCA model and holds potential advantages over existing school counseling supervision models. The next chapter examines the methodological approach and procedures which were employed in this study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter includes a description of and rationale for the use of a qualitative methodological study approach which is phenomenological in nature. The population is described, followed by a description of the data gathering and data analysis procedures. Trustworthiness and ethical considerations of the research design are also examined. Finally, the researcher provides a personal summary of her school counseling, supervision and academic training experiences, and a description of what is believed to be the researcher’s personal biases, assumptions, and pre-conceptions related to the study material.

Overall Approach and Rationale

A qualitative research approach, which is descriptive and seeks to understand the lived experiences of study participants in their natural settings (Marshall & Rossman, 2006), seemed to the researcher to be the most methodologically appropriate for the present study. Qualitative inquiry has been a historic presence in the counseling field, helping to advance theory and practice (Ponterotto, Kuriakose, & Granavskaya, 2008). In a broad review of literature these authors found that qualitative research has made substantial contributions to the advancement of the counseling field in a variety of ways including: providing an in-depth understanding of the intense emotional and cognitive
experiences of varying populations, giving a voice to oppressed peoples, offering insight into critical events occurring within and between therapy sessions, influencing the training motivation and career self-efficacy of counselors-in-training through attention to the personal world of helping professionals, and enhancing the credibility of the profession through a “user-friendly” approach affecting a broad audience.

Qualitative research methods, according to Patton (1990), generally share three basic assumptions. The first is a holistic view which seeks to form a complete understanding of a phenomenon in its entirety. The second assumption of qualitative research is that it is an inductive approach which requires researchers to minimize presuppositions related to the phenomenon being studied, moving towards the development of patterns and themes as the data is analyzed. Lastly, qualitative research uses naturalistic inquiry in that the intent is to understand phenomena as it occurs in the natural context. The present study fits most comfortably in the qualitative method for a variety of reasons. A holistic and naturalistic view was applied as the researcher sought to discover and understand the phenomenon of a particular supervision process in the natural school setting. This study also employed an inductive approach as the researcher sought to limit presuppositions as the study began and allow themes, patterns, and subsequent conclusions to arise through immersion in the data.

The qualitative research model that was applied in this study is phenomenological in nature. When using a phenomenological approach, researchers explore and capture how study participants experience and make sense of a phenomenon in their lived experience. Additionally, this approach requires a carefully and thoroughly executed collection and description of the data (Patton, 2002; Rossman & Rallis, 2003; Schram,
The goal of this type of research is to understand on a deeper level the essence of the lived experience of the individual (Lichtman, 2006; Schram, 2006). In this study, the researcher, through several in-depth interviews and analyses of the supervisees’ logs, attempted to get at the essence of the supervision experience as participants employed the PSCSM and log.

The researcher also operated from a constructionist perspective, which holds that reality is socially constructed through the meaning that individuals make of phenomena by social interaction with others (Cresswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). In this study, supervisors and supervisees at times had different experiences and perceptions of the supervisory experience being studied. These various perspectives were captured through the interview process and the voices of both are represented in the data analysis and reporting. Additionally, supervisors and supervisees collaborated with the researcher to co-construct meaning from the data as together they explored their understanding of their supervision experiences using the PSCSM and log. Study participants were encouraged to share their perspectives on how to make the model and log more effective for the practice and delivery of supervision in the school setting.

Participants

Potential participants for the study were identified as a convenience sample of professional school counselors and school counseling interns who were recruited through contacts at Western Michigan University, Grand Valley State University, and Spring Arbor University, all in Michigan. The final group of interns who participated in the study came from the first two universities, two from one of the universities and three from the
other. Tables summarizing information regarding participant demographics may be found in Appendix L.

Study participants were invited to participate by the following means. First, the researcher obtained permission from counselor educators at the various universities to visit group supervision classes to introduce the study. Secondly, the researcher obtained contact information for site supervisors and interns from the counselor education departments at the three universities. From this contact information the researcher could also email the study information and invitation to participate to groups of students. Interns were invited to participate in the study first. Interns who expressed interest gave the researcher permission to contact their site supervisors. In an attempt to obtain participants, the researcher met with nine groups of students during their university supervision groups. Four more groups of students were sent emails with study information and an invitation to participate. All of the supervisors that were contacted agreed to participate in the study except for one. Six supervisor/supervisee pairs were selected, one from the elementary, two from the middle school, and three from the high school level. As noted in Chapter I, although there were six pairs that participated in the study, there were actually 11 individuals since one of the interns agreed to participate at two of her internship sites (elementary and high school), with a different supervisor at each site. Inclusion of this pair allowed the researcher to obtain some, albeit limited, information from the elementary level. Study participants were required to use the model for a 6-week period of time at the same site. In appreciation for participation, and as an aid to understanding the ASCA National Model during the study, each supervisor/
supervisee pair received one copy of the ASCA National Model manual (2005). Supervisees were also provided with the blank logs needed to participate in the study.

Data Gathering Procedures

Each supervisor/supervisee pair was asked to participate in the following activities: (1) an initial 30- to 60-minute meeting during which participants completed a demographic form (Appendices D and E) and received training in the use of the model and log (Appendix F); participants received copies of the model (Appendix B), log (Appendix C), and an explanatory handout of the 12 PSCDM model domains (Appendix G); (2) a brief phone contact with the researcher after approximately 2 weeks of use of the model and log to ensure accurate understanding of and compliance with the model framework (see Appendix H); (3) a 30- to 60-minute individual interview (separately with each supervisor and supervisee) with the researcher after a minimum of 6 weeks of use of the model and log (see Appendix I); (4) a 30- to 60-minute combined interview with supervisor and supervisee after the individual interview had been conducted (occurring on the same day as the individual interview for the convenience of the study participants) (see Appendix J); and (5) a possible follow-up contact for clarification of findings if deemed necessary.

All interviews were face-to-face and took place either in the school counselor supervisor’s office or in an available space found in the school building. Individual interviews ranged from 30 minutes to 60 minutes with an average length of 40 minutes. Conjoint interviews were shorter as they consisted of a summary of what had been shared
in each individual interview and any additional input from participants. Conjoint
interviews ranged from 15 minutes to 40 minutes with an average length of 25 minutes.

When reviewing various timing issues in the study, each pair seemed unique in
some way. Several of the participants did not begin to use the model and log immediately
following their training session. For two of the interns, they did not begin to use the
model and log for approximately 3 to 6 weeks after the training. The reasons for this
delay vary and are described more fully in the within-case summaries in Chapter IV. The
timing for the final individual and conjoint interviews also varied across participants.
These interviews occurred from 10 to 16 weeks after the initial training session. In some
cases this occurred because, as noted above, the participants did not begin use of the
model and log immediately after the training. Other reasons included weather
cancellations, scheduling difficulties and 1- and 2-week holiday breaks. One of the pairs
continued using the log for a 9-week period because of the benefits they felt they were
receiving.

Data were collected from the individual interviews conducted separately with each
supervisor and supervisee and from the conjoint interviews which included the supervisor
and supervisee pair (number 3 and 4 above). Each of these interviews was audiotaped and
transcribed and took place in the school setting where the supervisor/supervisee pair was
working. Interview guides were utilized which included a general set of questions (see
Appendices I and J). The uses of such guides are helpful in ensuring some uniformity in
lines of inquiry for each interview while allowing the researcher the freedom to explore
particular topics in a spontaneous, conversational manner (Patton, 2002). Conjoint
interviews were conducted on the same day as the individual interviews. The researcher
allowed for personal reflection time between each of the interviews to write brief notes on her thoughts and questions. These notes were then included in analytic memos (described below) written as soon as possible following the interviews.

Although the content of the interviews was the main data source for this study, the supervisees’ logs also offered a rich source of information adding meaning to the supervisory experience. For example, the log provided a place for supervisees to note their questions, concerns, areas of personal strengths and weaknesses, and feedback received from their supervisors during supervision sessions. Use of more than one data source will provide data triangulation which serves to strengthen the study as the secondary source serves to support and elucidate the research findings (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The logs served to provide a more in-depth look at the essence of the supervisory experience, especially from supervisees’ perspectives.

Throughout the data collection and analysis stages of the study, the researcher was involved in the process of writing analytic memos. These memos were written personal notes covering “emergent insights, potential themes, methodological questions, and links between themes and theoretical notions” (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 291). The researcher used the analytic memos to record general thoughts, questions, and insights after each contact with study participants. This personal writing process helped the researcher to elucidate contradictions in thinking, make connections, and obtain a written record of her own thinking process throughout the study.
Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis procedures for this study followed seven phases (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Rossman & Rallis, 2003) including: (1) organizing the data, (2) immersion in the data, (3) coding the data, (4) generating categories and themes, (5) interpretation of the data, (6) searching for alternative understandings, and (7) writing the report. These procedures are typical for general qualitative methodology and are described below. As data were being analyzed and coded, within-case analysis (individual supervision pairs) preceded cross-case analysis (across pairs). This procedure allowed the researcher to obtain an initial gestalt of each pair before formally comparing the pairs to one another.

1. Organizing the data: Data, in this phase, were logged according to dates, names, times, and places. In this way the researcher attempted to make the data feel more manageable. The interviews were also transcribed by the researcher in this step. As materials were collected for each pair, they were stored in file folders which were labeled with the pair’s assigned number. These files were then placed in a locked file cabinet. All identifying information was kept in a separate location.

2. Immersion in the data: Numerous readings of the data are important at this stage of data analysis as the researcher develops an intimate familiarity with the information. The initial focus began with a within-case analysis of each supervisor-supervisee pair and then moved to cross-case analysis of all pairs. As the transcriber of the interviews, the researcher had already begun to
develop an intimate familiarity with the data in the previous step. In this stage, the researcher read through each interview twice, and began to develop a list of possible codes. Analytic memos and participant logs were read and analyzed, after which the researcher wrote a comprehensive summary of each pair. Each summary included the following: demographics of the participants, information on the setting, a summary of the analytic memos, a summary of the interview transcription for the supervisor and the supervisee, an analysis of the supervisee’s logs, and the researcher’s overall impression of the supervision experience for the pair. The analysis of the log included noting how many weeks of logs were filled out, how thorough or in-depth the content was, how much of the log was actually filled out, whether the activities had been recorded in the appropriate boxes as covered in the initial training session, whether the intern noted strengths as well as weaknesses, how the intern rated him or herself on the developmental levels, the types of questions asked by the intern, and the presence and content of the information recorded in the “Understandings from Supervision” box. The researcher also noted in the analysis of the log whether the findings from the log seemed to corroborate the information that participants shared in their individual and conjoint interviews.

3. Coding the data: In this phase the researcher applied a coding scheme that had resulted from the previous step as the data were searched for the presence of categories and themes. Each interview transcription was read again. In this reading, the researcher highlighted and labeled sections of the interview which
could possibly correlate to a theme. The coding scheme continued to be refined as the interview transcript data were analyzed.

4. Refining final categories and themes: The researcher identified significant patterns and salient themes and recorded these in an analytic memo along with emerging questions and general impressions. The qualitative software program QSR N6 (a version of Nudist) was employed at this stage to bring a sense of order to the emerging categories and themes.

5. Interpretation: In this phase, order was imposed on the findings, conclusions were drawn and inferences were made. The researcher evaluated the usefulness of the data segments in support of the emerging picture of the supervision phenomenon. Previous analytic memos were analyzed for the transformational thinking that had occurred in the researcher’s approach and thought processes regarding all aspects of the study.

6. Searching for alternative understandings: In this phase the researcher evaluated the plausibility of the conclusions that had been drawn by a thorough exploration of the data, critically challenging the themes and looking for negative instances. Also at this stage, the researcher employed a “devil’s advocate” (a colleague, details described below) who reviewed the researcher’s conclusions to that point with the goals of questioning the researcher’s thinking and pointing out alternative perspectives.

7. Writing the report: In this phase, the researcher continued with interpretation of the data as they were reflected upon and summarized for others to read. Chapter IV contains the findings that resulted from the steps above.
Trustworthiness and Ethical Considerations

Trustworthiness refers to the overall integrity of a study and how well it conforms to standards for competent practice and ethical conduct (Rossman & Rallis, 2003; Schram, 2006). Several strategies were utilized to ensure the trustworthiness of this particular study and each is explained below. It is hoped that these precautions will lend credibility to the research findings.

1. Triangulation: In this study, triangulation methods were used to contribute to the verification and validation of the analysis. One method of triangulation included obtaining the perspectives of both the supervisor and supervisee in their use of the model and log. By conducting both individual and conjoint interviews, the researcher was able to hear the voice of both supervisor and supervisee. The researcher also provided a summary of what was said in the individual interviews at the beginning of the conjoint interview, allowing participants the opportunity to correct misunderstandings and misinterpretations on the part of the researcher and to hear how their partner thought and felt about the supervision experience. Another triangulation method involved corroborating the data collected through the in-depth interviews with an analysis of the supervision logs filled out by the supervisees. As described above, an analysis of the logs provided several important pieces of information, including whether the supervisee filled out the logs, whether they were used in the supervisory process, if they were filled out as prescribed in the training, and, finally, if the information on the log
matched statements made in the interview. The data discovered from analysis of the logs served to enhance the interview findings and informed the researcher throughout the data analysis process. Additionally, initial data analysis was conducted with the individual interviews before proceeding with the pair interviews. The analysis of the individual interviews served to enhance the pair interview by revealing varying perspectives and/or inconsistencies.

2. Reflexivity: Reflexivity refers to the process of taking into account the effect of the researcher's presence on the phenomenon being studied (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). In this study, the researcher conscientiously and meticulously recorded all such observations and considerations throughout the study in analytic memos. Possible effects were analyzed and noted in the research findings. Some of these effects included: participants' feeling self-conscious sharing honestly with the researcher who was also a practicing school counselor at the time, and in fact responding in ways to please or impress the researcher; professional school counselors who have had no formal supervision training feeling a sense of inadequacy or incompetence when sharing with a doctoral level school counselor; fear of offending the researcher if participants did not like the model or log, and a subsequent lack of honesty in sharing negative reactions to either. Reflexivity also refers to the process of "critical self-reflection on one's biases, theoretical predispositions, preferences, and so forth" (Schwandt, 2001, p. 224). As a practicing professional school counselor at the time of the study, the researcher needed to
be aware of biases and employ appropriate methods to safeguard the integrity of the research findings. One such method that was employed is described next.

3. Bracketing: The term *bracketing* originated from Husserl (as cited in Schwandt, 2001) and refers to the notion that researchers should set aside or suspend their assumptions in order to concentrate more effectively on the phenomenon being studied. This process, which is a part of phenomenological reduction, is used to discover the true essence of an experience (Lichtman, 2006; Schwandt, 2001). Lichtman asserts that writing down ideas on a topic ahead of time makes explicit the researcher's presuppositions and assumptions. This idea is also expressed by the term *Epoche*, a perspective whereby the researcher uses self-reflection to uncover personal bias related to the subject of study in order to gain clarity and the ability to approach the study from a fresh, open perspective (Moustakas, 1994). In this study, the researcher acknowledges that personal closeness to the phenomenon being studied creates a possibility of bias. These potential biases are described later in this chapter. Through the use of bracketing, said biases continued to be acknowledged explicitly during the data collection and analysis process.

4. Search for alternative understandings and negative instances: In the analysis of the data, the researcher searched for alternative understandings and negative instances. As an aid in this endeavor, the researcher had a colleague, who had been a practicing school counselor in the past and who is currently a school counselor educator, review the findings. His role was to play "devil's
advocate” by challenging the researcher’s interpretations, and by pointing out alternative perspectives and negative instances. The reviewer was given a draft copy of the researcher’s findings (Chapter IV) to read and analyze. After reading the material, he offered some alternative views and understandings in several areas, reframing some of the researcher’s assumptions or analysis of the data. The reviewer identified several areas of concern which provided the researcher an opportunity to reflect upon these issues. The first concern noted was the fact that participants may have responded to the questions more positively than they actually felt because they were seeking researcher approval. Another concern noted, was whether participants spent extra time and effort on the model and log, subsequently finding some value in the exercise, because of the activity itself or because they felt some obligation in being a part of a research study. In other words, if they had not been a part of this study, would they have been as compliant in the use of the model and log?

Finally, the reviewer wondered if some of the noncompliance issues noted with several of the participants could have been related to resistance to the use of this particular model and log. The researcher has incorporated and noted these concerns and other details regarding the presentation of the findings throughout the reports of both the within case analysis and the cross case analysis in Chapter IV.

There are several ethical considerations pertinent to this study. The research project was first approved by Western Michigan University’s Human Subject Institutional Review Board (HSIRB). In this research study, the researcher obtained an informed
consent from each participant (see Appendix K). The informed consent verified that study participants understood all of the following: the length of the study, the specifics of their commitment, the possible risks involved in participation, the total time involved, the possible benefits for involvement in the study, the fact that all information collected was confidential and that participant identity would be protected, the fact that all data would be retained in a locked cabinet and destroyed after a 3-year period following the completion of the study, and, finally, that participants could quit at any time without prejudice or penalty.

There were no foreseen risks or discomforts involved in participation of this study beyond the inconvenience of time as a cost of participation. There were several possible benefits to study participants. The provision of training in and use of a school counselor specific supervision model which is based on the ASCA National Model could have a positive impact on participants’ current and future development as counselors and/or supervisors. In appreciation for participation and as an aid to understanding the ASCA National Model during the study, each supervisor/supervisee pair received one copy of the ASCA National Model manual (2005). The school counseling profession has the potential to benefit from this research in its contribution to a supervision model that is directly applicable to the school setting. Study participants may have found their contribution to this endeavor to be rewarding.

**Personal Experiences With the Phenomenon**

The following sections are written in the first person to more comfortably relay the researcher’s personal information and potential biases. These sections were written
just prior to the researcher conducting the study. At the end of the 2008-2009 school year (in which this study was conducted) the researcher retired from her position as a practicing school counselor and is currently working as a counselor educator. This section highlights the researcher’s frame of mind while conducting the study.

I am an LPC in the state of Michigan where I currently work as an elementary school counselor in a small rural school district. In addition to working as an elementary school counselor for the past 16 years, I have also worked for a brief period of time as a middle school counselor. I currently serve as the Chairperson for our district’s K-12 school counseling department. Prior to my work in school counseling, I taught in various public school settings for 15 years. I am also in my final year of doctoral studies at Western Michigan University and am a member of several professional organizations including: American Counseling Association (ACA), American School Counselors Association (ASCA), Michigan School Counselors Association (MSCA), Chi Sigma Iota (CSI), and the Association of Counseling and Supervision (ACES).

My educational studies for school counseling occurred in the early 1990s, and included no training in supervision and minimal information on Comprehensive School Counseling Programs. My own internship experience occurred in the district in which I was teaching, at an elementary school that had no working school counselor. I was supervised by the district’s middle school counselor as the district had no elementary school counseling program at the time. The principal of the building in which I did my internship had no working knowledge of what counseling in the elementary school should look like and was thankful for any services I could provide to the teachers and students. Subsequent to my internship and during a leave of absence, the district hired me to
develop an elementary school counseling program. Since study of comprehensive school counseling programs was sparse in my master’s program, I took that opportunity to research comprehensive program models and developed the elementary school counseling program based on that design. I was subsequently hired along with two other elementary school counselors and was put in charge of communicating the comprehensive program model to the principals and newly hired elementary counselors, both of whom came from agency settings and were not certified teachers.

My own supervision has consisted solely of principal evaluations which occurred once every 3 years. I have been evaluated by three different principals and all have used the same evaluation tool that was used with teaching staff. Although none of the three principals were knowledgeable regarding the comprehensive school counseling model, all were open to allowing me to function in the roles and responsibilities as laid out in the comprehensive model. It is my belief that this was due in part to the fact that the model had been board adopted at the inception of the district’s elementary school counseling program.

In the ensuing years, I served as a supervisor for five different school counseling interns. I received no instruction from the interns’ university supervisors and was never contacted by university personnel before, during, or after the internship experiences. Interns were required to keep a log of the hours spent on site, but to my knowledge were given no other instruction as to the types of experiences required during their internship. For the supervision of my fifth intern, I utilized the PSCDM to structure our supervisory experiences (see Appendix A for a summary of this experience).
As part of my internship experience in my doctoral studies, I co-supervised a supervision group which included several school counseling interns. Their experiences varied greatly from very effective internship sites and supervisors to very unsatisfactory internship experiences, where interns were given little to no responsibilities and supervisors were ineffective in their mentoring techniques.

Model Development

The PSCSM used in this study was informed by my prior experiences with the Professional School Counselor Developmental Model (PSCDM). The PSCDM was developed by colleagues, including two counselor educators, a school counselor, and a doctoral student. My first experience involved a pilot study conducted as an assignment during my doctoral studies (Bultsma & Glaes, 2005) in which the PSCDM and corresponding log were utilized by three professional school counselors and their interns to structure their supervisory experiences. Three counselors/intern pairs received training in the use of the model and log. After the model was used for a 1-week period, the researchers observed a supervision session and subsequently interviewed each participant separately. Several changes were made to the log after this experience, including the addition of a section for supervisees to record their understandings from supervision sessions. My second personal experience with the PSCDM has been with an ongoing study conducted with four researchers (Bultsma, Glaes, Hedstrom, and Parfit) in which eight supervisor/supervisee pairs received training in the use of the model and log, subsequently using it for a 10-week period, followed by an interview with a researcher. In the third example of the use of the PSCDM, I used the model and log in my elementary...
school work setting as I supervised an intern over a 15-week period. This experience was written up as a professional work sample for a comprehensive exam in partial fulfillment of the researcher’s doctoral program requirements (Glaes, 2007; see Appendix A for an overview and summary of this experience).

Each of the above experiences lent support to further exploration and development of a school counselor specific supervision model. Participants expressed appreciation for the applicability of the model in the context of the school setting. In the reworking of the PSCDM, I took into account several factors noted in the above experiences. First, although the PSCDM included the four components of the ASCA National Model’s Delivery System, it did not include the other three elements (foundation, accountability, and management system), nor did it include the four themes (leadership advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change). Three of the four Counselor Developmental Factors (Multicultural Issues, Ethical/Legal Issues, and Intrapersonal Issues) from the PSCDM log have been incorporated into the new PSCSM log into the various ASCA National Model components (Advocacy, Foundations, and Collaboration, respectively). Additionally, the PSCDM log allowed sufficient space only for the Delivery System Components and not for the additional domains, thus the PSCSM was made larger and space was added for the additional ASCA National Model components.

Personal Biases, Assumptions, and Preconceptions

My experiences in the school counseling field have played a major role in the assumptions, pre-conceptions and biases that I hold. It is important for the integrity of this study to acknowledge these up front and to take care throughout the data collection and
analysis processes to bracket such biases in order to acknowledge them and make them explicit. Following is a list of my assumptions, pre-conceptions, and biases as I recognized them when this study commenced.

1. It is my belief that internship experiences, as a whole, are far too loosely structured and that interns are too frequently left to the whim of supervisors in regards to required activities during internship, as well as the frequency and content of supervision sessions. This belief stems from the freedom I was given as a supervisor myself, from my own internship experience, and from my experience at the university level as a co-supervisor for interns.

2. It is my assumption that interns will come to their internship experience with some working knowledge of the ASCA National Model and of comprehensive school counseling models. This belief is based on my experiences with interns over the last 14 years.

3. I also believe that there are many supervising school counselors who, as was true for me prior to my doctoral studies, have not had supervision training or exposure to current practices in their master’s level coursework. It is my assumption that these school counselors may feel inadequate or resistant to the introduction of new information, especially when they are supposed to be more knowledgeable than their interns and serve in the mentor role.

4. I believe that because school counselors are often the only counselors in their buildings, it is easy for them to lose their professional identity as counselors as they are enmeshed in a teaching and educational milieu. Their colleagues may not understand the training and capabilities that counselors have, or the
counselor's roles and responsibilities in an up-to-date and effective comprehensive school counseling program. This belief stems from my own experiences working solo in my building and from talking and working with my school counseling colleagues. This professional isolation makes it all the more imperative that interns find effective internship sites and supervisors who can train them in how to implement comprehensive programs in the face of little support or understanding.

5. In using the PSCDM, I found it to be extremely helpful in structuring supervision sessions and in ensuring that my intern was involved in a rich and balanced variety of appropriate school counselor activities. I found that use of the log allowed my intern to come to supervision sessions more prepared because she had already reflected on her experiences. She had no trouble recalling the events of the past week and knew what questions she wanted to ask. Supervision sessions were much more in-depth than in previous supervision experiences as the intern had taken the time to think through her strengths and weaknesses. I felt that the model and log allowed the intern to grow professionally more quickly and in a more in-depth manner.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Chapter IV presents the findings from this study regarding participants’ use of the PSCSM, a school counseling specific supervision model. The report of the findings is organized into two sections. The first section provides a summary of each pair, describing the demographics of the individuals as well as the school setting in which the pair were working. Compliance with the study protocol is also described for each participant as well as any pertinent contextual information, a brief description of participants’ overall response to the study, and the researcher’s impressions (taken from analytic memos and overall case summaries) of the participants’ experiences.

The second section provides the results of the phenomenological data analysis at the cross-case level. The researcher offers an analysis of the common themes that surfaced in the study findings related to the lived experiences of study participants as they participated in the use of the PSCSM in their supervisory practices. This section is organized into five sections. In the first section, six areas are covered, including: study participants’ overall experience; supervision sessions; the supervisor/intern relationship; the participants’ sense of self-efficacy, professional development, and accountability as a supervisor and school counselor; training of interns and supervisors on the ASCA Model and comprehensive school counseling program; and, finally, the identification and rectification of on-site problems or difficulties in internship practices.
Participants were encouraged to share their perspectives on how to make the model and log more effective for the school counseling profession and these findings are reported in section two. This collaboration between supervisors, supervisees and the researcher provides a co-construction of meaning related to their experience using the model and log. Section three includes findings related to how the use of the PSCSM and log compare to other previous supervisory experiences. Section four describes study participants’ suggestions for more effective school counselor education program practices, and section five identifies participants’ thoughts regarding possible future uses of the PSCSM and log.

Included in the second section of the findings are selected quotations from study participants. Providing the exact words of the supervisors and interns allows the reader to understand at a deeper level how participants experienced and made sense of the lived experience of participation in this particular supervisory experience. These quotations offer an opportunity to get at the essence of the study participants’ supervision experiences by allowing their actual voices to be heard.

Part I: Summary of Each Pair

Six pairs of supervisors and interns participated in this study. In the findings, pairs are referred to as Pair 1, Pair 2, etc. Supervisors and interns are referred to by the pair in which they participated. For example, the supervisor in Pair 1 is referred to as Supervisor 1 (S1) and the intern from Pair 1 is referred to as Intern 1 (I1). Although there were six pairs of participants, there were actually only 11 individuals participating in the study, as the intern in Pair 4 was also the intern in Pair 6. Therefore, I6 and I4 is the same person.
Because the researcher was having difficulty finding an intern who was working in an elementary setting, this particular intern agreed to participate in the study at both her high school and elementary sites, where she had a different supervisor at each site. This section describes the school demographics for each pair, the demographics of each participant, study participants' overall compliance with the study protocol, a brief description of their overall response to the study, pertinent contextual information relating to each pair's circumstances, and the researcher's impressions of the participants' overall experience. (Tables summarizing participant demographics may be found in Appendix L.)

Pair I: Suburban Middle School

The middle school in which this internship took place contains grades 6-8 and has approximately 600 students. It is considered a suburban school with 26.5% of the student population considered economically disadvantaged. The ethnic breakdown of the student population is as follows: White: 97.2%, Hispanic: 1.5%, Black: 0.5%, Asian/Pacific Islander: 0.3%, Multi-Racial: 0.3%, and American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.2%.

Supervisor 1 (S1) is a 47-year-old Caucasian female who has worked as a Professional School Counselor at the middle school level for the last 15 years. S1 has her teaching certificate with a school counselor endorsement and she worked as a teacher in a different district for 3 years prior to her school counseling career. She is also a Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC) and she reports that she has had no prior training in supervision. She reported that she had supervised one other intern prior to supervising II. On the demographic information form she checked “Strongly Disagree” to the statement, “I am very knowledgeable about the ASCA National Model.” She also selected “Agree”
to the statement “Our school’s counseling program is in compliance with the ASCA National Model.”

Intern 1 (II) is a 24-year-old Caucasian female with no prior school experience. After graduation she hopes to obtain a school counselor license, become a Limited Licensed Professional Counselor (LLPC), followed by a Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC). II has had no prior experience as a counselor and her prior supervision experiences include being supervised in her practicum course in her counselor education training program. She was undecided about whether her university program provided her with a solid foundation in and understanding of the ASCA National Model. II planned to be at this particular internship site 1 day per week on a regular basis until she had accumulated 200 hours. On 2 separate weeks she spent more days at the site in order to participate in particular activities which were occurring at those times. She was also concurrently interning at a high school site and an elementary site and planned to complete her 600 hours in one semester.

Overall, the pair found participation in the project to be worthwhile. S1 valued several things about using the model and log including the fact that the log was a “running record” of II’s activities, that the log allowed II to be more reflective about her experiences, and that its use allowed the intern to have more input into the supervision sessions (something she felt was a missing piece in typical supervision situations). S1 noted that she had to work at learning the model, which was helpful and frustrating to her at the same time. She felt that some of her normal job responsibilities did not appear to fit anywhere on the model. Both S1 and II noted difficulties in finding time for formal supervision, especially with II’s schedule. S1 felt that use of the model and log had
influenced her relationship with II in that use of the model and log seemed to give II permission to state her feelings more honestly, allowing S1 to understand her better. S1 was not sure that use of the model and log had influenced her growth as a supervisor, stating that she needed more time using them to make that determination.

II felt that use of the model and log encouraged more formal supervision sessions. She also felt that, in comparison to her other supervision experiences, she had asked more questions and reflected more deeply on her experiences. Because of this, II felt that the use of the model and log had helped her gain more understanding about her experiences and that it had positively influenced her development as a school counselor. Both S1 and II noted that use of the model and log helped to pull things together, allowing II to see the “big picture” (S1) and to experience her internship in a more “holistic” (II) manner. II appreciated getting more familiar with the ASCA model, noting that at her other two sites it was never mentioned. II felt that she and S1 had a “little closer relationship” due to the fact that use of the model and log encouraged more formal supervision sessions; however, she stated that she felt close to her other supervisors as well.

In an analysis of the intern logs (findings from which will be shared in more detail in a later section), the transcripts of the interviews, and the analytic memos kept by the researcher throughout the study, it appears that this pair’s ability to comply with the study protocol was compromised because of the limited amount of time the intern was on-site during the week. Because she was only there 1 day per week, several weeks were recorded on one log, which II stated created some confusion in recording. Also, both S1 and II commented that it was difficult to find time to sit down for formal supervision sessions with the log due to II’s limited schedule.
In the researcher's summary of the pair it is noted that compared to some of the other study participants, S1 and II's relationship did not appear to be as close and that their understanding of the process and feedback to the researcher seemed to lack some depth. It was also noted that during the final interview, II seemed somewhat overwhelmed and there was a sense that she felt that she could have done better. It is noted by the researcher that these findings may be due, in part, to an internship experience that was occurring simultaneously at three sites. The researcher's summary of this pair notes that, despite these difficulties, it did appear that participation in the study was beneficial for both participants in that it encouraged more formal supervision sessions during which supervisor and supervisee were able to look more closely at II's experiences. Given her schedule, it is possible that without the use of the model and log, there would have been less opportunity to ask and get answers to II's questions or to explore in more depth some of her experiences.

Pair II: Suburban High School

Pair II worked in a large suburban high school of approximately 734 students. The ethnic makeup of the student population is as follows: 86.1% White, 7.1% Black, 5.2% Hispanic, 1.1% Asian/Pacific Islander, 0.3% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 0.3% Multi-Racial. This high school includes grades 9 through 12 with 15.1% of the population considered economically disadvantaged.

S2 is a 58-year-old Caucasian male with 25 years of experience as a school counselor. S2 is also a certified teacher with 10 years of teaching experience in the same district but in a different building, prior to his work as a school counselor. S2 states that
he has supervised approximately six previous interns. He is not an LLPC or an LPC and reports that he has had no prior training in supervision. In rating his knowledge about the ASCA National Model, S2 disagreed that he is “very knowledgeable” about the model. He agreed that his school counseling program complies with the ASCA Model.

I2 is a 32-year-old Black male who has 5 years of experience in a different school district working as a teacher. I2 spoke with a strong accent indicating that he is not native born. He reported that he has no prior experience as a counselor and no prior experience in receiving counseling supervision. After graduation I2 will obtain either a school counselor endorsement or school counselor license. He did not indicate that he would seek an LPC. I2 “strongly agrees” that his university program provided him with a solid foundation and understanding of the ASCA National Model. I2 planned to be at this internship site 3 days per week for the first semester before switching to his second site during the following semester.

In the analytic memos for this pair, difficulties with study protocol compliance are noted. I2’s university supervisor and his on-site supervisor both questioned whether I2 was having comprehension difficulties due to a language barrier. The researcher also noted this concern after the initial training (in which I2 was very quiet and asked very few questions) and after several phone conversations with I2 to make sure he understood the study instructions. I2 had been using a log for his university supervisor that was similar but did not have the ASCA components found on the second page of the PSCSM study log. He continued using his original log for 6 weeks after the initial training even though it had been clearly stated in the training and in the 2-week phone check in that he needed to switch to the new log. I2 stated that he thought it would be all right to use his
university log since it was similar in some ways to the PSCSM log. After a phone conversation with him at the 6-week point, I2 did switch to the study log and used it for the following 6 weeks. This made the total time between the training and the final interview about 16 weeks (including a 2-week holiday break).

Difficulties were also noted in an analysis of I2’s logs. He did not appear to have a good understanding of where to record his activities and it was clear that he struggled with the components on the second page of the log, indicated by numerous blank sections and misplaced record of activities. He also followed the same format for recording activities on the second page as the first, even though the page is laid out differently.

S2 also seemed to struggle to follow the study protocol despite the fact that he was very attentive during the training session and asked very good questions. At the 2-week check-in after the training he seemed confused, stating, “Tell me now, what exactly am I supposed to do?” In a review of the interview transcripts and analytic memos, it appeared to the researcher that S2 was not meeting very frequently with I2 for formal supervision sessions. I2’s university supervisor also expressed concern that I2 was not getting to participate in a full array of comprehensive guidance activities, a fact that is corroborated by his logs.

Despite the above mentioned difficulties, a review of the final interviews, both individual and conjoint, indicates that both S2 and I2 seemed to find value in using the model and log. S2 thought that in comparison to the first log, the study log provided for more specific conversations. He also felt that having a log of this kind was valuable in that it helped the intern to reflect on his activities and that it captured and organized the information. Having more specific incidents to talk about in supervision made S2 feel
that he was more effective in helping I2. I2 stated that he liked the study log better than
the university log he had started out with because he felt it was more detailed and made
him more accountable. He complained that it was more time-consuming but also stated
that he felt that it was beneficial despite this fact. I2 liked the fact that the model taught
him more about the ASCA Model and that the log helped him to keep track of his
activities. He felt that the “questions, concerns, and areas for improvement” section of the
log provided him with better feedback from his supervisor. I2 felt that use of the model
and log strengthened his relationship with S2 because it gave them more issues to talk
about. Initially S2 had not felt that use of the model and log had affected the
supervisor/supervisee relationship; however, during the conjoint interview, when he
heard I2’s comments on this topic, he changed his viewpoint to agree with I2.

In the researcher’s summary of this pair, it is noted that it did not appear that
formal supervision was occurring on a regular basis. A review of the transcript of the
final individual interview with S2 states that S2’s answers seemed to lack depth and
insight regarding the use of the model and log or regarding his supervision of I2. S2 also
mentions in the final individual interview difficulties finding time for formal supervision
and noting that they would need to do a better job meeting for formal supervision sessions
in I2’s remaining time at the school. It is possible that use of the model and log improved
this internship experience in that it gave the pair something to actually refer to and
discuss when they did meet, possibly providing I2 with higher quality feedback regarding
his work. Without the model and log, as S2 indicated in his final individual interview,
their conversations might have been very general. It is also important to note that the
compliance issues identified with this pair could have been due to resistance on the part of the participants to using this particular model and log.

**Pair III: Suburban High School**

Pair III worked in a large suburban high school with approximately 1,940 students. The ethnic makeup of the student population is as follows: 57.8% White, 28.5% Black, 6.4% Hispanic, 6.2% Asian/Pacific Islander, 0.6% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 0.5% Multi-Racial. This high school serves students in grades 10-12 and 26.5% of the population is considered economically disadvantaged.

S3 is a 39-year-old Caucasian female. She has worked for 5 years as a school counselor. Prior to this she worked for 6 years as a special education teacher in a different district and an additional 6 years in a different building in the same district, also as a special education teacher. S3 reports that she has supervised approximately four interns prior to I3. S3 has a school counselor endorsement and is not an LLPC or an LPC. She reports that she has done some reading on her own regarding supervision but has no formal supervision training. She circled “Disagree” to the statement, “I am very knowledgeable about the ASCA National Model.” S3 was undecided as to whether her school’s counseling program was in compliance with the ASCA National Model.

I3 is a 41-year-old Caucasian female who has worked in a different school district for 9 years as a school secretary. S3’s future aspirations include obtaining a school counselor license. She did not indicate interest in becoming an LLPC or a LPC. S3 had no prior experience as a counselor, nor has she had any prior experience receiving counseling supervision. She agreed that her university program had provided her with a
solid foundation in and understanding of the ASCA National Model. She planned to work at her site for 14 hours per week through the first semester, switching to her second site for the second semester. As with S2, S3 started her internship using a log required by her university supervisor that was similar to the PSCSM log but which lacked the ASCA components found on the second page of the log.

Both the supervisor and intern seemed to find a great deal of value in participation in this study. In the final interview, S3 stated that she appreciated the structure provided in the use of this model and log. She felt that the process organized I3 and helped to point out areas that were missing in her experience. S3 noted that use of the model and log made her more accountable in her supervision practices in that it created a structured learning experience during their time together rather than just a quick “check-in.”

Because of the structure provided, she felt that formal supervision occurred on a more regular basis. S3 felt that the process made them both more reflective about their roles and activities. She noted that participation in the study caused her to reevaluate her department in light of a comprehensive school counseling framework. S3 noted that use of the model and log strengthened her relationship with I3 because of the increased amount of time they spent together communicating about mutual interests.

I3 also felt that the overall experience of using the model and log was helpful because it encouraged regular formal supervision meetings and provided a guide for those meetings. I3 felt that, in comparison to her first university log, the study log led to more in-depth two-way conversations. She appreciated the space given on the log to the ASCA Model components on the second page, noting that she especially appreciated the inclusion of those areas that she would most likely only be indirectly involved with as an
intern (such as management and leadership). I3 did not find the developmental levels helpful, stating that it was difficult to assign a number to her activities and that neither her site supervisor nor her university supervisor addressed these numbers. I3 felt that use of the model and log influenced her relationship with her supervisor in that it helped her supervisor to understand her better, grasping where she felt confident and where she did not. I3 also felt that the use of the model and log positively affected her development as a school counselor in that it gave her the ability to be more reflective about her activities.

It appears from a review of the analytic memos, logs, and interview transcripts that this pair complied very well with the study protocols. I3 was very thorough in filling out her logs, reporting her activities in the appropriate boxes. Her questions and comments in the “Understandings from Supervision” box verify information shared during the interviews that their supervision conversations were indeed in-depth and touched on a wide variety of topics. In the researcher’s overall summary of the pair it is noted that the two appeared to have a very good working and personal relationship. Both S3 and I3 spent a great deal of time with the researcher going over what they liked and did not like about the model and log, making suggestions for improvement. There is some question with this particular pair (as noted by I3 herself) whether their level of investment in the use of the model and log stemmed from the value they found in the experience, or in the fact that they felt obligated because they were participating in a research study.

Pair IV: Rural High School

Pair IV worked in a rural high school with approximately 331 students. The ethnic makeup of the student population is as follows: 74.0% White, 11.8% Hispanic, 10%
Multi-Racial, 1.5% American Indian/Alaska Native, 1.5% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1.2% Black. The high school consists of grades 9-12 and 56.5% of the population is considered economically disadvantaged.

S4 is a 56-year-old Caucasian female. She has worked for 5 years as a school counselor. Prior to this she worked for 11 years as a school improvement coordinator in a different setting. This was her first experience supervising an intern. S4 states that she has a school counselor license but not an LLPC or an LPC. When asked about prior supervision experience, S4 stated that she had done some reading on her own. She circled “Strongly Agree” in response to the statement, “I am very knowledgeable about the ASCA National Model” and she agreed that her school counseling program is in compliance with the ASCA National Model.

I4 is a 53-year-old Caucasian female with 12 years of experience in the same school district where she was working as an intern, 10 as a supervisor of in-school suspension and detention programs, and 2 as a substitute teacher. After graduation, I4 hopes to obtain a school counselor license, an LLPC, followed by an LPC. Previous counseling experiences included group counseling in her practicum course during her university counselor education training. She reported no prior experience receiving counselor supervision. I4 agreed that her university program provided her with a solid foundation in and understanding of the ASCA National Model. I4 planned to work approximately 42 hours per week divided between two different internship sites. She planned on completing her internship in one semester.

I4 had some initial difficulties complying with the study protocols. The initial training session seemed to go quite well with I4 being very attentive and asking good
questions. The researcher’s analytic memo notes that both supervisor and intern appeared to be hard-working and conscientious, willing to go above and beyond to do what is best for students. They shared that they met every night after school to discuss the day and were always there until 5pm. At the 2-week check-in, 14 had not begun to use the log yet and she stated that they were planning on meeting to discuss it that week. When I called to set up the final individual and conjoint interviews after week 6, 14 informed me that she had been filling out the logs, but that they had not actually used them in their supervision sessions. She agreed to continue filling out the logs for several more weeks and would begin bringing them to their supervision sessions. Because of 14’s approach to the study, this pair actually has three different supervision experiences to compare: supervision with no log at all (as they had started the internship prior to use of the model and log), supervision with 14 filling out the logs but not referring directly to them during her supervision sessions, and, finally, use of the log in the supervision sessions.

Some compliance issues were also noted in a review of 14’s logs. Although her logs were filled out more completely than any of the other interns in the study, 14 did not appear to understand where to put particular activities. She filled in many of the boxes with general statements rather than descriptions of specific activities, and she rarely recorded concerns about her performance or areas in which she felt she needed improvement. In reviewing the analytic memos, interview transcripts, logs, and the researcher’s summary of the pair, it appears that 14 felt it necessary to fill in every space. In several of our phone conversations, she seemed anxious about filling it out correctly and about not filling in all of the boxes, even though it was emphasized in the training and in various other phone conversations that it was not necessary or realistic to have all
of the boxes filled out in a week. Although this intern was very conscientious in how she approached her tasks, it is also necessary to consider that perhaps she was motivated by wanting to please the researcher.

In analyzing the interview transcripts and analytic memos, it is clear that this pair was very positive about their experiences using the model and log. S4 stated that she found that it helped them to be more focused during supervision. Without the use of a log at all, S4 found that she directed the sessions. After beginning to use the logs, she appreciated the insight and understanding she gained regarding I4’s perspectives. S4 felt that they were more “collegial” in the use of the model and log and that it helped her monitor I4’s activities better, allowing for the provision of a broader internship experience. S4 appreciated the ASCA components included on the second page of the log stating that these areas (specifically Accountability, Leadership, and Collaboration) provided deeper meaning related to the counseling program than just focusing on the Delivery System components. She felt that use of the model and log positively influenced her relationship with I4 in that she got to know her on a more “personal level.” She also felt it positively influenced her development as a supervisor because it allowed her to take I4’s feedback into consideration and use it to mold her experiences. Both felt that use of the model and log promoted more in-depth conversations during supervision.

I4 was working simultaneously at an elementary site and, because I was unable to find a supervisor/supervisee pair from that level to include in the study, she volunteered to participate at both levels. In fact, part of her delay in beginning use of the model and log at her high school site was that she wanted to begin using the model and log at both of her sites at the same time. Although she found the paperwork of maintaining two logs to
be time-consuming, she consistently stated that she found value in the exercise and gained a great deal from the experience of using the log and model at both sites. In the final interview I4 reported that she felt the log provided her with a tool to track her activities and that it drew attention to areas in which she needed more experience. She especially appreciated the opportunity the log provided for reflection on her work. I4 felt that the focus on the ASCA components on the second page of the log created more accountability as they would not normally be areas addressed in an internship. I4 also felt that the supervisor/supervisee relationship was enhanced through the use of the model and log because there supervision sessions were more personal and they got to know one another better. Additionally, she felt that it positively affected her growth as a school counselor in that it challenged her to obtain experiences in more areas. Both I4 and S4 indicated that they would like to continue using the model and log in future endeavors.

The researcher’s summary of this pair notes that S4 and I4 got along very well and that it is likely that they would have had a good relationship without the use of the model and the log and that they would have met faithfully on a daily basis for formal or informal supervision sessions. It is noted that a possible benefit for this pair in using the model and log was the focus and depth that it provided to their discussions, keeping their attention on the ASCA model and the activities that are most important for comprehensive school counseling programs. The researcher also surmised that since both appear to be high achievers, the model and log may have served to provide them with a yardstick to evaluate how they were doing, both as a supervisor and as an intern. This may have provided them with some assurance that they were performing their roles adequately and appropriately.
**Pair V: Rural Middle School**

Pair V worked in a rural middle school with approximately 265 students. The ethnic makeup of the student population is as follows: 93.6% White, 2.3% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1.9% Black, 1.1% American Indian/Alaska Native, 0.8% Hispanic, and 0.4% Multi-Racial. The middle school consists of grades 6-8 and 38.9% of the population is considered economically disadvantaged.

S5 is a 53-year-old Caucasian female who has worked for 11 years as a school counselor. She had no previous experience in the school setting prior to her work as a school counselor and she states that she has previously supervised four interns. S5 is licensed as a school counselor and states that she also has LMSW. She does not have an LLPC or an LPC. Prior training in supervision includes some reading she has done on her own. S4 is undecided as to whether she is very knowledgeable about the ASCA Model and she also rated herself as undecided as to whether her school’s counseling program is in compliance with the ASCA National Model.

I5 is a 29-year-old Caucasian female who has worked for 7 years in a different public school as a teacher. After graduation she plans to obtain her school counseling endorsement. She has no plans to obtain an LLPC or an LPC. I5 states that she has no prior experience as a counselor and some experience receiving counseling supervision in her practicum during her university counselor education training. I5 agrees that her university program provided her with a solid foundation in and understanding of the ASCA National Model. I5 planned to work 40 hours a week at her site.
A lack of compliance to the study protocol on the part of the supervisor in this pair was noted in analytic memos, interview transcriptions, and the researcher's summary. At the 2-week check-in, I5 mentioned frustration at not having much to put on her logs as she was not being given anything of value to do. She was also frustrated that her supervisor always seemed too busy to sit down for supervision time using the logs. In the final interview, I5 was clearly disappointed with her internship at this site. It was her opinion that S5 had not provided her with opportunities to participate in a broad array of comprehensive school counseling activities, nor had she provided weekly formal supervision sessions. It is noted in the analytic memo for S5's final interview that she appeared to recognize that I5's experience had been less than ideal. S5 appeared defensive, talking about cutbacks and time constraints, and that she hoped that I5 has seen how difficult it is to work in a real-world setting. It is noted that S5 seemed to know little about the model and log and that her answers lacked any kind of depth.

Despite the difficulties experienced in this particular internship, both S5 and I5 found benefit in using the model and log. S5 mentioned that she appreciated the structure that the model and log provided and that because it was difficult to find time to sit down for formal supervision sessions, the model and log made the times they did sit down more "efficient." S5 also mentioned that the log helped to identify areas where I5 needed more experience. Additionally, she felt that use of the model and log had affected their relationship because it helped I5 get her, as the supervisor, to focus on all areas of a comprehensive model.

I5 mentioned that she had met with S5 for two formal supervision sessions and that they had gone over three of the logs each time. She mentioned that the log was a
useful tool in that it gave her what she felt was a "non-confrontational" way to share her concerns about her internship experiences with S5. I5 felt that this opportunity had alleviated some of her frustrations. After one such discussion, I5 shared that she felt there had been a change in their relationship in a positive direction. I5 felt that use of the model and log had positively influenced her growth as a school counselor in that it informed her on the activities that she should be involved in, thereby educating her on the appropriate role for the school counselor. It was I5’s opinion that use of the model and log motivated her supervisor to meet with her the times that she did, noting that once the study was completed, S5 had not met with her for a formal supervision session again. I5 also felt that she had received more feedback from S5 during the supervision sessions using the model and log and that their conversations were more in-depth. Without the model and log, I5 noted that she would just report to S5 regarding her activities and that there was no conversation about them.

I5’s logs corroborate her description of her experience. She filled in, on average, less than half of the available boxes and she did not appear to be involved in a wide variety of experiences. There were no examples of classroom guidance activities and the second page of the log was rarely filled in at all. I5 did come up with good quality, insightful questions and she obtained answers to most of those; however, one of her six logs had nothing recorded in the "Understandings from Supervision" box. This is probably because it had never been looked at or discussed with the supervisor. Both S5 and I5 found the second page of the log (including advocacy/diversity, leadership, foundation, management, collaboration) confusing. S5 found it too "introspective" and
both preferred and found more useful the Delivery System components found on page one of the log.

In the researcher's summary of this pair, it is noted that use of the model and log may have ameliorated, to a degree, some of the difficulties that this pair experienced. Use of the model and log may have helped S5 to know and understand what a quality internship should look like. As mentioned above, it is possible that the use of the model and log gave her an avenue to share her frustrations regarding her lack of appropriate experiences with her supervisor. It also seemed to have encouraged S5 to participate in at least a few formal supervision sessions, which according to I5 were more in-depth and provided better feedback than without the model and log. It is also possible that it helped to educate S5 in more effective supervision techniques as she seemed to appreciate the structure that the use of the model and log provided, stating that it was an efficient way to use their time. It is also possible that S5’s noncompliance could have been related to resistance to the use of this particular model and log.

*Pair VI: Rural Elementary School*

Pair VI worked in a rural elementary school with approximately 417 students. The ethnic makeup of the student population is as follows: 72.7% White, 15.4% Hispanic, 6.5% Multi-Racial, 3.8% Black, 1.4% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 0.2% Asian/Pacific Islander. The elementary school consists of grades K-4 and 60.4% of the population is considered economically disadvantaged.

S6 is a 51-year-old Caucasian female. She has worked for 18 years as a school counselor. Prior to working as a school counselor, S6 was a public school teacher for 9
years in a different district. She has previously supervised five interns. In addition to
being a certified teacher with a school counselor endorsement, S6 also has her LLPC. She
lists as prior training in supervision participation in a mentor training program for
teachers. S6 disagrees that she is very knowledgeable about the ASCA National Model.
She is also undecided as to whether her school counseling program is in compliance with
the ASCA National Model.

As was noted earlier, the intern in Pair VI, I6, is the same intern as in Pair IV. Her
demographic information is repeated here. I6 is a 53-year-old Caucasian female with 12
years of experience in the same school district as she was working as an intern, 10 as a
supervisor of in-school suspension and detention programs, and two as a substitute
teacher. After graduation, I6 hopes to obtain a school counselor license, an LLPC,
followed by an LPC. Previous counseling experiences included group counseling in her
practicum course during her university counselor education training. She reported no
prior experience receiving counselor supervision. I6 agreed that her university program
provided her with a solid foundation in and understanding of the ASCA National Model.
I6 planned to work approximately 42 hours per week divided between two different
internship sites. She planned on completing her internship in one semester.

This particular supervisor was initially reticent to participate in the study. I6
shared with me that S6 did not appear to know a lot about the ASCA Model (a fact she
herself noted on her demographic information form) and that she was very nervous about
the final taped interview. S6 did finally agree to participate and during the training
mentioned that she hoped I "wouldn’t be too hard on her during the interview,"
corroborating some of what I6 had shared with me. I assured her that I would not be
evaluating her, but gathering data on the PSCSM. In the final individual interview, S6 again mentioned that “this was her least favorite part,” alerting me to the fact that she was still feeling nervous. Her answers to the interview questions were somewhat short with longer pauses in between. It is noted in the analytic memo following the individual interview that it is unclear whether the lack of depth to her answers was due to her discomfort, a lack of involvement in the study, or a lack of understanding about a comprehensive model.

Both S6 and I6 reported benefits of being involved in the study. S6 reported that use of the model and log helped her to better evaluate and keep track of what I6 was doing and that she especially appreciated the “questions/areas of concern” box in that it gave her insight into I6’s thoughts and feelings about how she was doing. Noting that I6 is a very “confident” person, seeing in writing areas where I6 felt less confident was good information for S6. S6 agreed that I6 may not have shared her questions and concerns as clearly without the model and log. S6 also noted that they probably talked about things they would not have talked about without the model and log. S6 also received positive feedback from I6 about her own performance as a school counselor and about the school counseling program itself. I6 noted that without the model and log, she may not have taken the opportunity to share this feedback with S6. S6 appreciated this feedback, noting that because she works alone she does not often get the opportunity to share and get feedback from a colleague.

I6 reported that writing things down on the log helped her to capture and remember all that she had done. Writing things down helped her to think about her activities more deeply and she also mentioned that her conversations with I6 were more
in-depth because of this. I6 felt that use of the model and log positively affected the supervisor/supervisee relationship in that it facilitated a friendship between them. She felt this was due to the fact that the model and log forced them to go deeper in their conversations, allowing them to get to know one another much better. I6 felt that she had learned more in her internship experience because of the use of the model and log, due to the fact that she was thinking about things so much more. Because she was more unfamiliar with the elementary level, she felt that the log provided her with more opportunities to ask questions and to get these questions answered. I6 especially liked the opportunity to rate herself using the Developmental Levels. She plans on using the model and log in any future position she obtains.

Similar to I6’s experience at her high school internship site (see Pair IV) she had a period of time during participation in the study where she filled out the logs but did not share them during her supervision sessions. After having spoken to the researcher regarding this, she had then agreed to continue using the logs for an additional period of time, bringing them to her supervision sessions to refer to with her supervisor. This again provided the researcher with various supervision experiences to compare. Besides this departure from the study protocol, this pair complied well with the study instructions. An analysis of I6’s logs showed that she was conscientious in filling out a majority of the boxes; however, similar to her high school logs, she often misplaced activities, placing them in the wrong boxes. She also included general comments and thoughts about various topics rather than a description of her activities. The logs corroborated the fact that in-depth discussions on a variety of topics had occurred during their supervision sessions.
Interestingly, I6’s logs seem to indicate that S6’s program is comprehensive in nature despite the fact that S6 was undecided about this fact.

In the researcher’s summary of this pair, it is noted that there is a possibility that use of the model and log facilitated the relationship between supervisor and supervisee in this instance. S6 discovered that although I6 presented in an extremely confident manner, her log provided the supervisor with insight into this supervisor’s private feelings regarding areas of personal concerns and weaknesses. S6 noted that this had surprised her and assisted her in helping I6 to grow and develop as a counselor. Without this information, S6, who appeared to be concerned about being judged negatively, may have misinterpreted I6’s confident presentation and perhaps been threatened by it. I6, who was initially unsure as to S6’s knowledge about comprehensive models, recognized her supervisor’s competence and was able to give S6 positive feedback about her skills and program. This was something that both agreed may not have occurred if they had not been using the model and log. As noted earlier, S6 appreciated this positive feedback. It appears that the model and log may have facilitated a more in-depth sharing and personal understanding between this pair.

The above findings have presented a summary of each pair which included demographics of the individuals and the school settings, information regarding how the pairs complied with the study protocol, contextual information pertinent to each pair’s situation, a description of the pair’s overall response to the study, and the researcher’s impressions regarding the pair’s experiences. This information provides important contextual information regarding each pair.
The next section of this chapter will describe the pertinent themes that emerged from a cross-case analysis of the findings related to the lived experiences of study participants as they participated in the use of the PSCSM in their supervisory practices. These themes were identified as the researcher examined the findings regarding the influence of the use of the model and log on the following: study participants' overall experience, supervision sessions, the supervisor/intern relationship, the identification and rectification of on-site problems or difficulties in internship practices, and the participants' sense of efficacy and professional development as a supervisor and school counselor. Part II will also describe findings related to participants' perspectives on how to make the model and log more effective for the school counseling profession, how the use of the PSCSM compared to other supervisory experiences, suggestions participants offered for more effective counselor education training program practices, and, finally, participants' thoughts about possibilities for the future use of the PSCSM.

**Part II: Cross Case Analysis of Study Participants' Experiences**

The school counselor supervisors and interns in this study were trained in the use of the PSCSM, subsequently using the model and accompanying log for a period of at least 6 weeks. They then participated in separate and conjoint interviews to share their reactions and responses to their experiences using the model and log in their supervisory practices. This part of the findings chapter will present the results from cross-case analyses in response to the primary research questions of this study, which include the following:
Both Supervisor/Supervisee:

1. What was the supervision experience using the PSCSM and log like for participants?

2. How did the use of the PSCSM and log affect participants’ relationship with one another?

3. What, according to the participants, were the strengths and/or weaknesses of the supervision process using the PSCSM and log?

4. If supervision with the same supervisor/ supervisee pair had occurred without the model prior to use of the PSCSM and log, how did the two experiences compare?

Supervisee:

5. As a result of participation in the supervision process using the PSCSM and log, what changes did participants note in their professional growth and development as school counselors?

Supervisor:

6. As a result of participation in the supervision process using the PSCSM and log, what changes did participants note in their professional growth as supervisors and as school counselors?

Part II of this chapter is organized into five sections. In the first section, the researcher describes the influence of the use of the model and log in several key areas related to the participants’ experiences. In the second section findings are presented related to study participants’ suggestions for improvements. Section three includes findings related to how the use of the PSCSM and log compare to other supervisory
Influence of PSCSM on the Supervision Experience of Participants

This section describes the themes that were identified as the researcher examined how the use of the model and log influenced various aspects of the supervision experience of both supervisors and supervisees. Emergent themes from six aspects of the supervision experience are delineated. These six areas include the following: (1) study participants' overall experience; (2) supervision sessions; (3) the supervisor/intern relationship; (4) the participants' sense of self-efficacy, professional development, and accountability as a supervisor and school counselor; (5) training of interns and supervisors on the ASCA Model and comprehensive school counseling program; and (6) finally, the identification and rectification of on-site problems or difficulties in internship practices.

Influence of PSCSM on Study Participants' Overall Experience of Supervision

The first question that participants were asked during their final individual interview related to their overall experience using the PSCSM and log. This section describes the themes identified in study participants' answers to this question. Because the responses reflect the first thing that came to respondents' minds, it may be that these thoughts are some of the most salient regarding participants' reactions to use of the model.
and log. Many of these themes emerged at later points in time during the interviews of various participants and thus will be described in more detail in later sections. Following is a description of the themes which emerged in the participants’ responses to the question, “Overall, how was this supervision experience for you using the model and log?”

_Value of the log as a record keeping and accountability tool._ Seven of the 11 participants noted the value of the log as a record keeping tool. S1 and I6 appreciated the fact that having a record of the supervisee’s activities assured that things would not be forgotten. S1 stated, “...afterwards sometimes it’s hard to remember everything that you’ve done...” and supervisee I6 noted, “Well, it’s easier to look at this and see what I had written because obviously, I can’t remember all of this.” S3, I4, S5, and S6 all noted that having a record of the activities the supervisee had been involved in allowed for the ability to monitor for what experiences were missing. In talking about their interns, S3 and S5 observed respectively, “She was able to look ahead and say ‘Oh, I’m kind of light in this area and maybe I need to do a few activities in this area to balance things out,’” and “…we could more easily identify the areas where I3 was getting a lot of experience and those areas where maybe we needed to up her exposure.” I4 stated, “It was easier to see areas that I needed more observation and more experience with.” I2 appreciated the detail of the log and felt that it held him more accountable, stating, “…I think I liked it because it was more detailed than what I was using before for school. …actually I ended up being more accountable because I had to enter more things.”
Provided structure to the supervision sessions. Three supervisors, S3, S4, and S5, all reported that use of the model and log provided structure to the formal supervision sessions. S3 indicated the following:

Well, I feel like it provided the kind of structure that I really appreciated and needed. So I found it to be very easy to follow and again the structure that was helpful. It really structured our meetings, structured our conversations.

S4 pointed out that the log provided more of a focus as they “debriefed” each day, which supplied a structure to their time together. S5 stated, “The value I saw in it was that it helped to kind of structure the times that we met…”

Encouraged formal supervision sessions. Two of the supervisees, I1 and I3, both commented on the fact that use of the model and log seemed to encourage the occurrence of more frequent formal supervision sessions. I1 observed the following:

It was good. S1 was great. I found a lot of the supervision takes place as we’re actually doing activities. Like directly after. I mean we did sit down and have talks and I feel like keeping the log actually made us sit down more on a basis like that rather than talking as we’re just going along with things.

I3 stated, “... kind of forced us to, you know, be more conscientious I guess in setting aside specific time.”

Made no difference. One supervisor’s first reaction was that use of the model and log did not make a difference on the overall supervision experience stating, “I think it was fine. You know it didn’t really make a difference, I don’t think, in what we were doing and how we were doing it.” As a side note, this supervisor, S2, changed this opinion in the final conjoint interview after he heard his intern’s reflections about the experience.

Supervisor would not meet regularly. When supervisee I5 was responding to the introductory questions regarding her overall experience, her first comment related to the
fact that her supervisor was not interested in providing formal supervision sessions. It observed, “Well, to be honest, I didn’t meet with my supervisor every week. I couldn’t quite get her to sit down with me...I was filling it out but then I couldn’t get my supervisor to sit with me to go over it.” This supervisee’s reaction to use of the model and log was most likely affected by her supervisor’s inability or unwillingness to comply with the study protocol and provide formal supervision sessions.

In summary, the themes that emerged from the first individual interview question regarding the participants’ overall experience, include the value of the log as a record keeping and accountability tool, the fact that use of the model and log provided structure to the supervision process, and that this use encouraged formal supervision sessions to occur. Single individuals noted that, in the first case, the use of the model and log made no difference (although this supervisor changed his opinion later) and in the second case, the supervisor would not sit down and meet with the intern for formal supervision. The next section examines the influence of the PSCSM on the supervision sessions themselves.

_influence of PSCSM on Supervision Sessions_

This section identifies and describes the themes which emerged in relation to the influence of the PSCSM on the supervision sessions themselves. Participants were instructed to use the intern’s completed logs from the previous week during their weekly formal supervision sessions. Eight themes emerged in the participant interviews related to how the model and log influenced these supervision sessions. These themes, which are described below, include the following: value of the PSCSM and log as a tool for
reflection, PSCSM and log encouraged more in-depth discussion, value of the PSCSM and log as a record keeping tool, use of the PSCSM and log added structure to the supervision experience, value of the PSCSM and log as a vehicle for interns to ask and receive answers to their questions, use of PSCSM and log encouraged formal supervision sessions to occur, value of the PSCSM and log in assisting supervisors to process intern strengths and weaknesses, and, finally, the PSCSM and log provided opportunities for more intern input and sharing.

Value of PSCSM and log as a tool for reflection. Taking the time to not only record the internship activities, but also to reflect on these experiences is likely to have some impact on the formal supervision session, especially compared to sessions where interns do not come prepared with questions, concerns and observations. The value of the PSCSM and log as a tool for reflection is one of the most significant themes which surfaced in the findings. All participants mentioned or referred to in some way the value of the model log as a means for reflection. S1 directly referred to the log as a “good reflection tool.” Several of the interns commented on the value of the reflection piece of the PSCSM and log as compared to experiences without the use of such a tool.

I had to reflect more so on what I was doing. I don’t think I really would have sat down and got as deeply into what I did and how I could improve it... I really had to think about OK, what did I do that day and how am I feeling about that and ... I think it made me more reflective. At my other internship sites I would just go home and not record anything. (I1)

... in laying this kind of stuff out, forcing myself to think about it because I think if I just had a time sheet where I had to log my time, I probably wouldn’t reflect on half of this stuff. (I3)

It just provided that level, a deeper level of thinking that maybe you wouldn’t go to if you had a checklist type of a thing and I think that that is appropriate....we should be reflecting on what we’re doing and I think she (I3) has gained a lot of
good experience being able to look at that and saying, "Hm, wow this was kind of odd. Well, what about this?" (S3)

Like you were doing what you had to do but you weren't thinking about it. And so then when you have to write about it then you have to kind of take a step back and do some deeper thoughts on it and that was interesting. And maybe you don't have time during the day to do it, but it might be a thing to do in the evening when you sit down and you want to unwind a little bit and kind of rethink things that happened during the day.... I'm a person who journals so this would be like journaling for me. (I4)

... when you sit down and you're writing this out, you're thinking more about it and you go into more details here than you would in your little notes that you scratch out (referring to the typical time logs). And so, this still allows you to go more in-depth into whatever the issue or the concern was, or how you felt about doing things. (I6)

Several participants did not use the term reflection per se, but used words that suggested or implied that the reflection process was occurring. For example, S2 pointed out, "Well, I think it really helped him (I2) to think about what he was doing ..." I2 remarked that, "Those (log entries) actually tried to help me to kind of look into myself ..." S6 felt that because her intern took the time to reflect on her feelings, these feelings were more evident to her as the supervisor. She stated, "And even though she may have verbalized it, I just felt stronger feelings coming out on the paper."

Both I3 and I6 reported that the practice of reflecting on their experiences helped them to gain more from their internship experiences.

... but having to look at it, categorize it, what did I do well, what are my concerns, what am I not getting, what am I getting? It's more growth for me, I think. (I3)

And you're thinking a lot more about what you didn't do or what you should do or what you should do different next time and I found that that's what I did. So, in that way, I think it's more of a learning experience on top of the internship, on top of actually doing the work, but then having to take a hard look at what you did and how you did it. (I6)
Both S5 and I5 responded positively to the researcher’s question about whether the intern’s prior reflections on her experiences made a difference during supervision sessions. Both agreed that the reflection was a positive experience, with S5 stating, “I think it (prior intern reflection) is beneficial to an intern because sometimes, especially initially you don’t always know what to ask or what to expect.” I5 further notes, “It (referring to supervision sessions using the model and log) was more in-depth and I got a lot more feedback than I get now (without the log).”

One pair, S4 and I4, actually reflected on the logs themselves before meeting together. I4 shared, “I always made copies (of the logs) and I would give them to S4 so she could read through it before we met and then we would both come back to the table with our thoughts.”

Several supervisors indicated that the process of using the model and log caused them to become more reflective on their own role as a supervisor and the kind of internship experiences they were offering.

It made me more reflective later on, after having the structured conversation. It made me more reflective about what kind of opportunities and activities I could provide or what I might do next time. Because it adds that reflective piece to it, it makes me reflect later. And like I said, she is going to be developing something (a guide for interns) that helps—that kind of spawned off of this, because we’re looking at how we’re going to do things from here on out. (S3)

I think there was more problem solving within the internship but also within just the counseling job itself—things that I will do differently as well. It became a learning experience for me to have someone asking me those questions, “Well, why do you do it that way?” (S4)

I3 remarked that reflecting on each of the model components will help her in the future as she recalls them and applies that knowledge to her activities as a future school counselor.
... and we were talking about separating out the pieces of that model that there was more reflection on each piece than there would have been without this model, so I can only believe that along the line that that's going to help me always think about those areas (ASCA model components) in the things that I am doing. (I3)

It is apparent that the act of reflecting upon one's experiences made an impression upon the study participants. This appears to be true for each supervisor and intern in their beliefs about the intern's experiences, but also seems to be true for several of the supervisors who reflected on their own practices as supervisors.

*Encouraged more in-depth discussion.* It would not be surprising that discussions within the supervision sessions might be more in-depth using the PSCSM and log, given the fact that interns spent more time reflecting on their experiences prior to these meetings. All participants except two referred to the fact that along with the use of the model and log came more in-depth supervision conversations. In their conjoint interviews, S5 and I5 both agreed that their discussions when using the model and log were more in-depth and S4 and I4 both agreed that without the model and log they would not have “gone into such depth.” I4 also stated that supervision conversations were “more comprehensive.” In a written communication provided to the researcher at the final individual interview, S4 listed some of the topics that arose in these in-depth conversations. She states, “Even though the internship required logging hours each day, discussions of the events of the day within the 12 domains, engaged us in deeper discussions of the counseling profession, the roadblocks, and even prompted problem-solving.”

These in-depth conversations may have occurred because of the added specificity which participants perceived to be present when using the model and log. I6 agreed that
they were able to go into “more detail,” and S2 indicated that he valued the fact that they had some “specific examples to really look at.” Additional comments on the added specificity to supervisory discussions when using the model and log include the following:

I think with this log …our conversations might have been a little more specific as far as particular things we talked about. (S2)

… and we were able to really, not just have a kind of narrative, but really to be able to go through specific things and that was helpful, very helpful. (S3)

I think maybe this zeroed in a little bit more on specific areas. (S6)

Use of the model and log also seemed to promote and create opportunities for more discussions to occur, adding to the likelihood of more in-depth content covered in the supervision sessions. S2 mentioned that use of the model and log “prompted a lot of discussion,” I2 indicated that they had “more issues to talk about,” and I3 observed that it “generated more two-way discussions.” Additional comments regarding the model and log creating increased opportunities for added discussions include the following:

It was a really good platform for additional discussions…. I doubt that it stopped for what was written on there, but it sort of opened the doors to a lot of other discussions of things. (I3) (This statement was made in the conjoint interview and S3 agreed with it saying, “Yeah, it did definitely.”)

I think just talking about the children we were working with and things, that maybe I6 could have done differently and just her perceptions of things, I think the communication was greater. (S6)

It appears that for some supervisors (4 out of 6) and some interns (4 out of 5), use of the model and log created opportunities for more discussions, which were focused on specific topics, and were of greater depth.
Value of the log as a record keeping tool. Because the interns recorded on their logs a description of the activities they had engaged in as well as questions, concerns, strengths, and areas of improvement, the log served as a comprehensive record of their experiences. Themes that emerged in this category include participants feeling that the log helped them to track what was missing in the interns’ internship experiences, that many experiences would not have been remembered if they had not been recorded, that the log serves as a visual tracking tool, and that some topics would not have been discussed if they had not been written down.

Seven of the participants noted that the log was valuable as a tool to keep track of what was missing in the interns’ experiences, highlighting the areas in which more exposure was needed (I2, S3, S4, I4, S5, I5, S6). I2, S5, and I5 shared the following:

If I didn’t do something the other week, I kind of put that all into next week. So it kind of became like a time table or like a calendar. Last time I didn’t do a systematic thing so I want to include it in the next week. (I2)

It provided more opportunity for noticing specific areas in which one might want to gain more experience or one might want to expand some of their activities. (S3)

I think probably one of the largest benefits to this again is just the written visual piece of information that helps you to track and then identify again where the needs may or may not be ... any kind of check list ... to make sure you don’t miss any specific components ... there’s no second guessing of what we want to make sure we cover in that time. (S5)

... it has documentation of what I’ve done and like I told you, it also said what I didn’t do. (I5)

I think maybe something that’s interesting from doing this is noticing, say several weeks in a row you don’t have anything in the Leadership area, maybe you want to take a look at that and say, “Hmm, how could I be addressing this area?” (I6)

On a similar note, I2 pointed out that his log helped him to notice where he needed to improve:
I think that the good part of it is how you make in writing to yourself, to see where you need to improve. This actually helped me to kind of look into myself and say, “This is where I need to do better, this is where I need to improve. And by writing it down, I kept it very visible” (I2)

Four participants (S1, I2, I4/6, I5) commented on the fact that it is hard to remember everything when it is not written down. As noted in an earlier section reporting on participants’ answers to the researcher’s first individual interview question regarding their overall experience, S1’s first response included mention of difficulties remembering everything that is done during the internship experience. I5 made note of the same issue stating, “I would have forgotten a lot of the things.” I6 also observed, “… if you are trying to remember it … my memory is not that great a tool.” The logs served as a record of the internship activities.

Several participants pointed out the benefits of having a visual tool to which they could refer. In the conjoint interview, S5 referred to the log as a “visual tracking record.” I5 agreed with this description. S1 stated, “I liked it because it’s a running record, you could actually see, even from day one, what we actually did…. I think because there was a document that you could go back to and take a look.” I2 and I5 both referred to their logs several times as “documentation” of their activities and I4 noted, “I think it allowed me to keep much closer track of my activities.”

Several participants noted that the log provided information that prompted conversations during supervision that would not have occurred without this written record.

… if I wouldn’t have read his log, I wouldn’t have noticed that he had met with the student; then we wouldn’t have discussed what he did and so that would have been just lost. (S2)
I know some of the things that we discussed during this, had we not been doing this (referring to use of the model and log) there are conversations that would never have occurred. And so, I think it is a really good learning tool. (I6)

In another example illustrating this theme, S1 related an experience where I1, who was at her site just 1 day a week, had observed her supervisor administering a suicide assessment to a student. The intern, not being at this site the following day, missed some of the activities surrounding the resolution of this case and recorded her questions on her log, prompting a clarifying discussion with her supervisor. S1 described this scenario in the conjoint interview.

... to see the whole picture of it because she was involved in part of it—where it might be a serious topic like suicidal ideation. She saw one piece of it and well then there was what happened as a result, what was the outcome of that. And so I think that was more of a relief you know for her but had it not been written down and had we not discussed it, it might not have been addressed ... (S1)

On hearing this story retold, I1 agreed, stating that the conversation that occurred in supervision related to this incident helped her to “tie the pieces together.” It appears that recording experiences on paper increases the chance that they will be addressed in a supervision session. S2 stated it well: “It’s just like anything else—if you write things down, then you’re going to pay more attention to them” and “Without any log, then we would really have been hit and miss to discuss things.”

*Added structure to the supervision experience.* In their initial training sessions, the supervisors and their interns were asked to refer to the interns’ logs during their supervision sessions. In this way, the log served to structure their sessions because they used it as a focus for their conversations. All of the supervisors and three of the five interns mentioned that the use of the model and log added some structure to the supervision process in a positive way. S1 stated that she thought the process was “more
structured” and that this structure, “led I1 to follow the model and write things down and then we could meet and discuss it.” S3 described use of the model and log as providing a “structured conversation” and a “structured learning experience” and that “… to put some structure to and some expectations and accountability on the supervisory end of things is a fair thing to do.” S3 also noted that the structure provided her with a sense that she was serving effectively in her role as supervisor. She stated, “Just the structure, the increased structure, that helps me because then I know that I am tackling what you (referring to the university requirements for site supervisors) are looking for.” S2 indicated that the structure of the model and log helped his intern to “think about what he was doing…. putting it in a more organized fashion, categorizing it” which S2 felt “is a valuable thing for an intern to do.”

Four participants commented on the structure they felt was added to the formal supervision meetings and the conversations which occurred within those meetings. As noted in an earlier section on participants’ first responses to their overall experience, S3 emphasized that she appreciated the structure that was added to their meetings and conversations. She called the log a “communication log” which she felt “provided a lot of good reflection and structure.” I3 agreed noting that it added a “guided feeling” and that it was a “good guide to our discussions.” Other comments include the following:

We were able to get through our meetings in a half hour, no problem. It wasn’t too much…. The fact that it was structured in this way, and the fact that our conversations were structured kind of giving one description or thing after the next, it really allowed us to do a lot of contemplating and pontificating and that was I thought very, very good. (S3)

In the beginning we started without the log and so we built in that time at the end of the day to debrief. And that’s exactly what it was: talking about what happened throughout the day, what kind of experiences she had had, how they might be
better, how things occur in each of the different buildings. However, when we put the log in place, not only did we debrief but we were more focused on how we debriefed.... Because when you are just talking, it is easy to get sidetracked, go from one topic to the next, and you don’t really know if you’ve thoroughly completed that topic.... my intern and I both discovered that completing the log daily, weekly improved our thought processes and helped to focus our discussion on the various aspects of school counseling. (S4)

I guess the biggest benefit I saw to it was that when we could grab that time to formally sit down, it provided a lot of structure to it.... again it’s like a prop that you can follow to make sure again that you hit all of the different systems.... I think the greatest benefit to that form is again the structure and the efficiency it can provide in a formal supervision setting. (S5)

These participants seem to indicate that use of the model and log in the formal supervision sessions provided a protocol to follow which they found to be efficient and focused.

Both S3 and S4 mentioned that use of the model and log provided a structure to the way that their interns approached their activities throughout the days and weeks. S3 stated that “... it also organized I3’s time” noting that there was a “concreteness to her experience” as she determined from the log and their supervision discussions where she needed to focus her time. S3 also mentioned, “It helped me think of our environment here” as she determined how best to structure I3’s day. S3 stated that “just having that structure” was helpful as she planned what I3 would be involved in. S4 also observed the following, “... when we began to use the log and we had the feedback from the log” she was better able to “take feedback from her (I4) and from that, then I will continue to mold her experience.”

Several participants alluded to the fact that the structure of using the model and log contributed to a sense of viewing their experience as a whole.
I think the big difference was in my other supervision sites, we would sit down and talk also, but it was more choppy and this was more ... I want to say like holistic... as far as pulling everything together as a whole rather than looking at individual activities.... at my other sites we would talk about like just the small tasks, whereas here we would take all the different things that we had done, all the different tasks and I guess we would just look at a larger understanding of it. (II)

Both I3 and S6 made similar comments regarding the value of the structure. Their comments are, respectively, “I think that it was helpful, kind of pulling it together” and “Looking back and putting it all together at the end and going over it.” For these participants it appears that the model and log served as a tool to help them make sense of the multiple tasks and experiences that the interns were involved in during their internships.

**Vehicle for interns to ask and receive answers to their questions.** All of the interns and three of the six supervisors (S1, S3, S5) referred to increased opportunities for interns to ask questions and/or obtain answers to their questions due to the use of the model and log. Some of the intern comments are as follows:

I think I asked probably more questions due to the log because after sitting down and thinking OK what did I do that day and reflecting on what I did, it made me think of more questions I just had in general for S1 to ask. The thing I liked the best is the “understanding from supervision” because it forced me to ask S1 about things I was uncertain about. And maybe before I would have just thrown some different questions off. Whereas the log actually forced me to ask her about it because things that I maybe didn’t see as real important but then after asking her I gained a lot more understanding then if I hadn’t asked. (II)

I mean I might have had a question in passing but I’m not sure we would have really sat down and addressed it and really talked about it. (I4)

Well, there were a lot of things that were different about this age level compared to the high school. I was able to have a better understanding because I asked a lot more questions about why things were done differently here or why do you do this in this way, or why don’t you do this. (I6)
Several areas on page two of the log referred to activities that interns would not normally be involved in, meaning that interns would do more observing of their supervisors as the supervisors engaged in these activities. I3 remarked that she appreciated the opportunity to ask “questions that helped facilitate conversations but understanding in the areas that I am not directly involved in, to make sure I am understanding those correctly.” I5 noted that in comparison to times when the log was not used in their supervision sessions, her questions prompted her supervisor to give her more feedback.

Several supervisors also commented on the opportunity that the use of the model and log offered for interns to ask questions. S1 felt that the opportunity to ask questions allowed the intern to gain a more thorough understanding of her experiences. She pointed out:

... after she wrote it in and going back we were like “what was the purpose of that?” and “why do we have to do it?” It kind of created a better understanding of how you get from point A to point B and you know bridging the gap … (S1)

S3 reported:

I think it really is thorough and I appreciate that. It provided a lot of opportunity to be able to answer questions, for her to put down questions once she had them. It made someone think. It made the intern think about “How I could have done things differently?” (S3)

S5 observed that use of the model and log is beneficial to interns “initially” as they “don’t always know what to ask.”

It is important that interns feel comfortable asking questions of their supervisors. These participants’ responses indicate that use of the model and log may make it more likely that interns will ask questions and that their supervisors will provide answers to these questions. This may be due to the fact that the log is structured in such a way that
asking questions and having the supervisor answer them becomes the norm, thus making it an expectation of the supervisory experience.

*Encouraged formal supervision sessions to occur.* Four of the six supervisors (S1, S2, S3, S5) and four of the five interns (I1, I2, I3, I5) indicated that use of the model and log encouraged formal supervision sessions to occur. All of these participants also commented on the time constraints inherent in the daily schedule of school counselors making formal, “sit down” supervision sessions difficult to accomplish. Some of these comments include:

Well, probably the one thing is that it is hard to find time to sit down.... now that these people (interns) are involved in the school and I have my things that I have to get done, and you know it’s become more and more difficult to find ten minutes to sit down and say, “OK, we’re going to stop here and discuss what you’ve done.” (S2)

Yes, there are times when we are going to meet and then one of my students has a crisis and then we don’t get to it. (I2)

It was very difficult to, because ... they’ve really fragmented and reduced counseling services here too. I’m three days a week but it’s still the full time job you know, it doesn’t stop. So, it’s always playing catch up. We have a limited amount of time together ... and you’re constantly multitasking. We haven’t had a lot of time to talk in the last couple of weeks alone.... You are often pulled in several directions at one time and you have to kind of triage. So there have been times when we’ve said that we’re going to meet at this time and of course, in the order of priority you can’t do that ... I’m hoping that she can appreciate the fact that as much as you try to structure that formal supervision in; it’s very, very difficult. (S5)

S3 commented that although she wanted to provide the formal supervision sessions and she believed that her intern deserved “to have a weekly session,” due to “busyness and multitasking” and “the scatteredness” it didn’t always happen.

Several supervisors appeared regretful about not providing more to their interns in this area. S1 stated, “I think we needed to carve in a time within each day to go over it a
little more thoroughly.” S2, whose intern would be with him for several more weeks, remarked in the conjoint interview:

We definitely need to be more consistent on that (meeting weekly). But I think we need to do it. I think you and I (looking at I2) both feel that it’s valuable. I’m not saying that we neglected it, but I’m saying that we need to be more consistent throughout the rest of his internship. (S2)

As noted above, four of the six supervisors (S1, S2, S3, S5) and four of the five interns (I1, I2, I3, I5) found that in spite of the time constraints that seem apparent for school counselors and their interns in the school setting, use of the model and log encouraged more frequent formal supervision meetings. As noted in the previous section on participants’ first reaction to the question regarding their overall experience, I1 found that “the log actually made us sit down more” as opposed to what her supervisor (S1) termed as “on the fly” supervision. For I2, writing things down in particular boxes appears to have prompted a meeting. He stated the following:

... especially in the questions, concerns, and areas for improvement, every time I write something different on that section then I had to meet with him and then we would brainstorm and he would give me feedback. (I2)

S3 attributed the fact that they met weekly to the structure the model and log provided, noting that without it they would not have processed her experiences regularly. She stated:

... but when you have a structured situation like this, you make time for it to happen and I think that it is a very, very fair accountability piece that needs to be a requirement for supervisors. Like I said it’s a privilege and I think that we’re giving you your due time, so you’re not walking away from this experience going, “OK they kind of let me do whatever, and then they didn’t have time to go over it.” I just don’t think that that’s a thorough or fair way to proceed, and that’s the way it probably would have gone had we not had this tool.
I3 was not sure which variable to attribute the more frequent formal supervision sessions to. She noted:

I’m not sure if it’s the log or participating in research—they kind of forced us to, you know, be more conscientious I guess, in setting aside specific time. (I3)

When I5, who noted difficulties getting her supervisor to meet with her for formal supervision sessions, was asked if she thought the logs prompted her supervisor to meet with her for the few times that they had met, she replied, “Yeah, because really we haven’t met since.” She elaborated further on her situation after the study was completed and she was still working at her site, stating:

I mean there might be like ten minutes here or ten minutes there, but we haven’t actually sat down to have a good long talk about what I have been doing. It’s like a quick, “well, this is who I work with or this is what their thing is” and that’s it. (I5)

It appears from these participants’ comments, that finding time for formal supervision is a distinct problem in the school setting and that participation with a model and log such as the one used in this study, could encourage more frequent formal supervision meetings. One of the interns, I1, thought it would be helpful for all interns stating, “I think it’s a good idea to have students fill these out, just so they do get that sit down time.” It is also possible that for supervisors who feel less than confident regarding their supervisory skills, this increased pressure to meet for formal supervision sessions could add to their sense of inadequacy, adding one more thing that they feel they cannot do well.

Assisting supervisors to process intern strengths and weaknesses. Four supervisors (S2, S3, S4, S6) and one intern (I6) mentioned that using the model and log helped or could potentially help in the processing of intern weaknesses. S2 noted that
talking with an intern about a weakness would be difficult for him, stating, "... my personality, that would be difficult to discuss with them." He went on to say,

... at least there's an opportunity to bring it up and talk about it (using the model and log)... I would probably do this with J2 because he and I have developed a really good relationship. I could tell him, "You could have done better if you would have said this." ... I think it would provide more opportunity just to have that kind of discussion if it needs to be had. (S2)

Referring to intern weaknesses, S3 observed that the use of the model and log, "allows for adjustments." S3 felt that, "Sometimes I didn't know I didn't understand because I didn't know it." She stated that in going over her log in supervision, "... gave me a chance to process those (weak areas) which, hopefully, then on future ones (logs), then became strengths." In a written communication, S4 mentioned that the log helped her be more observant, stating, "I believe that completing the log gave me additional insight into supervising the internship. I was able to see areas of weakness and areas of repetition."

S6 expressed surprise that the log was able to help her observe more readily the areas that she was weaker in or, "that she felt weaker in." Had these weaknesses not been noted on the log, S6 felt they may not have been addressed. S6 also commented on the discussions in supervision sessions related to her weaknesses, giving an example of one such discussion which seemed to make an impression on her.

We talked about things that I was good at and things that I needed to work on. I know that there was one level and the students noticed my facial expressions, so S6 said, "You're showing facial expressions." So it's like, I didn't know I did that. I always thought I was pretty neutral. It was maybe surprising for me to hear the things out of those mouths of kids that age. So I was surprised. So I had to be really careful about that afterwards. It's like then it was something that we addressed and that I tried to work on through here (the log). (I6)

I6 also commented on the fact that, had she not been using the log, she would not have examined as closely her areas of weakness.
I think it made me take a hard look at how we did things that I would not have done otherwise. I mean I think without that, if you (her supervisor) would have said I was doing OK, I would have just said OK. This way I had to evaluate myself which is hard to do and I tried to be brutally honest about it all and I think that it gave me a more in-depth evaluative look at the whole process. (I6)

Two supervisors noted that the model and log were particularly helpful when working with interns without teaching backgrounds. S1 stated, “... if they have never been in the classroom, I think they might not understand... the structure ... the flexibility of the teacher and even motivating the kids.” When asked if she felt that using the model and log had helped her facilitate growth in this area with her intern she responded:

Yes, definitely. We had to change, even as a counselor, if things don’t work the first time in getting the ideas across (during a classroom lesson) to the students. I think she kind of learned from modeling. Ok now we need to create a visual because what we were giving them was too abstract.... how to redo a lesson that really didn’t come across as well as you planned it. (S1)

S3 also noted that using the log could help point out for interns without teaching experience that there may be a “need to probably get in the classroom more and be able to do the classroom management and get over that hurdle.”

Three of the five interns (I1, I2, I3) and one supervisor (S3) pointed out that using the model and log was helpful to the intern in identifying their strengths, something that interns might not normally do without a prompt of some sort. Several interns felt that the focus on the strengths category was a confidence builder.

I mean the strengths category, that's important for anyone to kind of try to focus on your strengths because I can see, I don’t know, I get down on myself in lots of instances. Just because that’s like a learning process and I feel like I’m not doing as well as I always would like to, so the strength category was nice just to give myself a boost. (I1)

I found it helpful (writing down his strengths). Because many times I concentrated on my weaknesses and questions. So sometimes it was good to go back and say this is where I do well. It's kind of a boost to my confidence. (I2)
I think the strengths for me was more of a reinforcement. (I3)

One of the supervisors also commented on the value of the log as a tool to focus on the intern's strengths as well as their weaknesses. She stated:

It is good to look at the strengths though too. It's good for you to say, "Well, I spoke very clearly and that was good and I was able to present this material and it didn't intimidate me like I thought it was going to" or I really enjoyed this and learning things about yourself. So, it offers a venue for reflecting on the positives. (S3)

Because the log provides a place for interns to record both their strengths and the areas where they feel they need to improve, it offers supervisor/intern pairs the opportunity to focus on both the positives and the negatives of interns' developmental growth. This process has the potential to provide interns with a well rounded supervisory experience which includes more specific and targeted feedback.

*Opportunities for more intern input and sharing.* Participants S1, I3, S4, S6, and I6 all indicated that use of the model and log seemed to encourage more intern input and sharing. S1 appreciated this piece stating,

I think she (I1) had time to reflect on it and kind of put her input into it. So I think ... her own input. I think that was the piece that was always missing, is the intern's input. (S1)

It was also noted by several participants that the model and log allowed the intern to share thoughts and feelings that might have been difficult to share without that structure in place.

Because I think that sometimes people aren't going to state that their feelings as much because they want to be on top of things. (S1)

I3 confirmed this sentiment. She shared the following:
I liked that it helped me make it so that you could understand me a little bit too because it’s hard for me to walk in here and say, “Here’s what I’m about.” But through that (the log) it was easier for you to see both things that I didn’t necessarily feel were strengths or things that were going on in my personal life that were just pressing in on me at one point. It gave a good venue for that that otherwise I think could have been hard to. I would have kept it and I wouldn’t have shared it and then I don’t know what she would be thinking and this way I kind of just put it out there. (I3)

This same intern shared that a classmate in her group supervision at the university had expressed fears about sharing things with his supervisor. I3 stated, “I don’t feel that way with S3…. if something is not like I would like it to be or if I’m weak at something I don’t have a problem with saying, ‘This is where I’m at.’” This intern also stated:

… when we had to sit down, I think she learned a lot about me by reading through this (the log). I learned a lot about me! By putting it out there, it helped her understand where I feel confident, where I don’t feel confident in terms of the kinds of things she might want me to do while I am here. (I3)

S1 felt some surprise in reading II’s log as she discovered the intern’s concerns that she had not known about. II shared the following: “I was actually reading this morning (II’s log). I didn’t really understand … and then I read some of her intrapersonal comments and I thought ‘Wow, she’s really concerned about being there a little late’ and so it kind of let me understand.”

S4 describes below the difference between her supervision sessions with I4 before use of the log and after using the log, pointing out again, that the intern’s thoughts and feelings were shared with the log, that were not shared without it.

As I said, you know, in the beginning, I had my idea of what needed to be done and what kind of experiences I wanted her to have and we just discussed it at the end of the day. And then as she began to fill out the logs, she obviously put down a lot of the things that we discussed but she included on the log some of her personal thoughts that she hadn’t shared with me before. So then when we took the logs and we sat down together and I read across and we talked and looked at them, it gave me much better insight into how she was thinking and how the
different responsibilities that I had given her, what she was thinking about them, whether she was thinking they were good, they were bad, or “I would do this different.” (S4)

S6 made note of the fact that the log provided her opportunities to correct misunderstandings on the part of the intern that she would not have realized existed had they not been shared on her log. She stated, “... and maybe she misinterpreted things and so we could talk about it then.” S6 also indicated that use of the model and log kept her from misinterpreting I6 as well. In the conjoint interview she told I6:

I could see things through your eyes a little bit differently and I may have interpreted your thoughts differently than what I could see on the paper. (S6)

In comparing to past supervision experiences without the log, S6 observed, “I think you feel you have an understanding for what they’re thinking, but maybe you don’t. So, I think this helped more in that way.” Because her intern came off initially as very confident, S6 appreciated the information she gained from the logs regarding areas the intern perceived as being personal weaknesses, S6 stated, “Just something surprised me. I6 comes across as very confident and I was surprised at some of the areas that she wasn’t as confident, which I thought she would be. So, I think that was helpful.” Without the log to document this, S6 felt that she “… maybe would not have seen it as strong.”

Another type of intern sharing occurred between I6 and S6. I6 describes this below:

It was good to have her as a role model. She has 18 years of experience working with this age group which was really good for me to see. And you know, she found out some things about herself because I evaluated her through the process too. Things that I noticed that she did all the time that impressed me, you know. Maybe we wouldn’t have talked about otherwise. (I6)
When S6 was asked what it was like for her to receive that kind of feedback from an intern regarding her program and performance, she shared the following:

That was very helpful because as a counselor, I don’t have anyone to share what I am doing with or get that feeling for how things are going and to hear feedback from someone that has been in other places. That was helpful. (S6)

According to these participants, intern sharing and input is often a missing piece in internship experiences in school settings. Interns may not always feel comfortable sharing their inner thoughts and feelings, especially related to perceived areas of weakness. Such intern sharing can help the supervisor correct misinterpretations and can help to clarify misunderstandings between intern and supervisor. Additionally, use of the model and log, at least in one of the cases in this study, provided the supervisor with positive feedback about her performance and program, something the supervisor found helpful.

In summary, there were eight themes which emerged from the findings regarding the influence of the PSCSM and log on the supervisory sessions themselves. These eight themes, which have been described above include: value of the PSCSM and log as a tool for reflection, PSCSM and log encouraged more in-depth discussion, value of the PSCSM and log as a record keeping tool, use of the PSCSM and log added structure to the supervision experience, value of the PSCSM and log as a vehicle for interns to ask and receive answers to their questions, use of PSCSM and log encouraged formal supervision sessions to occur, value of the PSCSM and log in assisting supervisors to process intern strengths and weaknesses, and the PSCSM and log provided opportunities for more intern input and sharing. It appears that providing to supervisors and interns a model and log such as that described in this study, can, to some degree, influence a great
many supervisory session related factors including the depth, content, structure, and frequency of such sessions. The next sections continue to explore the influence of the PSCSM and log on supervision experiences of participants, starting with the influence on the supervisor/intern relationship.

*Influence on the Supervisor/Intern Relationship*

One of the questions which was asked of both supervisor and intern was if the use of the model and log had influenced the relationship between the pair and if so, how. All participants except one (I5) felt that the use of the model and log had positively affected the supervisor/intern relationship in some way.

The theme which surfaced the most frequently regarding the supervisor/intern relationship was that participation in the use of the PSCSM and log seemed to promote more interpersonal understanding, which in some cases seemed to lead to a closer relationship between the pair. Both S1 and S6 noted that they appreciated the opportunity the log provided to access and understand their interns’ personal thoughts and feelings. S1 noted that I1’s responses on her log gave her a better understanding regarding some of I1’s interpersonal feelings related to particular situations (i.e., feeling uncomfortable about being late). S6 appreciated getting beyond I6’s initial presentation of confidence and learning about her more personal feelings and perceived personal weaknesses. S6 stated that use of the model and log helped her to “see things a little more clearly” regarding her intern’s thoughts and feelings. I6 also felt that use of the model and log had affected their relationship. She stated, “I do because we ended up being friends.” I6 elaborated on why she believed this had occurred:
You get to know someone pretty well using this. It would be hard not to because you’re not just talking about surface things here. It goes deeper, so I think you have to go deeper in the supervisor/supervisee relationship. (I6)

The development of a closer relationship due to more interpersonal sharing seemed to be true even when the individuals had a prior relationship as was the case for S4 and I4. S4 stated:

The effect that I saw that it had was that I began to know her from a more personal level. We did have a relationship you know, I’ve been here five-and-a-half years, and she worked or subbed in the building during all of that time, in a different capacity, but it gave me much more insight into what she wants to do, what is meaningful to her. So that was very, very good for me to see that instead of just assuming. (S4)

I4 mentioned the prior relationship as well, stating, “Well, that’s hard to answer because we already had a pretty good relationship. But I think that we’ve become much closer. We’re colleagues, we’re mentor and mentee, supervisor and supervisee, but we’re also good friends now.” When asked to elaborate on how the use of the model and log facilitated their new friendship, I4 shared the following:

Because of the way that you have to address things more in-depth. You get into a lot more talking about your ... worries and concerns, you are talking about things that you believe and hold dear to your heart, things that are important to you and that’s why you’ve written about them. So, I think it gives you a real opportunity to get to know the person better. So that’s part of your personality and part of who you are. So I think it would be hard not to get to know someone better using this. (I4)

The perception that the pair had more to talk about because of the use of the model and log was another factor noted as affecting the supervisor/intern relationship. In the individual interview, S2 indicated that he doubted that the model and log had affected his relationship. However, in the conjoint interview he noted that without a log their relationship might have been similar, but that the log gave them a lot more “particular
things to discuss” and “specific examples” in which he could commend his intern when he did well. His intern agreed stating, “It kind of strengthened it (the relationship) because then we had more issues to talk about when I was logging them on a daily basis.” S3 identified some of the more specific kinds of information that use of the model and log prompted in their supervision discussions stating, “I think that always helps a relationship when you are able to spend time communicating about a common goal and a common good and so, that's really what it provided.”

Several participants (I2, S3, I3) noted that the relationship was affected due to the fact that use of the model and log encouraged the pair to meet more frequently. I2 stated that, although she felt that they would have had a good relationship anyway, (and that she did feel close to her other two supervisors at her other sites), she thought that she and S1 may have a “little bit closer relationship.” She attributed this possible increased closeness to the fact that “it (use of the model and log) forced us to sit down at points and really look at what was going on.” In regard to their relationship, S3 noted that, because she and her intern met more frequently, “I think it made it much more solid.” When asked how she felt the model and log affected her relationship with her supervisor, I3, stated, “I feel like it created a lot of the relationship that I have with her,” agreeing with S3 that the more frequent formal supervision sessions helped her supervisor understand her strengths and weaknesses better. I3 also made the following statement: “I think it was really helpful to getting the relationship started” indicating perhaps that the fact that it was an expectation that they sit down weekly to go over the log created a comfortable structure for a new relationship.
Two of the supervisors (S3, S4) commented on the aspects related to the supervisor's attitude towards the intern. S3 spoke a great deal about the "respect" she felt her intern was due and how use of the model and log provided a process that showed respect for the intern and her experience.

I think it provided, due to the format of it and the requirements of meeting weekly, it provided this, I think a level of respect that an intern should feel that is sometimes I think lacking when we get so busy and we're doing our full time job. It allowed us to slow down and focus just on her and just on her experience and I think that that is very fair because this is an additional experience to our experience here, but it is her only experience here. So, I think that that helped build that relationship, build that kind of level of respect. (S3)

S4 also alluded to interacting with her intern in a respectful manner, describing her relationship with I4 as "collegial" because of the problem solving that the two of them engaged in as they reviewed the information from I4's log.

Two participants (S5, I5) were much less enthusiastic about the effect of using the model and log on their relationship. S5 did not believe that it had affected her relationship with I5 except to possibly motivate her (S5) to be more focused in the meetings which they did have. She stated it this way:

I don't know that it would have necessarily impacted either a more positive or negative relationship. What it probably did was help I5 get me to focus on every area, because we're all over the place.

When I5 was asked if the model and log had influenced their relationship at all she stated, "I don't think it did, but I don't think it was used to its potential either." In thinking more about it, I5 did feel that there was some effect on the relationship when they did sit down for formal supervision on one occasion stating, "... that was kind of a turning point in a positive way and it really was for a few weeks." When asked more about this, she explained that she thought it was because she had been able to ask about some things that
were bothering her (i.e., lack of experiences in various areas). However, because their meetings did not continue, she felt that things had “regressed again.”

The opportunity to share on a more interpersonal level, the apparent increased time spent in “sit down” supervision sessions, and the ability to process misunderstandings and frustrations related to on-site difficulties, seems to indicate the possibility of the development of closer and more meaningful supervisor/intern relationships. It is interesting that the pair which experienced the least amount of influence on the supervisor/intern relationship was also the pair that met the least frequently. The next section explores the influence of the PSCSM and log on intern and supervisor self-efficacy, professional development, and accountability.

Influence on Supervisor/Intern Self-Efficacy/Professional Development and Accountability

In the final individual interviews, the researcher asked each of the participants if use of the model and log had affected their development as a supervisor (for supervisors) and as a school counselor (for interns). In their responses to this question, participants spoke not only about their professional development as supervisors or school counselors but also about their sense of self-efficacy related to their respective roles. Several participants also spoke about being accountable, a construct that seems to fit with dialogue related to effective practices for supervisors and school counseling interns. Reported below are findings on supervisor professional development and sense of efficacy, followed by the findings for interns regarding the same issues. The findings on the emergence of accountability through use of the model and log are reported last.
Professional development and sense of efficacy of supervisors. Each supervisor was asked the following question during the final individual interview: “Do you think the use of this model and log influenced your development as a school counselor supervisor in any way?” These findings are described below.

Three of the six supervisors (S3, S4, S6) felt that the model and log had positively influenced their development as a supervisor in that it provided them with opportunities to reflect on what they were providing to their interns and subsequently being able to modify the interns’ experiences to provide a better internship experience. S3 noted that after the supervisory conversations, she would reflect on their discussions to determine what she needed to arrange next in order to provide I3 with a good experience. S4 responded enthusiastically to the question regarding whether the use of the model and log had influenced her development and efficacy as a supervisor stating, “Absolutely!” S4 also used the feedback from the supervision sessions and the logs to help “mold her (I4) experiences.” S6 was also concerned with providing her intern with an educational and personally fulfilling experience. In answering the question regarding whether use of the model and log had affected her development as a supervisor, she stated, “I hope so. I haven’t had an intern for a few years. And my concern is meeting their needs and so that’s a question I put to I6 several times. What else can we do so that you feel you’ve had the best experience?” When asked if she felt that the model and log had helped her to accomplish this task, she stated, “Yes, I think so. Looking through the entire log I think.” S6 agreed that the log had helped her to keep track of what I6 had done and not done and that looking it over together had helped them to determine whether I6 was getting what she wanted out of the experience.
S2 also mentioned the benefit of being able to track the intern’s activities. The benefit for him however, was in being able to process these activities with I2. In response to the questions regarding development as a supervisor, I2 stated that use of the model and log might have helped him to “be a little more effective.” When asked to elaborate, he reiterated that had there been no log, he would not have known of some of I2’s activities and thus would not have been able to process these with him. He also stated, “I don’t know if I really made a big difference in him as a counselor, but just anything that we discuss in relation to his counseling is going to be helpful.” In the conjoint interview he stated that he felt that he had been “much more effective as far as helping” his supervisee.

No other themes surfaced in the findings for multiple participants regarding supervisor development, however several other individual findings are noted here. S3 spoke about an increased level of personal investment in the process, something that could influence her development as a supervisor.

I think my level of investment was increased and that is very important. I mean we are training counselors and it’s important. It’s hard. It’s very easy sometimes for internships … to become this almost a too easy thing. (S3)

S3 also talked about feeling more effective in writing I3’s final evaluation, again referring to increased investment and a potential sense of increase efficacy.

And it allowed me to feel like I had some investment in assessing. It helped me with writing her performance review. It really did, having those discussions. That was one big thing that it did really help me with, is to be able to write that up and feel that I could be very knowledgeable about what I was answering and making the narrative comments based on what we did in here. So, that was very helpful. (S3)
S4 noted that the discussions in supervision sessions regarding the ASCA domains reflected in the model and log led them into "deeper discussion" about the profession as they engaged in "problem solving" together. These discussions could help S4 to feel more effective as a supervisor as she models for her intern how to apply the ASCA model to real life situations. S5 responded to this question in the affirmative, stating that she would be more likely to "use this (log) the most of any other form." She also felt that use of the model and log had made her a more effective supervisor because it provided "that quick efficient structure to a formal supervision session."

S1 was the only supervisor who was unable to answer this question as she felt that she had not used the model and log enough to give a valid response. This may be due to the fact that her intern was on site only 1 day per week and they were unable to meet for formal supervision sessions each week.

The predominant theme that emerged in response to this question was that supervisors felt that use of the model and log had positively influenced their development as a supervisor in that it provided them with opportunities to reflect on what they were providing to their interns, allowing them to then modify the interns' activities to provide a better overall experience. Other individual responses include an increased feeling of investment in the supervision and intern evaluation process, increased discussions and real life problem solving related to the ASCA Model components, and the value added in use of the log as an efficient structure for supervision sessions. It is interesting to note that supervisor responses to this question represent a range of feelings from less than enthusiastic to very enthusiastic with about one half on one side and one half on the other.
Professional development and sense of efficacy of interns as school counselors.

Interns were asked the following question during the final individual interview, “Do you think that the use of this model and log influenced your development as a school counselor in any way?” All of the interns seemed to feel that their participation with the model and log had contributed in a positive manner to their growth as a school counselor. The opportunity to reflect on their experiences in relation to the model components, being held accountable for tracking their activities, gaining knowledge in and being challenged to engage in appropriate intern/school counseling activities, and having the opportunity to have questions answered all were cited as reasons for this professional growth and development and are elaborated on below.

Two interns (I2, I3) commented that the opportunity to reflect on their experiences influenced their development in a positive way. When asked about the influence of use of the model and log on her development as a school counselor, I1 stated, “I think to a certain extent.” She felt this to be true because she had to “reflect more so” on what she was doing, especially in the section titled “Areas of Improvement.” I3 explained that because “… there was more reflection on each piece than there would have been without this model” she could “only believe that along the line, that’s going to help me” as she evaluates her future activities based on the components of the model. I3 stated that she was developing “An ability to be more reflective about what I am doing and how it fits into that model.”

Two participants (I2, I4/6) alluded to the fact that use of the model and log challenged them in various ways, subsequently developing them as school counselors. I2 felt that use of the model and log had challenged him to be more accountable, stating that
the logging exercise helped him to "kept track" of what he did. The construct of accountability surfaced for several other participants and will be explored more fully in the next section. I4 also noted that she more than likely grew as a school counselor because of the challenge that participation in the study provided her.

I think it probably took me outside of my comfort zone a little bit too, which is always a good thing because that is how you challenge yourself. So, there is nothing wrong with that. (I4)

This is likely to be especially true for this intern as she participated in the study at two of her three sites.

Two interns (I4/6, I5) commented on the value of gaining the knowledge from the model and log regarding the appropriate activities that they should be involved in to obtain an effective internship experience. In response to the above question, I4 stated:

Well, being the over achiever that I am, it made me want to target all these areas. So, I'm sure it did help me be better in the internship and the things that I've done make me feel ready to take on a job of my own. (I4)

I5 felt similarly. Although she did not have the opportunities that I4 had at her site, she still found having the knowledge of what were appropriate internship activities to be helpful. In response to the question she stated:

Yeah, I do. I think that it helped me to see the areas to get like a good experience. Because like we take one class on school counseling, the rest is more just counseling. So to get a true idea of what experiences I should be getting here. I thought it was really good for that. (I5)

It is possible that, since I5 had not been provided with a wide range of appropriate activities to be engaged in, having this model and log may have been helpful to her, as she said to "get a good grasp of the different areas ... I need to get experience in."
I6 also agreed that she had grown as a school counselor due to her involvement with the model and log. She was not familiar with the elementary setting and because of this she stated that she “asked a lot more questions” about the way things were done. I6 felt that because she had asked so many more questions, which she felt she would not have done without the use of the model and log, the experience contributed to her growth as a school counselor.

In summary, reflection, increased challenge and accountability, knowledge of and opportunity for engagement in a variety of areas, and the opportunity to ask and get more answers to intern questions all were cited as examples of how use of the model and log positively affected intern growth and development as a school counselor. Although interns gave several examples of how their experiences with this supervision experience had contributed positively to their growth as a school counselor, it is also possible that they may not have felt comfortable saying no to this question, perhaps feeling that it would reflect badly on them.

Encouraged accountability on the part of interns and supervisors. Several participants (I2, S3, I4, S5) used the term “accountability” when describing the use of the model and log. For I2, the accountability was related to the actual recording of his activities. I2 noted that because he had to “enter more things,” it made him “more accountable.” I2 added the following, “… by logging in here, I keep track of what I did,” He also stated, “I think what this form actually did most is for accountability…. you know most guidance offices don’t keep records of what they do.” For I4, there was accountability because of the adherence to the ASCA Model, especially because of the
focus on those areas that interns might not normally engage in. When referring to her other site where she was not using the model and log she stated:

You’re not accountable. There’s nothing to account by. And this way you know, you’re looking at the ASCA Model, you’re looking at your twelve themes and when you try to relegate things to those categories, it would have been sad (at the other site). I like bringing these into it (pointing to areas not typically done by interns) too because I think it holds us more accountable for areas that maybe we normally would not think about. (I4)

From the supervisor’s perspective, S3 spoke several times in the final individual interview about the necessity and significance of holding the supervisor accountable in the supervision process. S3 pointed out strongly that an intern is “... not just here as an additional person to assist you in your work and to lighten the load.” S3 believes that the supervisor has some accountability to that intern. She stated:

... is a good accountability for supervisors because it is a privilege to be asked to supervise and it puts a structure to it so that there is some accountability on my end. Obviously there is accountability on the end of the intern because they have a program that lays out what they need to do and they’re following that but it provides that for me, I guess. More so, it provided some accountability on my end to have a greater understanding or a reminding of what’s within the program. (S4)

S3 also noted that the model and log were very “thorough” and that in comparison to other models, she felt that, “... this is more appropriate. It’s more a master’s level program (which) deems this level of accountability.” S5 mentions accountability as well, alluding to the fact that this accountability stems from the clear identification of what should be covered in the internship.

It makes us both accountable. I think it’s for both the intern and the supervisor and again, there’s no second guessing of what we want to make sure we cover in that time. (S5)

Accountability seems to mean different things to different people, ranging from the recording of what has been actually done, to the focus on obtaining experiences in the
ASCA Model components, to being accountable for providing appropriate supervision to an intern.

The above section has described findings related to the professional development and self-efficacy of supervisor and school counselor intern study participants and the influence of the model and log on their sense of accountability in their duties. The next section explores findings related to how use of the PSCSM and log trained supervisors and interns on the ASCA National Model and comprehensive school counseling programs.

Training Supervisors and Interns on the ASCA Model and Comprehensive School Counseling Programs

Using the PSCSM and log appears to have kept the ASCA National Model and the principles of comprehensive school counseling programs in the forefront of participants' thinking during supervision sessions. This focus served to train interns in how to apply these principles. Several interns commented on this phenomenon.

It made me process my experiences in terms of each of these elements (the ASCA model components). Sometimes I had something to fit and sometimes I didn’t, but I was at least thinking of what I was experiencing in each of those categories. (I3)

... they teach you that in 629 and 630, they base what they teach on ... the ASCA Model and the Michigan Comprehensive Guidance, but you go over it in class but you’re not actually using it. So this would be a really good way to learn your way around it, learn what is included in each of the categories. (I4)

... we don’t have a lot of classes in school counseling, we only have one. So, it allowed me a good visual of what I needed because I don’t really know ... I didn’t know a lot of specifics, just what I see in the school that I’m in. So, it helped me just grow my knowledge of the school counseling role. (I5)
I2 commented that the model and log covered “the basics of the ASCA model.” At one of her internship sites, I6 was not provided with a full array of comprehensive school counseling activities. Without the model and log, she states, “I would not have known what I was missing.” I3 especially appreciated learning through the use of the model and log about the roles and activities that she was not actively involved in as an intern. She noted:

At some point, I feel I’m going to have to go out and do some of those things and there’s not a real good way to gain those experiences directly. But it gave me the opportunity to process it indirectly because there was a spot to do that. Then it became conversation for us…. I’m not sure I would have paid as much attention to Management and Leadership because I’m not doing it myself. So it allowed me to process some of what she was doing that I probably will end up having to do at some point. (I3)

Several interns indicated that using the model and log built their confidence for the future. I1 liked “getting more familiar with the terms” stating that “it made me feel more confident.” I1 agreed that when others talked about the model in the future, she would have a sense of what it means, and I4 agreed that she would now have more confidence going to an interview for a school counseling position. I1 also felt that she had learned something about supervision stating, “I know that if I’m a supervisor, which I probably would hope to be sometime in the future, I’ll have a better grasp on supervising my person.”

Supervisors also seemed to gain some knowledge about comprehensive school counseling models from participation in the study. S1 observed that it kept her “more in tune with the different components” of a comprehensive model as she found herself needing to double check the categories within which her intern’s activities fell. S4 also found that she needed to keep the PSCSM information close at hand because she knew
that her intern would have questions and she “wanted to be able to help her correctly.” S5 acknowledged that use of the PSCSM helped her to know “just what needed to be done … kind of referencing the Michigan Counseling Guidance Model.”

Three of the six supervisors used this supervisory experience to help them evaluate their own school counseling programs in light of a comprehensive model. When her intern noted that there were several areas she was not getting experiences in, S3 observed, “OK, well maybe that’s an area where as a department we are light on certain areas in the Michigan model.” In her written note shared at the final interview, S4 wrote, “I see the PSCSM as a valuable tool for not only counselors and interns, but also as a tool for counselors to evaluate their programs and make suggestions for improvement.” S3 also found that the model and log provided her with an understanding of the experiences local universities want for their students at their internship sites. S3 observed the following:

I can have the Michigan Comprehensive Standards in front of me but the book is this thick (motions with her hands).... This is what our local grad programs are asking. These are the things that they are looking for.... So if that’s what they are looking for, we should mirror or at least be in the ballpark. (S3)

All of the interns and four of the six supervisors seemed to grow in their knowledge of comprehensive school counseling programs from participating in the use of the model and log. This experience seemed to provide interns with some confidence about their current practices as well as in their future endeavors. The supervisors found the experience helpful in evaluating their own programs from a comprehensive school counseling perspective. The next section will address the influence of the use of the PSCSM and log on internship difficulties and on-site problems.
Influence on Internship Difficulties and On-Site Problems

One theme that emerged from the findings is the facilitative use of the model and log in resolving difficulties that may arise during the internship. Illustrative examples are described below.

Probably the most obvious example of this phenomenon occurred with S5 and I5. As noted in a previous section, I5 reported that “my supervisor just doesn’t meet with me very much.” The study protocol requested that interns complete the log during the week, recording information in the appropriate boxes. Supervisors were to meet with their interns weekly to go over their logs during their weekly formal supervision sessions. After 6 weeks of use the researcher would interview the pair individually and conjointly about their experience using the model and log. At the 2-week phone check-in, it was clear to the researcher that I5 was feeling frustration for two reasons. First she reported that she did not have much to record on her logs because she was not being given much to do, and second, that her supervisor had not sat down to go over her logs with her as yet. By the time I met with the pair for the final individual and conjoint interviews (6 weeks later) S5 had met with I5 for a formal supervision meeting only twice, and they went over 3 weeks of logs at each sitting.

In the individual interview with I5, she made several comments regarding how the use of the model and log had possibly influenced her situation.

The good thing using the log with my supervision was that I was able to show what experiences I have or haven’t gotten. Because after the first two that I showed and I could show that I only had experiences in two areas, she made a comment like, “I’m feeling kind of guilty.” But unfortunately, it didn’t really turn into action in that I didn’t then just start doing things in the different areas. It didn’t really change. However, I was able to kind of get my point across that I
need more experience and in this way it allowed me to show her visually instead of just saying it. (I5)

Thus the log was able to document for her exactly what she was and wasn’t doing. I5 appreciated having a venue to share her frustrations. She observed:

Because I was getting so frustrated and I just didn’t really know how to approach it and so I used the log to show. It was kind of a non-confrontational way so, it wasn’t so much proving, I don’t think she was really unaware of it but I mean seeing it, I think has more of an effect. (I5)

I5 noted that she felt a positive shift in her relationship with her supervisor after one of their supervision sessions where they were able to discuss some issues.

We were able to talk about it and she saw, I kept pointing out, “I’m not getting anything in guidance curriculum.” So she seemed more open to, “OK, well how can we get you this experience?” So, I felt like it was a turning point in a positive direction…. when we could talk about it, like it was positive. But like I said, it wasn’t every week. So it (their relationship) wasn’t able to continuously grow. (I5)

I5 reported that because her situation never really changed in regards to being given a wider range of activities to engage in, she became more proactive in finding meaningful work to do while at her site.

I5 made note of another frustrating incident in which she used the model and log to help her in her interactions with her S5. In the high school, a crisis intervention was put into place when a student died. All district counselors were required to be there to assist, however S5 told I5 that she should stay at the middle school. I5 describes below her supervision session where she addressed the issue:

What I did use the log for, when that student died, I wasn’t included in the planning of what was going to happen and I almost wasn’t included in any of the things that they did. So, I kind of wrote something and then I crossed it off ... But I wrote like that I wish I could have been there…. So it kind of prodded me to ask was there a reason why I couldn’t have been there? (I5)
I5 reported that she appreciated having the opportunity to ask S5 about the situation. She stated. "But I did like that I was able to (pause) it kind of got me to ask, because I was just upset." When asked if this issue would have come up without the log, I5 stated, "It wouldn’t have, I’m sure."

It appears that for this intern, although the circumstances of her internship did not seem to change, the opportunity to express her frustrations and at least occasionally feel heard was beneficial to her in a difficult situation.

S3 found that the experience of using the model and log brought to her attention inadequacies at their site in supervisory practices. She noted:

It pointed out some inadequacies I guess I would say in the supervisory/intern (supervision process) the way that I feel about how it should be or could be here and the things that I could do to prep for that. One of the things is we got to discussing it, I3 is going to be preparing kind of an Intern for Dummies type of a handbook or whatever, more of a “From My Perspective” from an intern’s perspective coming into the building. Things that I might not think of being a veteran here. Things like “Here are the people you need to know,” “Here are the places,” “Here are the kinds of activities you could be doing,” “Here’s some ideas,” “Here’s some things I did” … that kind of spawned off of this (use of the model and log) because we’re looking at how we’re going to do things from here on out. (S3)

S4 also mentioned that use of the model and log helped to point out weaknesses in the on-site supervision program. She remarked:

And that (getting feedback from I4’s logs) in effect directed me in how to help what we should do next, weaknesses in the structure of what we were doing here. When she would say, “Oh, I didn’t have anything for this block today.” We would look at that and you know, I would think, “Well, I bet you would next time if we included an activity or responsibility for you, to give her a broader experience in counseling.” (S4)

I4, like I5, had a negative experience at one of her three internship sites. Although this was not a site at which she was using the model and log, she commented on what it
might have been like if she had participated in the study and had been using the model and logs at that site.

It was very different, very different program and I thought at different times during this process that had I been doing this project at the middle school level my experience there probably would have been a lot different. Because it would have had glaring deficiencies in things that weren’t being done at the middle school whether I was there or not. So I would have had very little activity there and it would have been like a warning sign.

I4 commented that she may have been able to address her difficulties with her supervisor through writing about them in her log and discussing them during the supervision session. Asked if she had not been involved in the study at all how this might have affected that situation, she noted, “I probably wouldn’t have thought about it that way. I wouldn’t have known what I was missing.” I4 also noted that supervision sessions with the log were helpful in resolving difficult teacher situations and “bad days.”

What do you do when, like it’s in my log, “What do you do when you have a teacher who is hostile to work with when you are trying to as a counselor advocate for a student and the student’s success and you’re butting heads with the teacher? How do you get through that?” I think it was cathartic too because it helped us through some really bad days. If she (S4) had a really bad day and was upset at the end of the day, we always had this hour at the end of the day debriefing time and we’ve used it well. (I4)

Participants used the model and log to resolve several issues including: as a venue for sharing frustrations with supervisors in a non-threatening manner, as a vehicle for pointing out what is missing in internship experiences, as a prompt for supervisors to evaluate and redesign their supervisory practices, and as a place to record personality conflicts with other school personnel, with the supervision session providing an opportunity to process difficult situations or days. It is possible that the structure of the model and log provides for a safer way for interns to address their site concerns and at the
very least provides them with an opportunity to express their frustrations and hopefully feel heard.

This concludes the first section of Part II of this chapter. Six aspects of the supervision experience were described including: study participants’ overall experience; supervision sessions; the supervisor/intern relationship; the participants’ sense of self-efficacy, professional development, and accountability as a supervisor and school counselor; training of interns and supervisors on the ASCA Model and comprehensive school counseling program; and, finally, the identification and rectification of on-site problems or difficulties in internship practices.

The second section of Part II of Chapter IV will address participants’ evaluative responses to the model and log along with their suggestions for improvements.

**Participant Evaluations of the PSCSM and Log and Suggestions for Improvements**

In the final individual interviews, participants were asked what they liked best and least about the model and the log. They were also asked for their suggestions for improvements for both. This section includes the findings for each of these areas.

**What Participants Liked Best About the PSCSM**

For several of the participants (S2, S3, I3, S4, I4) the thoroughness of the model and the inclusion of the 12 components of the model were what they liked the best. S2 noted that the liked that this model was “a little more particular.” S3 stated that this model was “much more thorough” and, as such, was “more appropriate” for a master’s level program. I3 liked that the model included “areas that I am not directly involved in.”
She is referring to the components from the ASCA model in which interns would not normally be engaged during internship experiences. She noted especially the areas of management and leadership, noting that she appreciated that I still had to look at myself in that and how I fit into those pieces. Am I understanding those pieces right because I’m not actively involved in them? Here’s what I think my supervisor is doing, here’s what I think that means.

S4 mentioned several things that she liked best about the model. One of these was similar to S3. S4 stated the following:

As I began to plan early on, I was thinking of these areas (pointing to the Delivery System) because I am very well versed in the Michigan Comprehensive Guidance. But I found that these (other eight components) were interesting and to me sometimes, these were the deeper meaning of what we were doing here. The Accountability particularly, the Leadership, and Collaboration: those are the three big ones that would pick out. (S4)

I4 also mentioned that she liked the inclusion of all 12 components. Her comments include:

I like bringing these into it (pointing to the more indirect components) too ... areas that may we normally would not think about and then when you relate that to what you did during the week, you’ll see how you touched on some of those things, maybe not really in-depth but you have touched on some of them. So I think they are important to include and think about. (I4)

In a few other instances, when asked what they liked best about the model, the participants indicated that they liked the Delivery System components. I5 indicated that she saw the Delivery System components as the “four major categories.” I6 noted that having “the four main Delivery Systems” was beneficial because they are “what most people are used to using.”

Two other participants stated that they appreciated learning and becoming more familiar with the counseling terms and fundamentals. I1 stated, “A thing I really did like
about the model was getting more familiar with the terms. I just really liked that. It made me feel more confident.” I2 liked that this model “reminds you of the fundamentals of the counseling.”

Other participants liked varied things about the model. S4 believed that what was “most important” to her were the developmental levels and that she “found that to be an important piece” which gave her a significant amount of information about where her intern was coming from as she interacted with students. S1 mentioned that she liked the “structure of it” in that it “led 11 (to) just follow the model.” S5 liked that the model provided a “written visual piece of information” that helped to keep track of what needs to occur. And finally, S6 appreciated the Intrapersonal component as she found “it was helpful just knowing a little bit more about I6.”

What Participants Liked Least About the PSCSM

Five participants, (S2, S4, S5, S6, I6) did not identify anything they did not like about the model. When asked this question some responses included, “Not really” (S2), “I’m not sure. I think it was helpful. I can’t think of any ways to improve” (S6). S4 stated, “There wasn’t anything that I didn’t like about it. I found that each piece within it was very usable and friendly to use” (S4).

Four participants mentioned things they did not like about the developmental levels component of the model. I1 noted that even though she found the developmental levels helpful in making her aware of her own strengths and weaknesses, she thought they “were just real difficult for me to determine” and she was not “sure how accurate” she was when determining the numbers she selected, stating that “It was so subjective.” Although
S3 did not identify per se any particular parts of the model that she liked least, when asked about the developmental levels, she stated that she “didn’t concentrate so much on those.” I3 also identified the developmental levels as a difficult area for her stating, “It’s not so much that I liked them least as that I found them most difficult to focus on.”

Similar to I1, she also struggled in determining how to rate herself.

You know it’s hard to rate yourself low and ... I just understand it’s a lack of experience you know but it’s hard to have a comparison whether I’m low, medium, or high. I think we tend to be harder on ourselves than other people are.... Maybe I’m doing better than I think that I am. You know, how meaningful is it then for someone else to look at? (I3)

I4 also identified ranking herself on the developmental levels as what she liked least about the model stating that “it’s hard to rate yourself.”

Two participants (S1 and I2) answered the question regarding what they liked least about the model by referring to time constraints. Since this actually pertains more to issues related to the log, this information will be shared in that section.

Although I5 did not identify specifically what she liked least about the model, in answering the question related to what she liked best, (the Delivery System components), she stated that she found the other components “kind of confusing” and that she “didn’t have much to put there” so she “didn’t like that part of it.”

Suggestions for Improvement of the PSCSM

Most participants did not comment on ways to improve the model. In responding to this question, I2 mentioned difficulties with understanding where to record her specific activities under the various model components listed on the log. She stated the following:
The model itself—I feel like it's a good kind of system to go off of. I just wish that I had more familiarity with the terms themselves. Because what I was doing ... it was nice to have those terms but I constantly had to look at them and I feel like I missed out on a lot of the different ... especially like accountability and foundation, things like that. Even though I was looking at those different terms I feel like I probably missed out (recording them) on a whole bunch of different things that we ended up doing here just because I didn’t understand some of the things clearly. (11)

This could indicate that more training is needed during the initial training session to help participants feel more comfortable with the terms and the appropriate, likely activities that would be placed in those categories.

Two participants (13, 14) suggested improvements regarding the developmental levels. 13 felt strongly that there needed to be more of a reason for including the levels. She suggested that to derive meaning from them, supervisors need to address these developmental levels in supervision or that they be used in some way to track progress.

Well, there are a lot of hoops to jump through in the program and I’m happy to jump through everyone that has meaning, but if it doesn’t have meaning, I don’t have time to bother with it. And that’s kind of how the developmental levels are for me. It felt like there was no meaning behind it so, why really is it on there at all? Don’t make me do it, or if you are going to make me do it, that’s fine, but then it has to mean something…. if no one is looking at it I guess I’m not understanding the purpose of having it on there. If the supervisor is going to look at it, or the university supervisor is going to look at it, or if there is something I need to do in terms of tracking the ups and downs or something. I guess I’m not seeing the growth by using that…. I can throw any number on there. No one is questioning what number I put on there. I’m not going back to look and reflect on any pattern of my numbers on there. (13)

Because 14 felt that it was difficult knowing how to rate herself, she suggested that “more training on rating yourself (on the development levels) would pay off.”
What Participants Liked Best About the Log

Five participants (S1, S2, I2, I5, I6) indicated that what they liked best about the log was the fact that it was a written record. S1 called it a “running record” which helped them see on a daily basis what had actually occurred. S2 appreciated best that the log helped I2 to organize and categorize what he was doing. I2 appreciated that the log was a “visible” record of the areas where he needed to improve. Both I5 and I6 appreciated that the log documented the activities that the intern had and had not been involved in. I6 observed that the log would be helpful at pointing out a pattern of missing activities over time.

I would look back at what I did that week and wonder why I hadn’t hit any of those things you know. Maybe there was something that was missing or maybe it’s something you’d want to take a look at in the future…. if you still have the same blank areas (continually) maybe you’d want to look to make sure that you are addressing everything. (I6)

Four participants (I1, I3, I4, S4) noted that they liked having the strengths category listed on the log, with some of these same participants (I3, I4) also mentioning that they appreciated having both the strengths category and the areas for improvement section. I1 noted that one of the things she liked best about the log was focusing on her strengths because it gave her “a boost.” I3 responded that what she liked most about the log was assessing her strengths, especially in those categories not normally involving interns. In the conjoint interview, I3 elaborated a little further on the strengths part of the log stating that she liked having both the strengths box and the areas for questions and concerns as it gave her more of an opportunity to grow.

I think I used the box more not just for strengths but more for the concerns, questions pieces too because that to me was a little more of the processing piece
then just being able to say what my strength is. “I did well at this but, in the process of this these three things came up for me and I didn’t know, what do I do about this, or how would I handle it.” (I3)

I4 felt similarly, stating:

I think really the most useful part for me was the strengths, what you did well and then your questions, concerns and areas for improvement. I think that’s what I liked the best because that’s where I really reflected on what I did. I think that is how you grow … looking at where your strengths are and where they aren’t and trying to improve on what you have. Even if you already have strengths in an area, it’s not saying that you can’t improve yet. So, I think this makes you think about that, think of ways that you can be better, do things better. (I4)

As a supervisor, S4 appreciated that the log did not use negative terms such as “my weaknesses” but rather used terms such as questions or concerns.

Two participants (I1, S3) responded that what they liked the most about the log was the opportunity for the intern to ask questions and to get their questions answered. I1, who also liked the strengths category, noted that the “understanding from supervision” box forced her to ask her supervisor questions that she probably would not have asked. S3 stated that she appreciated that the log provided her with opportunities to answer I3’s questions.

Other responses to this question included the following. S4 appreciated best the layout of the log noting that it was “easy to read across.” She also observed that it was an “appropriate” amount of space for intern writing noting that it made them “zero in on the most important.” S5 liked the structure the log provided to their supervision sessions, stating that it was a “prop” they could follow to made sure they “hit all of the different systems.” And lastly, S6 again noted that she liked best that it helped her understand I6’s personal feelings and reactions to her internship experiences.
What Participants Liked Least About the Log

Six participants (I1, S3, I3, S4, I4/6, S6) all mentioned formatting issues when asked what they liked least about the log. Two of the individuals (S3, I4) noted that they did not like the size of the paper (legal size) and that they would have liked 8 1/2 by 11 size paper better. S3 stated that this was "just a logistic thing" and I4 noted that it could be a problem for some interns when trying to print (although it was not for her). S4, S6 and I6 all noted difficulties with the fact that the second page of the log was laid out differently from the front side. They felt it could cause some confusion when the intern goes from filling out side one to filling out side two. I3 did not like that when she first switched to the study log from a similar log used by her university; the study log was in Excel rather than in Word. Because it was in Excel, her university supervisor could not write directly on the log and when she printed it off, longer comments were cut off. The log was eventually sent to her in MSWord; however, she did not switch over. I1, because she was only at her internship site 1 day per week, began to record more than 1 week at a time on her log. She felt that this became confusing for her in that it was not always clear as you scanned across the log which comments pertained to which activities.

I2 noted that time factors were an issue for him. In response to the question of what he liked least about the log he stated, "The only thing is the time it took. Otherwise this form is perfect." As mentioned above, I2 had also mentioned time issues when asked about his least favorite part of the model (as had S1). He noted that his previous university log, which was somewhat similar, took less time, stating, "The other one took approximately one hour but with this one it took like two hours. So it took double the
time.” I2 was quick to state the gains he had experienced however, observing “But it’s also good because it’s more stuff that I have write and keep me challenged.” When asked, he agreed that although it was time consuming, he felt that he had gained a lot from using the study log. In response to what she had liked least about the model, S1 had noted that it was difficult “just having the time.”

When asked what they liked least about the log both S5 and I5 again referred to difficulties they had with the model components listed on the second page of the log. They both mentioned appreciating the first page of the log, which included the Delivery System components. S5 stated that the components on the back page were “more introspective types of things” and that she finds it more helpful when “there is something that is more detailed and specific.” I5 stated, “I didn’t like the back. I found that hard to put things in. All these areas are obviously very important and it’s following the model but these are your main things (referring to Delivery System components).” It may not be surprising that I5 struggled to find things to write in these areas since, as she had shared earlier in her individual interview, she was not given much of a range of activities to participate in at her internship site.

S1, in response to this question, noted difficulties in knowing where to record certain activities on the log. She stated, “…sometimes the things that you do really don’t fit this supervision model at all, but yet we still have to do it because it’s the nature of our job.” S2 did not identify anything he liked least about the log stating, “I didn’t see anything that I really thought was particularly out of the way of how I thought it should be or anything detrimental about it.”
Suggestions for Improvement of the Log

Six participants (I1, I2, S3, I3, S4/I6, S6) made formatting suggestions that they thought would improve the log. To correct the problem that I1 had where she was recording several weeks on one log and finding that her comments did not match, she suggested placing dividing lines within the boxes. She also suggested making the boxes larger because she writes big and she found it difficult to fit everything in the boxes. I2 appreciated that the log was legal size (as did I4/I6); however, three participants (I2, S3, I3) suggested that a way to improve the log would be to change from legal to letter size. I2 stated that he “had trouble trying to print it.” He also felt that letter size paper was better for storing the logs in a file folder and I3 mentioned letter size would fit in a three ringed notebook better. S4, S6 and I6 all mentioned putting a bold or double line down the middle of the second page of the log to distinguish that the layout is different from the first page.

Three participants (I4, S5, I5) had suggestions related to the 12 model components. I4 found all 12 components to be valuable; however, she suggested giving those components on the second page of the log (which includes all components besides the Delivery System components) less space, stating, “Where these (ASCA components) would maybe be subcategories of the Delivery System.” S5 suggested that because the Delivery System components are, she thinks, “the most helpful,” there should be more of a focus on them in the log. She did not make any specific suggestions as to how that would look. I5 suggested that, if it were up to her, she would only include the Delivery System components on the log. She did admit that “It might be different for somebody
that had a different experience,” again referring to the fact that she was not involved in a wide variety of experiences at her internship site.

Another participant suggestion to improve the log included incorporation of an overall reflection of each of the model components as the end of the internship. S1 explained this idea further.

... sit down with her and look at each of the categories because usually I was looking at you know maybe one of the categories at a time but I think sometimes it’s good after it’s all been done, to go over it and take a look from the reflection piece of the whole part and see where she started from and where she is ending from just to see her growth. (S1)

S3 suggested that the developmental levels be recorded on the model handout as well as on the log in order to gather more progress data. She stated:

It probably would be a good idea if these were kind of consolidated. If she wasn’t just putting them down on here (on the log) but that the intern would actually put them down here (on the model) so that we could see them as a progressional type thing. I’m very visual and I think that when you can see “Wow there’s a lot of them in this area, but there’s very few in this area” or “Lots of ones in this area but a lot of threes in this area.” Then you start to really be able to visualize your strengths and know where your weaknesses or weaker areas are.

S3 seemed to believe that paying attention to the developmental levels “certainly could be helpful” and that by recording them in the suggested manner noted above, would make the developmental levels more meaningful.

In summary, this section has shared participants’ thoughts about what they liked best and least about the model and log. It also reported the findings on participants’ suggestions for ways to improve the model and the log. The following section, section three of Part II of this chapter, reports on the findings related to how participants compared their supervision experience using the model and log to other supervision experiences they have had.
Comparisons of Current Supervision Experiences to Past Supervision Experiences

Much of what participants shared regarding comparisons with past supervision experiences has already been reported in more detail in previous sections. Therefore, this section will only briefly list those areas that have already been reported, adding additional quotes only if they are not repetitions and add to the meaning. This allows for an understanding of the participants’ overall response to this question without repetition of specific quotes.

Five participants made comments regarding the use of this log compared to not having a log at all. S2 described this difference.

... now that I think about it, you know, the first couple (interns) that came through, I probably just signed a log and you know basically, I think it was more hours and I didn’t think anything of it. But now that I have been through where I’ve been actually looking at the student’s log, I don’t think I would do it without having some kind of log after this.... I do see the value of keeping a log and I probably wouldn’t have a couple of years ago before, when I first started having interns. Because we definitely discussed some things as a result of him keeping a log that we probably would not have. (S2)

When asked to compare to no log at all, I3 stated, “I would not want that” and I6 said, “I think again, it was better than not using it.” I2 and I5 felt that there were more frequent formal supervision sessions with the use of the log compared to having no log at all.

Several participants (S4, I4, I5, S6, I6) noted that more in-depth discussions occurred in this supervisory experience compared to past ones. Several participants (I1, S4, I4, I5) noted a difference in past supervision experiences related to interns asking and getting more feedback related to their questions.

S1, S3, and S4 all noted that this supervision experience differed from past experiences in that it provided structure. S3 stated that past supervision experiences were
“... so much more vague at that point. We would kind of have ‘catch up’ meetings or just kind of convene and talk for a little bit and (have) kind of ‘check-in’ meetings rather than a structured learning experience.”

S1, S4, and S6 all commented that there was more intern input with this supervision experience. I2, S3, and I4 all noted that this supervision experience held them more accountable for their activities. Compared to other supervision experiences, I4/6, S5, both felt that use of the log in this experience provided a better record keeping tool.

Several participants (I1, S4) noted that use of the model and log promoted more of a focus on the ASCA National model components. I1 stated, “We definitely looked more at the model (ASCA Model) in general. At my other sites I don’t think I even would have looked at the different aspects involved in the supervision.”

I3 and I6 both commented on the fact that use of this model and log promoted more intern reflection compared to other supervision experiences. I3 stated:

When you think about it off hand or off the cuff through your day, you kind of glance on it and maybe you won’t even come back and think about it again that day, but when you have to sit down and write about it, you are thinking about it.... I think that reflection piece is huge. Without that, I don’t know if you would look into these things like we did using this. This forces you to look at it and to talk about it, so it makes it a better experience. (I6)

I2 and I4 both noted that participating in this supervisory experience was more time consuming because of the log. I3 felt that this experience was much more thorough stating, “Comparatively, as far as the structure goes, I think that this was much more thorough.” I1 stated that it was more holistic, noting that at her other internship sites supervision felt more “choppy.”
Prior to involvement in the study, three of the five interns were using only a log tracking their time at the site. They either switched from that log before or after involvement with this study. The other two interns switched from a university log that was somewhat similar to the study. Differences between the two included the following. Their university log was one page instead of two and did not have all of the ASCA National model components represented on it. Components listed on the PSCSM which were not on their university log included: Foundation, Management, Accountability, Leadership, and Systemic Change. Their university log did include Intrapersonal, Diversity, and Interpersonal, but these areas were all included in one box at the bottom of the page under the Delivery System Components. Their university log was also on letter size paper rather than legal size. The responses of these interns and supervisors as they compared these two different supervisory experiences are reported below. Again, if specific quotations have already been reported in a previous section, they are not repeated here, although the general concept is reported again to provide an overall understanding of the differences. The information is reported by individual.

S2 did not believe there was a tremendous amount of difference between the two logs, stating that he thought that the conversations they engaged in were “a little more specific” regarding the particular things they talked about.

L2 noted that the study log was “more detailed” than his other log and that it “took more time,” which in effect made him more “accountable” as he had to “enter more things.” L2 struggled with the transition to the study log. He describes this difficulty below.
I think probably the switch over was a little hard for me at first because the other one did not ask for so much and now I was switching over to something that was taking longer. So on my first few ones I did, I didn’t put so much information and now I have it down. What I have to do is after every time I meet a student or I do something, I go and mark it down. (I2)

I2 also noted that he was trained more in the school counseling components with the new model.

I think when I compare this with my previous log is that it ... reminds you of the fundamentals of the counseling. So, at a glance every week I fill in, it kept reminding me of what all model says actually. You know, like the other one wasn’t having the accountability, you know. Every time now I am logging, you know, it keeps getting trained on the basics. (I2)

I2 did not like that the new log was so time consuming stating that “it became like I’m writing a paper.” As noted earlier though, he did feel that because he had more things to write down it kept him “challenged.” I2 also noted that how and when he filled out the study log was different from his university log.

The only way I found it easier for me to work with it was I had to keep doing it as I work. The other form I used to wait until the end of the week. Maybe because of my other commitments I end up doing so much and then so I ended having my work for the week on Friday. But with this one, I kind of kept a notebook where I wrote everyday what I am doing so I have enough material to fill the form. So I think it’s good if you are in a system sitting where you have a desk and an office and I have the time where at the end of the day or at the end of each session I would log the information. (I2)

I2 did note that having a desk and an office where he could complete his daily logging was helpful. I2 was then asked if he remembered more of his experiences using the study log, due to the differences in recording practices. He noted the following:

Actually, this form (PSCSM form) was better because you did it as you go and it had more detail in the daytime. I found so long as I didn’t, the times that I waited until the end of the week it was harder. It took more time. What did I do? And I tried to guess what I did. But if I did it every day as I went, it became better.
When asked to compare the study log to the prior university log, S3 stated that the study log was more “thorough” and “more appropriate” for a master’s level program.

S3 felt that the study log promoted more in-depth discussions than her prior university log.

Well, leading up to using this log, I had another log that I’m responsible through my courses to use that’s similar but a little bit different. It’s hard to say whether if it was because it was the beginning of the school year and it was really busy and it was really hard to carve that time out or whether it was a little more in-depth pieces in our discussions that led to some helpful direction that I could go. Whereas the other one had some of the same elements but I guess I didn’t feel it generated the same kind of discussions that we were having that were more helpful to me to get something out of our time together…. whereas the other one that we were using before that, when we did have time to sit down were a little more on the surface and not as much discussion of things for me to take away. (I3)

I3 elaborated further on the variables that she felt may have affected this difference.

So it was hard for me to separate whether it was that we felt a little more obligation to do that (meet for supervision) although it is expected through my program that I sit down and do that, but then again I don’t know if it was the time of year—at the beginning is so busy for them (school counselors). You know (whether) this form is the thing exactly, but there was a difference. Whether it was the form in addition to the fact that we felt an obligation to the research and really putting forth a little more time to it.

I3 also commented on the differences in what was included on the two logs noting that the study log motivated her to think more specifically about the ASCA Model components found on the second page of the PSCSM log.

In a previous model, everything that’s on kind of the second page, the pieces from foundation down where in one little box. I don’t know if I had a feeling of it being an afterthought, if you have something to throw in there go ahead and throw something in that little box? Where this, broken out like this I feel like it made me think about each specific piece more and sometimes I had something to put in there and sometimes I did not. But instead of “Oh, do I have something to put in that final little box?” on the other one, this one was “Do I have something specifically in this category or this category or this category?” So it made me think of my experiences in terms of these individual categories. It made me process my experiences in terms of each of those elements. Sometimes I had something that
fit and sometimes I didn’t, but I was at least thinking of what I was experiencing in each of those categories. (I3)

I3 continued using the study model and log for 9 weeks, 3 weeks beyond the study requirements. She had intended to continue using the study model for the remainder of her internship; however, she had not transitioned to the Microsoft Word version of the log and so, for “convenience” sake, she switched back to her university log. When asked what she noticed about the change back, she again noted the difference of not having the second page elements. She did note that having filled out the PSCSM log, she now felt more able to fill in the smaller box at the bottom of the university log.

I find that that the bottom little box, it’s a little more meaningful. I am a little more inclined to place things in there, add things to say, after having done this (study log) because I understand all those little pieces better that need to go in there. (I3)

As mentioned in an earlier section, I3 also liked being able to assess herself in the areas that she would not normally be directly involved in as an intern, such as management and leadership. She appreciated that it gave her an opportunity to check her understanding in those areas.

Am I seeing the whole picture? … so it helped to process some of those things that I guess I felt less directly involved in. (I3)

This concludes section three of Part II of this chapter. The findings shared included the ways in which participants compared their supervisory experience using the model and log to other supervisory experiences. The next section, section four, reports findings related to participant suggestions for counselor education programs.
Several participants (II, I4/6, I5) commented on the need for counselor educators to make programmatic changes which would encourage a more thorough understanding of the ASCA National Model. II commented that she wished her university classes would have been more thorough in covering the various components of the ASCA Model. II indicated that she struggled more with filling out her logs because her university classes had not provided a foundation in the ASCA Model components. She also wished that the university would have devoted time to teaching supervision skills within the ASCA Model.

I feel that they should have maybe not a whole class devoted to supervision but a fraction of a class devoted to supervision because I feel like it's a really important part of being a counselor because you're trying to help others. It's a part of your role to help other counselors develop and without knowing these things (ASCA components) I don't feel like you can do as good of a job at it. (II)

I4 also commented on the lack of an experiential component to her university classes in the areas of the ASCA Model and comprehensive programs. She recommended that universities include a model such as the PSCSM in internship experiences.

And you know they teach you that (ASCA Model) in 629 and 630. They base what they teach on that model, the ASCA Model or the Michigan Comprehensive Guidance, but you go over it in class but you're not actually using it. So this would be a really good way to learn your way around it, learn what is included in each of the categories.... See that's something that they (the university) could incorporate into that whole counseling program is more in-depth understanding and knowledge and use of that model. And by doing something like this in your internship, you have to use it so you're going to at least learn it enough to feel your way around it. (I4)

I5 also noted the lack of coursework at her university regarding school counseling programs in general. I6 (who is the same individual as I4) reiterated this sentiment in her
final interview at her elementary site, stating that a model and log such as the PSCSM “should be required” because interns “would have a much better internship.”

I4 also suggested that use of a model and log such as the PSCSM would be helpful in less than ideal internship sites.

And maybe this should be part of the training in becoming a counselor? Because not every internship that you’re in is going to be the caliber that I’ve had…. I have to think that this would help so that you have something better, because when that supervisor has to sit down and look at this, at where you’ve got all the blanks or where you have some big concerns, it’s right in front of their face and they’re going have to address that somehow. (I4)

These participants feel that university school counseling program should be promoting a more thorough understanding of the ASCA National Model for their school counseling students. It was also stated that use of a model and log such as the PSCSM would be beneficial to use for all internships to provide that experiential piece and to assist with less than ideal internship experiences. The next section, section five, shares participants’ thoughts about possible future uses of the PSCSM and log.

Participants’ Thoughts About Future Uses of the PSCSM

Several participants spoke about the ways that they would or could use the PSCSM and log in the future. I2 planned on continuing to use the PSCSM log even though he had completed his required weeks for the study.

S4 stated that she thought the PSCSM and log would be very beneficial for new counselors.

I liked it so much that, I felt that, especially with first years, when you are counseling, this would be wonderful to keep for yourself, just for your own reflection and for your own growth so you could see it from the beginning of the school year to the end. (S4)
I4 agreed stating that she would like to use it in her first school counseling position to be sure that she is engaging in the most appropriate activities.

And I think in a lot of ways, for a counselor, and maybe more so for me because I am just starting out and I don’t have the experience of doing it you know, I’m already thinking that I’m going to be using this book (referring to the binder with all of study materials) and I am going to be using it just to kind of keep a tab on myself to see, Am I addressing these things? Am I looking at these other issues that are still important? (I4)

Several participants (S3, S4, I6) suggested that the model and log could be used to justify school counseling programs to administrators and school boards. S3 noted that the PSCSM and log could help on-site supervisors gain insight into what university programs are looking for at their internship sites. These university requirements could also provide justification for school counselors in the provision of comprehensive programs helping school counselors to “defend their situations.” S4 commented that the log was a good way to keep track of what counselors do thereby defending their activities to others.

I know there are many different forms and many different ways to keep track of what we do with counselors to show our time that we are investing in each of the different areas, but it’s frantic in the office here. I am assuming that it is that way everywhere. And so, I think you have to zero in on one piece that will do it for you and also for your principal and your Board if necessary. And I think that this probably would be a very good piece, especially with the twelve domains. (S4)

On the same note, I6 asked,

And why couldn’t these be used to justify what you do in your job? ... If you kept a record of this and you could just reproduce them and present them to the Board ... It would give them a good idea of what’s going on and what you’re doing. (I6)

I6 also asked, “If school boards are approving essentially the Michigan Comprehensive Program, do they even know what that means? This would show them.” Thus the use of a model and log such as the PSCSM could be employed to educate administrators and school board members.
S4 asked for permission from the researcher to continue using the model and log in “her next supervising position,” another example of a future use of the model and log. She also commented that the model and log could be used by a supervisor to evaluate a program. In a written statement she noted the following:

I see the PSCSM as a valuable tool for not only counselors and interns, but also as a tool for counselors to evaluate their program and make suggestions for improvement. (14)

This section has reported the findings from participants on ways that they plan to use the PSCSM and log in the future. Supervisors and interns alike noted that the model and log would be beneficial for future new entry school counselors to track their activities, for school counselors to evaluate and defend their programs, and to educate administrators and school board members on the components of comprehensive school counseling programs.

Summary

In summary, the findings from this study regarding participants’ involvement in a supervision experience using the PSCSM and log have been reported in two major sections. Section I provided a summary of each pair, describing the demographics of the individuals as well as the school setting in which the pair were working. Compliance with the study protocol was also described for each participant as well as any pertinent contextual information, a brief description of participants’ overall response to the study, and the researcher’s impressions of the participants’ experiences.

Section II provided the results of the phenomenological data analysis at the cross-case level and has been organized into five sections. In the first section, six areas were
covered. The first section reported the findings on study participants' answers to the first individual interview question regarding what they felt about the overall experience of using this particular model and log in their supervisory practices. The researcher has suggested that these responses could be very salient as they are the first thing that came to the participants' mind when asked a general question about their overall experience. Themes that emerged included that the participants appreciated that the model and log provided a record keeping and accountability tool, structured the supervision sessions, and encouraged formal supervision sessions.

Whether the model and log had an influence on the supervision sessions themselves was the topic of the second area addressed in the first section. Use of the model and log appeared to have influenced the supervision sessions in a number of ways. First, it appears to have provided a tool that encouraged both intern and supervisor reflection. Participants reported that this reflectivity subsequently encouraged more in-depth conversations during supervision. Additionally, using the log as a record keeping tool appears to have provided participants with things to discuss during supervision that may have been omitted without such a log. The model and log also provided structure to the supervision sessions and a vehicle for interns to ask and get answers to their questions. Several participants also reported that the use of the model and log seemed to encourage formal supervision sessions to occur more frequently. Other influences on the supervision sessions included assisting supervisors in processing intern strengths and weaknesses as well as providing more opportunities for greater intern input and sharing.

The third area covered in the first section was a report of the findings related to the influence of the model and log in the supervisor/intern relationship. According to the
findings, for some participants, use of the model and log encouraged a closer supervisor intern relationship in that it promoted more interpersonal sharing on a variety of topics that may not have surfaced without the model and log. Some participants also felt that they had a closer relationship because the structure of the model and log increased the frequency of formal supervision sessions. This increased time spent together may have led these participants to share more, thus creating a closer feeling in the relationship.

Several supervisors felt that the model and log provided the intern with the “respect” (S3) that she deserved and that the relationship was more “collegial” (S4) in nature. Some participants did not feel that use of the model and log affected the supervision relationship a great deal (S5, I5), although this pair did not comply with study protocol and met for formal supervision only on two occasions, which adds interesting contextual information to this finding.

The fourth topic addressed in the first section addressed how use of the model and log influenced participants’ sense of self efficacy, professional development and accountability. The supervisor’s responses to this question were quite variable. All but one felt that use of the model and log had positively affected their development as a supervisor. Several stated that it offered a venue for reflection on intern activities which might need to be modified to provide them a better experience. Other responses included that it provided specific information and intern activities to discuss, that it created more of a sense of supervisor investment in the process, that there were deeper discussions regarding the ASCA model, and that it provided an efficient structure. Each of these ideas was offered by the supervisor as an example of how use of the model and log had helped them to develop their skills as a supervisor.
All of the interns shared that using the model and log positively influenced their development as a school counselor, citing that it provided opportunities for reflection, accountability and challenge, involvement in a wider array of activities, obtaining knowledge about appropriate school counselor activities, and asking and getting answers to their questions. It is uncertain though whether interns would have felt comfortable stating that use of the model and log did not help them to develop as a school counselor for fear of being seen as incompetent, or not wanting to disappoint the researcher.

The concept of accountability, which is closely related to efficacy and professional development, was noted by several participants as well. The model and log were seen by some as accountability tools in that they encouraged interns to record more information about the activities they were engaged in, and they promoted a focus on ASCA model components. It was also noted that this process held both supervisor and intern accountable for involvement in activities deemed appropriate for school counselors. Supervisor accountability was noted by one participant as particularly important and "owed" to the intern.

The fifth topic addressed in the first section involved the influence of the model and log on intern and supervisor training and acclimation of knowledge on the ASCA Model and comprehensive school counseling programs in general. Use of the model and log assisted interns to process their activities in light of the ASCA model and to educate them on the important model components that might be missing in their internship experience. Several interns felt that use of the model and log built their confidence for future job interviews or in opportunities to someday be a supervisor themselves, noting that familiarity with the terms would be of great assistance. Several supervisors also
found value in knowing what opportunities needed to be provided for their interns and several noted that it was helpful in evaluating their own program and supervision practices.

The sixth topic of section one focused on how the use of the model and log influenced the identification and rectification of on-site problems or difficulties in internship practices. Several interns noted the value of the model and log as a vehicle for pointing out to site supervisors where the interns were not gaining experience in appropriate school counselor related activities, thereby alleviating some intern frustration. Several supervisors stated that use of the model and log helped them to evaluate inadequacies in their school counseling programs and in the supervisory practices in their schools. Finally, it was noted that the model and log helped interns and supervisor process difficult or distressing days.

The second major section of this chapter presented findings of the cross-case analyses related to study participants’ suggestions for improvements to the model and log. Participants were asked to share what they liked most and least about the model and the log. They were also asked for their suggestions for improvement of both. In reporting on what they liked best about the model, four participants identified that they liked the addition of the ASCA components found on page two of the log. These components include all of components not related to the Delivery System (i.e., Accountability, Management, Foundation). Two participants noted that what they liked best were the Delivery System components on the first page of the log. Additional things that participants liked most about the model include that it provided familiarity with ASCA terms and taught the fundamentals of counseling, structure, an avenue to rate oneself
through the developmental levels, and that it included an interpersonal component. In reporting what they liked least about the model, three participants did not like the developmental levels, stating that it was difficult to rate themselves and that there did not appear to be much meaning they could derive from the activity. Five participants did not identify anything about the model that they liked least. Suggestions for improvements to the model included leaving off all ASCA components except for the Delivery System components, and either leaving off the developmental levels or providing more training and meaning for their use. Several participants could not think of any ways to improve the model.

In reporting on what they liked most about the log, participants noted that they liked that the log: included a section to record intern strengths, documents intern activities that are done and not done, is a good record keeping tool that helps organize and categorize intern activities and point out areas in need of improvement, provides opportunities for interns to ask questions and get answers to those questions, includes a section for recording interpersonal thoughts and feelings, and that it provides structure. Two other participants noted that they appreciated the layout of the log. When reporting on what they liked least about the log, six participants noted formatting issues. Although several participants enjoyed the space the legal sized paper allowed them, others preferred letter size to legal size. Several participants complained that it was very time-consuming (even though they found it worthwhile). Other comments included not liking the contents of the second page of the log and not always knowing where to place particular activities. One participant could not think of anything that he liked least about the log. Suggestions for improvement of the log included changing the paper size and adding a dark line down
the center of the second page to help with layout issues. Other suggestions included not having an equal focus on all 12 components and providing an overall review of the intern’s activities at the end of the internship.

Section three of this chapter included findings related to how the use of the PSCSM and log compare to other supervisory experiences. Compared to having no log at all, participants found that this log helped keep better track of intern activities, prompted the occurrence of more frequent formal supervision session, was more thorough and provided opportunities for more in-depth discussions during supervision sessions, offered interns opportunities to ask more questions and provide more intern input, provided more structure to the supervision experience and was more holistic, held participants more accountable, provided more of a focus on the ASCA National Model components, provided more intern reflection, and was more time-consuming. Four participants had used a similar model provided by the interns’ university. The university log was one page (letter size) and focused mainly on the Delivery System components of the ASCA model. Their university log included attention to Intrapersonal, Diversity, and Interpersonal, but these areas were all included in one box at the bottom of the page under the Delivery System Components. Participant comments about the differences between these two logs included that the study log was more detailed and specific; held participants more accountable; was more time-consuming; provided more training and focus on the ASCA Model and comprehensive school counseling program components; was more challenging, thorough, and appropriate for a master’s level program; encouraged more frequent formal supervision sessions; and promoted more in-depth discussions. It is important to note that some of the differences between participants’ experiences using
these two logs might be attributable more to the fact that participants felt some obligation
to the researcher to attend to and use the study log because they were a part of a research
study, as opposed to finding more value in this particular log.

Section four describes study participants' suggestions for more effective school
counselor education program practices. Three participants commented on the need for
counselor education programs to include a more thorough grounding and understanding
of the ASCA National Model. It was noted that current university classes do not cover the
ASCA Model in a manner that promotes students' ability to apply what they are learning.
A suggestion was made by one intern that university programs should require the use of a
model and log such as the one employed in this study for all internship experiences, thus
promoting additional focus on clinical application in an actual school setting. Such a
requirement could also be helpful in ameliorating difficulties at less than ideal internship
sites.

Section five identifies participants' thoughts regarding possible future uses of the
PSCSM and log. One intern expressed a desire to continue using the PSCSM log even
after the study was completed. One supervisor also asked to continue using the model and
log with future interns. Several participants spoke of the value of the use of this model
and log for entry level school counselors stating that it could help them reflect on their
work and monitor that they are involved in appropriate school counselor activities. Three
participants suggested that the model and log could be used by school counselors to
justify and defend their programs to administrators and school board members, citing that
the model and log provide documentation and clarification of what universities are
looking for as well as the particular activities that school counselors are involved in.
Finally, the PSCSM and log could be effective tools in educating school personnel and district board members in what the Michigan Comprehensive Program really means. Many school boards formally adopt this model without a clear understanding of what it should look like when implemented. The findings summarized here and detailed throughout this chapter will now be discussed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of six sections. The first section provides an overview of the key findings of the study. Section two reflects on these findings as they relate to the existing research which was described in Chapter II. Implications of these findings for the school counseling profession and recommendations for future practice are explored in section three. Section four examines the limitations of the current study and section five offers recommendations for future research. Finally, section six provides a conclusion to the study.

Overview of Key Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the supervision experiences of school counselor supervisors and their interns as they employed a developmental school counseling supervision model which incorporates aspects of the ASCA National Model. The primary goal of the study was to gain an understanding of the lived experiences of the participants in order to better comprehend how the use of the model and accompanying log impacted the supervisory process, the supervisor/supervisee relationship, and participants’ professional growth and development as supervisors (for school counselors) and as school counselors (for interns).
The major findings of this study are presented in detail in Chapter IV. Some of the key findings are described briefly below.

1. The use of the PSCSM and log influenced participants’ supervisory sessions in a variety of ways. Use of the model and log increased reflectivity of both supervisors and supervisees. Interns thought more deeply about their activities than they would have without a log, thereby deriving more meaning from their internship experiences. Supervisors reflected more on their supervision practices and their programs. This increased reflectivity led to more in-depth discussions during supervision sessions. Use of the model and log created opportunities for more discussions which were more specific and of greater depth. The log provided a valuable record-keeping tool in that it helped to track what was missing in the interns’ experiences, documented activities which may not have been remembered and consequently not discussed if they had not been recorded, and provided a good visual tracking tool. The model and log also served to structure the supervision sessions in that they helped interns to organize and categorize their activities and facilitated their ability to see these experiences more holistically, offered a protocol to guide supervision discussions, and provided a structure for how to plan interns’ activities. This structure served to help supervisors to feel more effective and efficient. Use of the model and log also provided interns more opportunities to ask and get answers to their questions. In some cases, use of the model and log increased the probability that formal supervision sessions took place, an important finding since many participants noted time constraints for formal supervision.
Use of the model and log also helped supervisors to process interns’ strengths and weaknesses mostly due to the fact that supervisors were made aware of them in reviewing their interns’ logs. The final finding regarding the influence of use of the model and log on supervision sessions was that the model and log provided opportunities for more intern input and personal sharing, often a missing piece in internship experiences. Intern sharing allowed supervisors to correct misinterpretations and clear up misunderstandings and gave interns a chance to share things they wouldn’t normally share, including providing feedback to supervisors on supervisors’ performance and program.

2. The use of the PSCSM and log positively influenced the supervisor/supervisee relationship. Closer relationships were formed due to the following factors. The use of the model and log: promoted more interpersonal understanding, which led to more in-depth discussion; gave supervisors a better understanding of where the intern felt less competent; gave the pairs more to talk about when they did meet; and encouraged more frequent formal supervision sessions, which provided the time to develop closer relationships.

3. Use of the PSCSM and log positively affected participants’ sense of self-efficacy, professional development, and accountability. Supervisors noted that the model and log were helpful in the following ways: assisting them in reflecting on and modifying intern activities to create a better internship experience, providing specific information to discuss, promoting more investment in the evaluation process and deeper discussion regarding the ASCA Model, encouraging them to be accountable in their supervisory duties,
and providing an efficient structure which helped them to feel more effective in their supervisory role. Interns also felt that use of the model and log had positively influenced their development as school counselors. They noted that use of the model and log provided opportunities for: reflection, accountability and challenge, keeping a record of and involvement in a wider array of activities, obtaining knowledge about appropriate school counselor activities with a focus on the ASCA Model, and asking and getting answers to questions.

4. Use of the model and log influenced participants’ understanding and knowledge of the ASCA National Model and of comprehensive school counseling programs in general. Supervisors and interns were forced to view and process intern activities in light of the ASCA model, consistently evaluating what important comprehensive school counseling components might be missing in interns’ experiences. This helped supervisors to evaluate their own programs and supervisory practices in light of the ASCA model. Use of the model and log helped to build intern confidence for future job interviews where knowledge of the ASCA model terms might be helpful, as well as for future positions they may hold as school counselors where they may be asked to serve as supervisors for interns.

5. Use of the model and log helped to identify and rectify on-site problems or difficulties, including pointing out deficiencies and inadequacies in school counseling programs and supervisory practices, and in helping participants to process difficult or distressing days. In one case, the intern was able to
communicate with her supervisor in a non-confrontational manner when she was not getting internship experiences in appropriate school counselor related activities, thereby alleviating some of the intern's frustrations.

6. Participants spoke about what they liked most and least about the PSCSM and log, offering their suggestions for ways the model and log could be improved. Suggestions for improvement of the model included both retaining the additional ASCA components (four participants), and removing them (two participants). All participants appreciated the inclusion of the Delivery System components on the model and log. More training on and more meaningful application of the use of the Developmental Levels was suggested. Suggestions for improving the log included changing the paper size and improving the layout of the second page.

7. After participating in the study, several participants offered suggestions for school counselor educators and their school counselor training programs. Recommendations included that a more thorough grounding and understanding of the ASCA National Model be provided during students' university training. Several participants felt that the ASCA model should be covered in university classes in a manner that promotes students' ability to apply what they are learning.

8. Several participants noted ways that they would like to use the PSCSM and log in the future. These future uses included: continuing with the use of the log at the internship site after the study was completed; use of the model and log as an entry level school counselor to encourage reflection and monitoring
of program activities; as a tool to help school counselors defend and justify their programs as well as to educate administration and school board members on comprehensive school counseling programs; and for one of the supervisors, as a tool to continue using when supervising future interns.

In the next section, the above findings are discussed in the context of the research and literature on supervision in the school setting, which was presented in Chapter II.

Discussion of Key Findings

As noted in Chapter II, there is a paucity of research related to the internship experience and the clinical supervision of school counselor interns (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Jackson et al., 2002; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Roberts & Borders, 1994), with little practical information available for school counselor supervisors (Getz, 1999; Goodyear & Bernard, 1998; Studer, 2005). This qualitative study is an attempt to begin to fill this void by providing the professional field of school counseling with important information regarding school counseling supervision practices.

There has also been a lack of in-depth models and theories of supervision which apply directly to school counselors and which take into account the uniqueness of counseling in the school setting including the diverse roles, complex tasks, and multiple systems of individuals with which school counselors interact (Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Herlihy et al., 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001; Studer, 2005; Wood & Rayle, 2006). Because of the unique setting within which school counselors operate, the literature calls for a supervision model that is “clear, concise, practical, and provides concrete direction regarding their (school counselor) roles and the supervision process” (Nelson & Johnson,
1999, p. 91). The ASCA National Model and the ASCA Standards have been recommended as structures for the supervision of school counseling interns (Murphy & Kaffenger, 2007; Perusse et al., 2001). Such models have been few and, in fact, nonexistent until very recently (Murphy & Kaffenger, 2007; Studer & Oberman, 2006; Wood & Rayle, 2006). The model presented in this study incorporates important aspects of the ASCA National Model into a supervision model for school counselor supervisors. This developmental school supervision model provides an up-to-date framework that encourages the focus on best practice activities.

*Influence of the PSCSM and Log on Supervision Sessions and Supervisor/Intern Relationship*

The findings from this study indicate that there was a positive influence of the use of the model and log on the formal supervision sessions as well as on the supervisor/supervisee relationship. Several of these specific findings are discussed in this section in the context of the professional literature.

*Increased Self-Reflection*

All study participants noted benefits from the increased use of reflection which occurred for both interns and supervisors. As noted in Chapter II, the research supports the benefits of reflection to one's professional development in the fields of psychology and counseling (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993; Shapiro & Reiff, 1993: Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992), and its use has also been suggested for supervision in the school setting (Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Studer, 2005). Both oral and written self-reflection
have been encouraged (Peterson et al., 2004), practices that are tapped with the PSCSM and log since supervisees reflect on their activities in writing prior to discussing them orally with their supervisors during formal supervision. Skovholt and Ronnestad (1992) recommend three essential elements for continuous professional reflection including: intense professional and personal experiences; an open and supportive work environment that values an open searching process as opposed to the promotion of narrow, fixed views; and opportunities for a reflective stance which includes time and energy spent processing, both alone and with others, these intense experiences. In the current study, in most cases, interns were involved in intense professional and personal experiences, which they spent time and energy processing through the completion of the log. This processing occurred alone and with their supervisors. Also, in all pairs except for one, the supervisors appeared to provide the open and supportive work environment described as necessary by Skovholt and Ronnestad for continuous professional reflection to occur. It is likely that this increased reflectivity added to the more in-depth conversations that all but two participants indicated occurred due to the use of the model and log. As noted in Chapter II, good communication skills are a key supervisor competency (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Borders & Leddick, 1987). The time spent in reflection and in-depth conversation is likely to assist supervisors in their ability to communicate well with their interns.

*Structured Supervision Sessions*

Another reported positive influence on the supervision sessions, noted by all of the supervisors and three out of five of the interns, was the structure that the model and
log added to the supervision experience. Peterson and Deuschle (2006) found that well-structured supervision sessions help supervisors feel more comfortable, competent, and purposeful. The findings from this current study corroborate this research in that several supervisors indicated that the structure of the model and log helped them to feel more effective as supervisors and that their supervision sessions were more efficient. Peterson and Deuschle also recommend that campus supervisors provide site supervisors with clear expectations, guidelines, support and structure, including specific suggestions for their weekly supervision meetings with the intern. The PSCSM and log provide these clear expectations, guidelines, structure and specific suggestions, and supervisors in the current study appreciated the structure that was supplied (which guided their supervisory discussions) and knowing what needed to be covered in supervision sessions.

Additionally, Magnuson et al. (2000) note that supervisees see supervision sessions as unbalanced when the focus on elements of the supervisory experience is seen as too little or too much. Participants in this study appreciated that the model and log organized and guided their discussions, improved their thought processes, and helped them to cover all the necessary areas. There is a sense from study participants’ comments that the model and log served to provide a balance to their discussions. Use of the log as a record keeping tool, another benefit noted by all but one participant, also speaks to the beneficial structure provided by the model and log. Participants appreciated that the log was a visual tracking tool without which they may have forgotten or lost many of the activities they had engaged in since they would not have been written down. This ability to track activities added to the structure of the supervision sessions.
Identifying and Responding to Intern Needs

In poor supervision experiences, supervisees report that supervisors misjudge or fail to recognize or respond sufficiently to their changing needs (Magnuson et al., 2000; Najavits & Strupp, 1994). Several findings from this study demonstrate that use of the PSCSM and log can assist supervisors in recognizing and responding to interns’ needs. First, in the current study, interns felt they had more opportunities to ask questions and to obtain answers to their questions, due perhaps to the fact that the log is structured in such a way as to make the asking and answering of questions an expected norm of the supervisory experience. In answering more intern questions, supervisors may be more likely to recognize and respond to intern needs as the interns voice their questions and concerns. This is especially important since trainees tend not to communicate their needs adequately (Barrett & Barber, 2005; Reising & Daniels, 1983). Secondly, participants in the current study found that use of the model and log helped in the processing of intern weaknesses and assisted in making supervisors aware of where interns felt they had personal weaknesses. Several supervisors noted that use of the model and log helped them in the supervision of interns who had no prior teaching experience in school settings. The PSCSM and log provide for identification and processing of intern strengths as well as weaknesses. The professional literature indicates that in poor supervision experiences, supervisees report that their supervisors disregard their strengths (Wulf & Nelson, 2000). In the current study, three of the five interns and one supervisor noted that using the model and log was helpful in the identification of intern strengths, helping interns to feel more confident.
Encouraged More Frequent Supervision Sessions

Eight of 11 participants reported that use of the model and log encouraged more frequent formal supervision sessions. This is an important finding since all of these participants also noted difficulties with time constraints which made it difficult for these sessions to take place. Time constraints related to supervision practices in the school setting are noted in the literature and described in Chapter II (Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Herlily et al., 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001). Openness and accessibility on the part of the supervisor is recommended in the literature as a key supervisor competency (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Borders & Leddick, 1987) as is weekly, face-to-face supervision sessions which can serve to relieve supervisor anxiety and resolve current concerns (CACREP, 2009; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Peterson & Deuschle, 2006). Findings from this study may indicate that use of a model and log such as the one employed here may serve to promote more frequent formal supervision sessions. When supervisors appear to be too busy to mentor them, supervisees feel let down and unsupported (Nelson & Friedlander, 2001). This finding was substantiated in the current study when one of the interns could not get her supervisor to meet with her, leaving her feeling disappointed and frustrated.

Increased Sharing

Findings from the current study indicate that use of the model and log increased intern input and sharing. The interns shared things they would not normally have shared, including having difficult conversations with their supervisors about internship problems.
and difficulties. One pair noted that the use of the model and log helped them process
difficult and distressing days. The process just described sounds similar to O’Byrne and
Rosenberg’s (1998) sociocultural approach to supervision where supervisors and
supervisees engage in a continuing dialogue to negotiate meaning and co-construct their
understandings of professional issues. This is an important approach, since as Woodside
et al. (2009) found, when such a negotiation and co-construction of meaning is not able to
occur, interns are impeded in their ability to perform their duties with confidence. An
additional indication of the presence of this sociocultural approach to supervision is the
occurrence of more in-depth discussions (as noted earlier).

Findings from the study indicate that use of the model and log facilitated a closer
supervisor/supervisee relationship. This was due mainly to factors mentioned already in
this section, including more intern sharing, more in-depth conversations, the occurrence
of more frequent formal supervision sessions, better supervisor understanding of where
interns felt personally weak, and more sharing on a variety of topics that may not have
surfaced without the use of the model and log. This is an important finding since, as was
described in Chapter II, the school counselor supervisor is, in all probability, the most
critical factor in the supervisees’ internship experience (Magnuson et al., 2004).

Influence of PSCSM and Log on Supervisor/Intern Professional Development

None of the six supervisors in the current study had received formal supervision
training; however, three reported that they had “done some reading” on their own. This is
consistent with what is reported in the professional literature regarding lack of
supervision training for practicing school counselors (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Herlihy et
Supervision training for school counselors has been clearly called for in the literature (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Crespi, 2003; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Herlihy et al., 2002; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Miller & Dollarhide, 2006) especially in light of the broad scope of responsibilities and multiple roles in which school counselors are engaged (Magnuson et al., 2004). A significant finding of the current study is that all of the supervisors except one felt that use of the model and log had positively affected their professional development as a school counselor supervisor. Training in a school counselor specific supervision model such as the PSCSM can perhaps begin to fill the void created by a lack of supervision training for school counselor supervisors.

It has also been noted in the research that supervision was helpful in the development of professional identity for master’s level counseling students (Auxier et al., 2003). Through engagement in a professional acculturation process (O’Byrne & Rosenberg, 1998), novice counselors learn the values, mores, and scope of practice of the profession, as they develop skills and problem solving abilities (Brott & Myers, 1999; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). The PSCSM as a supervision model seems to reflect the most up-to-date vision of the roles and responsibilities of a school counselor in a comprehensive program design, and thus is an appropriate tool for the acculturation process described above. School counselor supervisors can feel confident that they are providing an appropriate and current representation of the school counseling profession. This is important since the school counselor supervisor is often the sole person accountable for interns’ supervisory experiences (Akos & Scarborough, 2004) making them the “sole voice of the profession” (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006, p. 243) and “the role
models for the future of the profession” (Roberts et al., 2001, p. 211). School counselors are also in a position to determine the model of supervision employed, often basing their supervisory practices on minimal and/or outdated personal supervision experiences (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007). This perpetuates a cycle in which supervisors model poor supervision practices to interns who will likely repeat these practices when they become supervisors (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006, Herlihy et al., 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001). As the findings from the current study show, supervisors felt that use of the model and log helped them to grow as supervisors because the process trained them on the appropriate activities in which supervisees needed to be participating, encouraged deeper discussion on the ASCA model components, and made them more accountable in their supervisory duties.

School counselors are not always involved in activities identified as best practice (Brott & Myers, 1999; Perusse et al., 2004) and consequently may not work in school environments which ASCA terms as “transformed” school counseling programs that are consistent with the ASCA Nation model (ASCA, 2005). Findings from the current study indicate that half of the supervisors felt that the model and log had encouraged their professional development as supervisors because it provided them with opportunities to reflect on the activities their interns were involved in, prompting them to modify these activities to match the ASCA model components when necessary. Several interns also felt that the increased knowledge gained regarding the ASCA model was valuable to their professional growth as it helped them to reflect on their activities in light of the model components and to monitor whether or not they were involved in appropriate activities.
One of the supervisors noted that the use of the model and log had increased her level of personal investment in the supervision process as a whole, and in the assessment piece more specifically. She felt more confident and knowledgeable as she wrote the narrative comments for her intern's assessments. According to the professional research literature, investment and commitment to the supervision process is a key supervisor competency (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Borders & Leddick, 1987) and the findings from this participant indicate that use of a model and log such as the PSCSM could possibly increase this level of investment and commitment.

Training Supervisors and Interns on the ASCA Model

As discussed in Chapter II, professional school counselors who were trained prior to the Education Trust's Transforming School Counseling Initiative (Education Trust, 1997), the development of the National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Dahir, 2001), and The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs (ASCA, 2005) are unlikely to have the knowledge necessary to provide an internship site that is fully transformed into a comprehensive school counseling developmental model (Jackson et al., 2002). Studer and Oberman (2006) also found that school counselors who had been in the field 6 years or less were significantly more likely to have taken a course in the ASCA National Model than those who had 7 or more years of professional experience. For supervisors who have been in the field for a long time, their university training was likely to be more traditional, with an emphasis on a remedial reactive approach that lacked a focus on student achievement and outcomes and was
based on services rather than the role of the school counselor (Akos & Galassi, 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Studor, 2005; Studer & Oberman, 2006).

The above research seems to match the information provided by the supervisors and interns from the current study. Four out of six of the supervisors had been working as school counselors for more than 11 years (with a range between 11 and 25 years). In response to the statement, “I am very knowledgeable about the ASCA National Model,” of these four supervisors, one strongly disagreed, two disagreed, and one was uncertain. The other two supervisors had worked as school counselors for 5 years each. One stated that she disagreed with the above statement and the other strongly agreed. Out of six supervisors, only one felt confident in her knowledge of the ASCA National Model and she was a more recent graduate. Three of the interns in the study agreed that their university had provided them with a solid foundation in and understanding of the ASCA National Model, one strongly agreed to this statement, and one was undecided.

Studer (2005) notes that interns could be in a difficult position when they come to their internship experience with more knowledge about current best practice than their site supervisors. In looking at the information from this study, it appears that this may be true in this case as well. For the most part, interns began their internships feeling more confident about their knowledge of the ASCA National Model than did their supervisors. Several authors have suggested that on-site school counselor supervisors are in need of training in the ASCA National model (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Studer & Oberman, 2006) so that they can effectively manage their school counseling programs and properly train their supervisees in current best practices (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007). One benefit of the PSCSM and accompanying log is the fact that it may assist the
interns and supervisors to be on the same page as they use the same professional language and focus on the same best practice activities. Some examples are described below.

Findings from this study indicated that several supervisors and interns found it necessary to refer to the training materials which instructed participants on the appropriate places in which to place intern activities on the log, possibly indicating that training continued to occur as participants used the model and log. As noted earlier, both supervisors and interns appreciated that the model and log forced them to view and process intern activities in light of the ASCA model, giving them confidence that they were focusing on the most appropriate activities for school counselor interns. Participants also noted that the model and log helped them to determine when important activities were missing for the interns. Additionally, several supervisors noted that use of the model and log led them to evaluate their own programs in light of the ASCA model. This finding lends support to the suggestion made by researchers that use of the ASCA model in supervision practices could facilitate program transformation for on-site supervisors, which would be a distinct advantage to the profession (Miller & Dollarhide, 2006; Studer, 2005).

Several interns seemed to believe that they were learning more than just how to apply the ASCA model components to gain a better understanding of their experiences. They also appreciated that using the model and log provided supervision training for them as future supervisors. Miller and Dollarhide (2006) have recommended that school counselor supervisees should receive supervision training, hypothesizing that it may instill an appreciation for receiving supervision.
Participant Suggestions for Counselor Education Programs

Three of the five interns made recommendations for counselor educators and counselor education programs. These interns felt that university school counseling programs should be promoting a more thorough understanding of the ASCA National Model for their students. It was noted that although the ASCA National Model was covered during their coursework, there was not an experiential component to assist them in application of the concepts. It is interesting to note that on the study demographic/background form, two of these same interns had stated they agreed that “their university had provided them with a solid foundation in and understanding of the ASCA National Model,” and the other stated that she was uncertain. It appears that it was not until the end of the study that their perceptions changed, perhaps due to the fact that early on, they were unaware of what they did not know. It is also interesting to note that these three students all attended the same university. The other two students attended a university which used a log somewhat similar to the study log. Although their original university log did not include all of the ASCA components included on the study log, it did include the Delivery System as well as a place to record feedback on a few other ASCA elements. These two students marked strongly agreed and agreed on the above statement regarding their university training related to the ASCA National Model. Perhaps these two students did not mention recommendations for counselor educators because they felt more comfortable in their knowledge of the ASCA model due to the presence of this university log which added an ASCA model related experiential training element.
This variability in program requirements corroborates findings from the professional literature described in Chapter II. There has been no agreement in the profession on a common set of supervisory guidelines for school counselor internship experiences (Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Studer, 2005). Akos and Scarborough (2004) found marked variability related to student expectations during internship in a study examining clinical preparation as described in internship syllabi, with no or very few required internship activities identified, and little reflection of current national guidelines such as the Comprehensive Developmental Guidance Programs (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000), ASCA National Standards (Campbell & Dahir, 1997), ASCA National Model (2005), or Transforming School Counseling Initiative (Education Trust, 2002). McMahon et al. (2009) recommend that counselor educators embrace the "new vision" approach in their own practices, becoming models for their students in the areas of leadership, systemic change, advocacy, collaboration, and the use of data. Additionally, as modifications occur to counselor preparation programs to correspond to a "new vision" model, students' practicum and internship experiences must do the same (Jackson et al., 2002). One participant in the current study recommended that the use of a model and log such as the PSCSM be a requirement for all internship experiences. Doing so might begin to provide some standardization to school counseling internship practice, subsequently ensuring that these practices were based on the new vision for school counseling programs.

It also becomes a challenge for school counselor educators to find appropriate internship sites which model comprehensive developmental school counseling programs (Hoffman, 2001; Magnuson et al., 2001; Studer, 2005). This is important since school
counselor interns are required to involve themselves in all aspects of school counseling during their internship experience (CACREP, 2009) and are expected to perform a variety of duties (Wood & Rayle, 2006). Just as school counselor education programs vary, so too do on-site internship practices since school counseling programs can vary in form depending on the state, district, or school (Herr, 2002; House & Hayes, 2002). Findings from this study suggest that the use of the PSCSM and log in less than adequate internship experiences may help to ameliorate some of the difficulties by tracking what may be missing from interns’ activities and in providing interns with a non-confrontational vehicle for discussing difficult topics with their site supervisors.

**Participants’ Thoughts About Future Uses of the PSCSM**

Three participants suggested that the model and log could potentially be used as a vehicle for school counselors to justify and defend their school counseling programs to administrators and school board members. Several participants noted that if counselor educators required the use of a model and log such as the PSCSM for internship supervision use, it could provide a defense to district administration for the provision of a comprehensive program model. It was also suggested that if professional school counselors used a similar type of log to track their own activities, these activities could be defended in light of the ASCA National Model. Participants also suggested that use of the PSCSM and log could help school counselors in evaluating and improving their own programs as well as for educating administrators and school board members on the specifics of a comprehensive school counseling model.
These participant suggestions are in line with some of the research described in Chapter II regarding school counselor role confusion and ambiguity, a significant professional issue in school counseling both historically and currently (Akos & Galassi, 2004; Brott & Myers, 1999; Fitch et al., 2001; Paisley & McMahon, 2001). Since the inception of the profession in the early 1900s, school counselor roles have been constantly changing (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Herr, 2001; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Paisley & Borders, 1995). School counselors often have their roles defined by a wide variety of individuals who hold differing philosophical and procedural principles, have their own agenda, and possess little understanding of school counselor capabilities (Culbreth et al., 2005; Johnson, 2000; Paisley & Borders, 1995). Building principals, who are likely the individuals who exert the most influence over how school counselors spend their time, are often not in agreement with school counselors about appropriate school counselor activities (Perusse et al., 2004) and most have had little or no exposure to the ASCA National Model (Leuwerke et al., 2009). Use of a model and log such as the PSCSM, as suggested by study participants, could serve to educate stakeholders on the appropriate activities in which school counselors should be engaged. Requirement by university school counselor educators to use a supervision model and log based on the ASCA National Model (something also recommended by study participants), could lend credence to school counselor involvement in appropriate roles and responsibilities as recommended in the best practice literature, and the benefits of a comprehensive school counselor program design.
Several participants offered feedback on the developmental levels. On each log, interns rated themselves on their level of proficiency on each of the model components. They could rate themselves as a 1, 2, or 3 according to guidelines which were explained to them in their training session. These ratings were referred to as developmental levels. Three of the five interns stated that they found it very difficult to rate themselves, finding the activity to be too subjective in nature and recommending that more training be provided to help with this task. Another participant suggested that more meaning be attached to the activity, suggesting that unless the information is used in a meaningful way it is not a good use of intern time. Three pairs reported that they had not discussed the developmental levels in supervision sessions. One pair reported that they did focus on them during supervision sessions; however, the supervisor did not provide feedback on the level the intern assigned herself. Two pairs did not mention whether they were discussed or not; however, it is unlikely that they were a focus during supervision.

Seven participants found the developmental levels to be a valuable element or a potentially valuable element of the PSCSM, with one of these participants identifying the developmental levels as what she liked the most about the model. Some of the reasons given for the benefits of the developmental levels include that they: provided the intern an opportunity to evaluate his/her progress, offered important information on patterns of development, provided information to the supervisor about how the intern viewed her progress, and provided supervisors with an avenue to address misperceptions in the intern’s self-assessment.
There is support in the research for the use of a system for assessing counselor development. It has been suggested that supervisors can comprehend trainee needs better if they have a systematic process for evaluating the cognitive and emotional maturation of the supervisee in order to provide the most appropriate interventions (Barrett & Barber, 2005). Developmental models have been recommended as an overarching framework highlighting on-going skill development (Borders, 2005; Kaufman & Schwartz, 2003) and it has been suggested that a model based on developmental principles is a suitable choice for the school setting (Kaufman & Schwartz, 2003; Magnuson et al., 2001; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Stoltenberg et al., 1998; Studer, 2005). It is possible that incorporating participant suggestions for use of the developmental levels may make this element of the PSCSM more effective and meaningful.

Findings Summary

The findings from this qualitative study suggest that the use of a school counselor specific supervision model which reflects critical components of the ASCA National Model (such as the PSCSM used in this study) can provide particular supervisor and supervisee benefits which are validated in the professional school counselor literature. The findings suggest that use of the PSCSM and log can positively influence formal supervision sessions by increasing reflectivity; encouraging in-depth discussions; adding structure; providing more opportunities for intern to ask questions and receive answers; increasing the frequency of formal supervision sessions; assisting supervisors to process intern strengths, weaknesses, and on-site internship problems; and encouraging more intern input and sharing. Supervisor/Supervisee relationships were also positively
influenced, an important finding given the critical role that supervisors play in a supervisees' internship experience (Magnuson et al., 2004).

Study findings also suggest that use of the PSCSM and log positively influenced supervisors' professional development, an important contribution given the lack of supervision training received by supervisors (Roberts et al., 2001). Use of the PSCSM also served to educate participants on the ASCA National Model, assisting them in understanding what specific activities interns should be involved in. This is helpful for supervisors who received their university training prior to the introduction of current best practice theories and models in the field, and for interns whose university programs may not have provided a thorough understanding of the ASCA National Model.

Participant suggestions for counselor educators include that the counselor educators provide a more comprehensive study of the ASCA Model during master’s level university training, with the inclusion of an application component such as use of an ASCA related supervision model for internship experiences. Participant suggestions for future use of the model also included that school counselors should utilize a model such as the PSCSM to justify and defend comprehensive school counselor program activities. These participant suggestions could serve to address problems documented in the literature at both the university level (lack of training in the ASCA model and no standard of practice established for internship activities) and in the public school setting (lack of school counselor specific supervision models and poor understanding by administrators of appropriate roles and responsibilities for school counselors).

Participants also made suggestions regarding improvements that could be made to the developmental levels component of the PSCSM. The use of a developmental model
framework in the school setting is also supported in the literature (Kaufman & Schwartz, 2003; Magnuson et al., 2001). Implications which emerged from the study findings are examined in the next section.

Implications and Recommendations for Future Practice

The findings from this study have implications for school counselor educators and their school counselor preparation programs. Implications can also be drawn from the study findings for the professional school counselor working out in the field. Implications for each of these two groups will be described in this section. Study participants made recommendations for ways that the model and log could be improved and these recommendations will also be discussed in this section.

*Implications for Counselor Educators and School Counselor Preparation Programs*

One implication that could be drawn from the study findings is that master’s level school counseling students could benefit from a more thorough grounding in and understanding of the ASCA National Model. Several study participants appreciated the opportunity to view their internship activities through the lens of the ASCA National Model components and expressed a wish that their university had trained them better in this model. By providing a more comprehensive focus on the ASCA model in university coursework, counselor educators could ensure that their programs were up-to-date with the current national guidelines for best practice, something found to be lacking in many school counselor education programs (Akos & Scarborough, 2004).
Another implication from the study findings is the possible benefit of requiring an ASCA-informed supervision model for all internship experiences. In requiring such a model, counselor educators could begin to address the lack of a common set of supervisory guidelines for internship experiences noted in the literature (Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Studer, 2005). Since school-counselor-specific, ASCA-related supervision models are few and have only been a recent addition to the school counseling supervision scene (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Studer & Oberman, 2006; Wood & Rayle, 2006), it would behoove school counselor educators to work to develop theories and models that take into account the unique roles and responsibilities of the school counselor in the school environment.

Once counselor educators develop or identify effective and appropriate supervision models, they must find the means to train their on-site professional school counselor supervisors in the use of such a model. Since practicing school counselors do not typically receive supervision training (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Herlihy et al., 2002; Nelson & Johnson, 1999: Roberts et al., 2001, Studor & Oberman, 2006), this guidance could possibly begin to fill this training void. According to the latest edition of the CACREP Standards (CACREP, 2009), school counseling site supervisors must have “relevant training in counseling supervision” (p.14). The details of what this training would look like or how it would be delivered is not described in the standards. If counselor educators train prospective school counselors in the use of an appropriate ASCA-based supervision model, this could serve to satisfy this CACREP requirement providing benefits to the counselor educators, site supervisors, school counselor supervisees, and ultimately the students they serve. As noted in Chapter II, practicing
school counselors encounter many obstacles to receiving clinical supervision and supervision training (Herlihy et al., 2002; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Magnuson et al., 2001; Sutton & Page, 1994). This fact, coupled with the fact that there are low numbers of professional school counselors who are willing to act as supervisors (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Page et al., 2001), makes it imperative that counselor educators must find efficient and effective ways to provide this supervision training. Coupling this training with the placement of a university intern may make it more likely that practicing school counselors would participate, especially if the training is brought to them at their site.

Additionally, since many practicing school counselors received their university training prior to the introduction of more current national guidelines, they may lack the knowledge needed to provide internship sites which reflect comprehensive school counseling approaches (Jackson et al., 2002). As findings from this study indicate, training in the use of such a model may encourage school counselors to transform their own school counseling programs, a recommendation from the literature (Miller & Dollarhide, 2006; Studer, 2005). Another benefit of such training would be to assist supervisors to be on the same page as their oftentimes more knowledgeable supervisees.

Another implication that can be drawn from the study findings is the value of incorporating a reflective log into the supervision process. School counselor educators should strongly consider the use of such a log, especially if it is tied to the ASCA National Model components. Many of the findings from this study could be directly linked to the value of using the log. These benefits are described earlier in this chapter.

Another interesting note regarding intern logs is who has access to them. For two of the study pairs, university supervisors were also looking at the interns’ PSCSM logs
and providing these interns with feedback directly on the logs themselves. Both interns were using electronic versions which they emailed to their university supervisor after completion. The university supervisor then commented directly on the logs and emailed them back to the interns. The other three interns were sharing their logs only with their on-site supervisors. It would seem that counselor educators could also benefit from having access to the intern’s logs. This access would serve to provide them with a more thorough understanding of the many facets of the interns’ experiences including the activities in which they were involved and the quality of the relationship between the on-site supervisor and the supervisee.

Supervision training has been recommended in the literature for school counselor supervisees in the hope that it would instill an appreciation for receiving supervision (Miller & Dollarhide, 2006). The latest edition of the CACREP Standards (CACREP, 2009) now includes a requirement that master’s level students engage in academic work that provide an understanding of supervision models and practices. As counselor educators begin to determine how to comply with this requirement, they may want to consider that training school counselor interns in the use of an ASCA-based school counselor supervision model which is incorporated into their internship supervision could serve as a partial means to accomplish this task. It would also behoove counselor educators, as they write the textbooks for university counselor education courses, to ensure that any supervision related texts include models, theories and issues related to the supervision of school counselors in their unique setting. School counselors comprise a large percentage of counselors overall, yet many key texts in the counseling and supervision fields fail to adequately address the specific needs of school counselors.
Implications for Practicing School Counselor Supervisors

School counselors, as noted above, do not typically receive supervision training (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Herlihy et al., 2002; Nelson & Johnson, 1999: Roberts et al., 2001, Studor & Oberman, 2006), and because there is little assistance found in the research literature to provide them with practical supervision guidelines (Getz, 1999; Goodyear & Bernard, 1998; Studer, 2005), implications can be drawn from the current study. First, practicing school counselors can begin to proactively seek out more guidance regarding supervision training from the universities that provide them with interns. This would be particularly appropriate given that the current CACREP Standards (CACREP, 2009) now require that site supervisors must have "relevant training in counselor supervision" (p. 14).

In the absence of supervision guidelines or the provision of a supervision model from the university, common occurrences according to the research (Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Studer, 2005), there are several supervisory practices that could be recommended to practicing school counselors based on the study findings. School counselors could ask their interns to keep a written record of various things which were found to be helpful in this study, including keeping a record of: activities, questions, concerns, and personal evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses. School counselor supervisors can also commit to meeting weekly with their supervisees for formal face-to-face supervision sessions to go over the intern's written record. According the CACREP Standards (CACREP, 2009), this is a requirement for internship experiences of students who are graduating from a CACREP accredited program; however, as was noted in the current
study, this is a practice that does not always occur, regardless of the university requirements communicated to the site supervisor.

*Implications for Changes to the PSCSM, Log, Training Protocol, and Future Supervision Training Possibilities*

Based on the recommendations of the participants, the following modifications to the model, log, and training protocol will be considered by the researcher. There was some discussion as to whether the ASCA model components, which are in addition to the Delivery System, should be included in the model and subsequently on the log. Four participants commented that they appreciated the inclusion of these components of the model and log, while two participants preferred they be excluded. Five participants made no comment about the additional ASCA components. The two participants who were opposed to their inclusion were I5 and S5 who met only twice and who struggled with compliance with study protocol. It may be that they did not have a full opportunity to experience the use of either the model or the log. At this point in time, it is the researcher’s opinion that the components of the model should be left as is in order to conduct further investigations.

In response to layout issues of the log addressed by various participants, particularly in regards to the size of the log, it seems appropriate to offer a choice. Several participants liked having larger boxes, one because she write large and the other because she likes to write a lot. Others found the log to be too large and would prefer a smaller size for filing and printing purposes. Because of these differing needs, the log could be available to users in either legal or letter size. The log should also continue to be available
in electronic or paper form according to the needs of the user, since there was some discrepancy as to preference on this issue. Changes would also be made to the layout of the second page of the log in the inclusion of dark borders separating the sections. This would make it easier for users to clarify which sections belong together.

Several participants commented on the difficulty of rating oneself on the developmental levels. Implications that can be drawn regarding this discussion include a need for the provision of more training for interns on how to effectively and more confidently rate themselves on these levels. An instruction sheet designed to provide specific guidelines for rating oneself on the developmental levels as well as instructions for how supervisors can best address these issues in supervision sessions would be helpful. Training sessions should include better instructions to supervisors on how to effectively interact with their interns regarding these levels, for instance, how to respond when interns, in the supervisor’s opinion, rate themselves too high or too low. Additionally, there seems to be a need to make the use of the developmental levels more meaningful and valuable for participants. This might be accomplished by following the advice of one of the participants and creating an additional form on which interns could record their developmental levels over time. Also, rating oneself weekly may be too frequent. Having interns rate themselves once per month may prove to be more beneficial. In this way, supervisors can help them to see patterns and growth over an extended time period. At the very least, pairs should be encouraged and trained to spend some time during their formal supervision sessions addressing the developmental issues, something that occurred for only one of the pairs.
Many professional school counselors must, within the first 5 years of receiving their school counselor license, obtain a specific number of continuing education credits or semester hours in order to renew their licenses. Typically, these credits or hours must enhance their professional development as a school counselor. Academic courses or workshops could be developed to serve this need. Such courses or workshops could address some of the school related supervisory issues discussed in this study along with training in the use of an ASCA-informed model of supervision such as the PSCSM and log.

Summary of the Implications

The findings of this study have implications for counselor educators and their school counselor preparation programs, and for school counselors. There are also implications for modifications to the model and log for future use. The findings of this study have five implications for counselor educators in regards to their school counselor preparation programs. Counselor educators should: (1) provide a more thorough grounding and understanding of the ASCA National Model for their master’s level students; (2) identify or develop appropriate ASCA based supervision models which reflect the uniqueness of counseling in the school setting; (3) require an ASCA based supervision model to be used during internship experiences, which includes a reflective log that is reviewed by both the on-site supervisor and the university supervisor; (4) provide training to both professional school counselor supervisors and interns on the effective use of the selected ASCA based supervision model to be employed during the internship experience; and, finally, (5) ensure that they include models, theories, and
issues related to the supervision of school counselors when they are writing new
supervision related texts for master’s and doctoral level counselor education course.

Three implications have been identified from this study for professional school
counselors including the following: (1) Professional school counselors should proactively
seek guidelines and training in effective supervision practice for the school setting from
the universities who are asking them to provide intern supervision; (2) When such
guidelines or training are unavailable or in the absence of a specific ASCA based model,
professional school counselors should incorporate the use of a reflective log which offers
interns opportunities to ask questions, voice concerns, and identify strengths and
weaknesses; (3) Professional school counselors should also commit to meeting weekly
with their interns in formal supervision sessions to discuss and go over the above
proposed log.

Implications for modifications to the model, log, and training protocol, and
suggestions for future training options include the following: (1) Continue with the
components that are currently included on the PSCSM in order to collect more
information on their effectiveness; (2) Offer options for the log which include legal and
letter size and electronic and hard copy versions; (3) Improve the layout of the second
page by more clearly delineating sections; (4) Provide more comprehensive training and
clearer written instructions to both supervisors and supervisees on the use of the
developmental levels, and provide a form to track change in the interns’ developmental
level over time; (5) Develop and subsequently offer a course or training for professional
school counselors which covers practical supervision guidelines for the supervision of
school counseling interns using the PSCSM and log. This course could serve the purpose
of provide required continuing education credits or credit hours for professional school counselors as they seek to renew their licenses.

Limitations of the Study

In this phenomenological qualitative study, the researcher endeavored to describe the lived experiences of professional school counselors and school counseling interns as they participated in the supervision process using a school counselor specific supervision model. Several limitations of the study are described in this section.

Due to the phenomenological approach of this qualitative study, the ability to generalize the findings of supervisor/supervisee experiences is limited. Use of a small sample size, selected using criterion sampling from a limited geographic region, make it difficult to generalize findings to other school counselors or school counseling interns. Of the 11 participants, 2 were male and 9 were female. Of these participants, 1 identified himself as Black and 10 identified themselves as Caucasian. This relatively homogeneous group makes generalization of the findings to other populations difficult. More variation in gender, race/ethnicity, and geographic location may produce different results.

Throughout the study process, the researcher employed reflexivity, which as described in Chapter III, refers to the process of taking into account the effect of the researcher's presence on the phenomenon being studied (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The researcher recorded these observations in analytic memos throughout the course of the study, analyzing and noting them in the findings when appropriate. In so doing, the researcher hoped to increase the trustworthiness of the study by making these effects transparent, thereby openly considering them in the analysis of the data. Even with this
safeguard in place, it is possible that the researcher's presence affected the findings in ways the researcher did not detect. Some of the ways in which this could have occurred include: participants' feeling self-conscious sharing honestly with the researcher who was also a practicing school counselor at the time, participants responding in ways to please or impress the researcher, professional school counselors who may feel inadequate or incompetent as they share with a doctoral level school counselor who has had supervision training when they have not, and participants' fears of offending the researcher if they did not like the model or log. The fact that the researcher conducted the interviews with the participants after their use of the model and log may have influenced their responses. Utilizing someone to conduct the interviews who was less invested in the PSCSM model and log and who had not done the training on this model might have yielded different findings.

Additionally, the researcher was the only interviewer and coder of the data. Moreover, the researcher was a practicing school counselor at the time of the study and partially designed the supervision model used in the study. Due to these factors, it is possible that the researcher's biases and personal assumptions and attachment to the PSCSM model and log may have affected the study at any point in time including during the interviews, and in the later analysis and reporting of the data. In response to these difficulties, the researcher used several strategies to enhance the trustworthiness of the study. These strategies are described in Chapter III and included bracketing in which the researcher used self-reflection to uncover personal biases and assumptions. A report of the researcher's personal biases and assumptions, as identified prior to the start of the study, is also included in Chapter III. The researcher also reflected on personal biases and
assumptions throughout the study in the analytic memos. Another strategy employed to increase the trustworthiness of the study findings was the use of a devil’s advocate whose job it was to look for non-examples and alternate interpretations of the findings. Even with these safeguards in place, however, researcher bias and personal assumptions still may have inadvertently affected and influenced the process of the study and/or the final study findings.

Another limitation in this study was the fact that one of the interns was a participant in two different pairs. Also this intern was the only participant who worked at the elementary level. This lack of equal representation at the elementary, middle, and high school levels limits the researcher’s ability to examine how use of the model and log might vary at each level. Three of the interns were completing their internships within a one semester time frame. This proved to be somewhat constraining in that the study required a full 6 weeks of implementation of the model with time before and after for scheduling training sessions and final interviews. Also, if interns were only at their sites 1 day per week, following the format of the log became more difficult.

Another limitation noted in this study was the fact that, due to several variables, final interviews were conducted anywhere from 10 to 16 weeks after the initial training. Some contributing factors were that study participants did not always begin the use of the log immediately after the training sessions. Two of the interns waited approximately 3 to 6 weeks before beginning to use the model and log. This could be a training issue or possibly a noncompliance issue due to participants not fully buying in to the process. Other variables which added to the later completion of the final interviews were weather-related cancellations, 1- and 2-week holiday breaks and conflicting schedules.
Recommendations for Future Research

Several recommendations for future research are discussed in this section. Because school counselor-specific, ASCA-based supervision models are few, future research efforts should be focused on the further development of existing models or the designing of new models. There is a need for the development of school counselor supervision models, theories, and standards of practice that reflect the new vision for school counselors and ensure that interns' time is spent on best practice activities. It is hoped that research efforts which further this agenda would eventually lead to a set of established supervisory guidelines for appropriate and effective supervision practices in the school setting.

Further studies which examine the use of the PSCSM in particular, could add to the current study findings in understanding how its use may benefit supervision practices in the school setting. Future studies could include the recommended changes suggested by the participants and described in the implications section above. In this way the participants of the current study serve as co-constructors of meaning as their voices are heard and attended to when revisions and modifications are made to the model, log, and study protocol. It is recommended that this constructionist perspective be maintained in future studies using this model in order to capture and subsequently integrate the voices of practicing school counselor supervisors, interns, and counselor educators who may include the use of the model and log in their required internship experiences.

Future research studies which continue to explore use of the PSCSM could focus on several areas of inquiry. First, several of the current study participants reported that
they planned on continuing the use of the PSCSM. These future uses included an intern who planned to complete his internship experience using the study model and log even though the study was completed. One of the supervisors asked if she could have permission to use the PSCSM and log with future interns that she might supervise. Finally, a supervisee asked for permission to use the model and log as a new entrant school counselor to assist her in self-reflection and monitoring of her activities in her new position. In each of these cases, it would be interesting to determine how not being obligated to the research protocol and to the researcher may change the individuals’ experiences using the model and log. Thus, follow-up studies over a longer period of time could identify whether and how the model or log was being used. Future studies could also explore implementation of this model over a longer period of time than the 6-week time period used in this study.

Other areas of inquiry in future research using the PSCSM could focus on exploring the most optimal time for initiating use of the model and log. Options for commencement of their use could include immediately as the internship begins, or after interns have been at their site for a period of time and have become adjusted to the environment. Interns who opt for starting use of the model and log later could provide a comparative viewpoint which could inform the study findings. Future studies could also compare intern experiences using the PSCSM and log with intern experiences in which no such model or log were utilized. Another consideration for future research using the PSCSM would be to conduct a check in meeting with participants at the 2-week mark rather than just a phone call. Perhaps a face-to-face meeting would help to resolve some of the issues which arose in the current study.
In addition to the above suggestions for future research, it is also recommended that all such endeavors that seek to study the use of new or existing school counselor specific models include a more heterogeneous participant group, including a greater degree of variation in gender, race/ethnicity, and geographic location. Further research could also include more supervisor-supervisee pairs at various school levels, elementary, middle, and high school and explore how use of the model and log might vary among these school levels. It is the researcher’s hope that future research endeavors will provide further direction and guidelines necessary for school counseling supervision practices that have been absent throughout the history of the school counseling profession.

Conclusion

In this phenomenological qualitative research study, the researcher endeavored to describe and elucidate the lived experiences of professional school counselors and their school counseling interns as they utilized an ASCA-based supervision model which reflects the most current roles, responsibilities, and foci of school counselors in the school environment. The findings indicate that the use of such a model provides some particular benefits for both supervisors and supervisees. Formal supervision sessions were positively influenced through the use of the model and log in a variety of ways. Use of the PSCSM and log increased participants reflectivity; encouraged in-depth discussions; added structure; provided opportunities for interns to ask questions and receive answers; increased the frequency of formal supervision sessions; assisted supervisors in the processing of intern strengths, weaknesses, and on-site problems; and encouraged more intern input and sharing. The increase in all of the above factors also served to strengthen
the supervisee/supervisor relationship. Study findings also suggest that use of the PSCSM and log positively influenced supervisors’ professional development and served to educate participants on the ASCA National Model.

The findings from this study add to the existing professional literature regarding supervision in the school setting in a number of ways. The study’s most important contribution is the addition of a supervision model which incorporates the ASCA National Model into its supervisory framework. The addition of such a model is critical due to a variety of factors relevant to school counseling. First, school counselor supervisors, who typically do not receive clinical supervision themselves (Page et al., 2001) or training in supervision practices (Studer, 2005), are in all probability the most critical factor in the internship experience (Magnuson et al., 2004; Magnuson et al., 2001). These site supervisors may have been trained in out-dated school counseling program models (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001) and may practice in schools that have not yet implemented a comprehensive school counseling model, where their roles are defined for them by others (Culbreth et al., 2005). Not much assistance has been offered to these practicing school counselor supervisors in that there is a lack of models and theories of supervision applicable to their unique setting (Magnuson et al., 2001; Studer, 2005), and no common set of supervisory guidelines provided by school counselor preparation programs for supervising internship experiences (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Studer, 2005). The ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2005), provided by the principal national organization for professional school counselors, has been recommended as a framework to properly train and supervise school counselor interns in current best practices (Murphy & Kaffenger, 2007; Perusse et al., 2001). However,
supervision models that incorporate the ASCA model have been nonexistent until very recently (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Studer & Oberman, 2006; Wood & Rayle, 2006).

This research study contributes to this discussion, adding the voices of practicing school counselors and school counselor interns. The PSCSM and log offer one possible means for supplying a set of supervisory guidelines which may contribute to the eventual development of effective standards of practice for the supervision of school counselor interns. The training of interns and site supervisors in the use of a model and log such as the PSCSM could also begin to address the issue of a lack of supervision training for master’s level school counseling students and for practicing school counselors, both of which are now required in the current edition of the CACREP Standards (CACREP, 2009). It is an ethical responsibility and critical imperative that we train and prepare our school counselor interns well, understanding that in accomplishing this task, we affect the future interns that they will someday supervise, as well as the lives of all the students, parents, teachers and other stakeholders that the intern will touch in the future.
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Overview and Summary of Professional Work Sample
Overview and Summary of Professional Work Sample

Title: Supervision of a School Counseling Intern Using the PSCDM

Internship Time Frame and Setting

This Professional Work Sample was completed as part of a comprehensive exam in partial fulfillment of the researcher's doctoral program requirements. A school counseling intern was supervised by the researcher using the Professional School Counselor Developmental Model (PSCDM). The internship occurred over a 15 week period between January and May of 2007 at the elementary school in which the researcher worked as a school counselor. The intern worked for approximately 20 hours per week during this time period. Of the 300 hours required, 120 were direct services and 180 were indirect. Because the intern worked 20 hours per week rather than 40, supervision sessions occurred for an hour every other week. Informal supervision occurred daily as the intern discussed her experiences as they transpired, with more in-depth processing occurring during formal supervision times. All sessions were videotaped and the professional work sample included analysis of seven video clips.

The internship took place in a Kindergarten through Fifth Grade elementary school located in a rural small town environment. The school population of 373 students was 99% Caucasian with 1% students of color and 22% of the students who qualified for free and reduced lunch. The school, one of three elementary schools in the district, is located in a rural small town environment.

Description of School Counselor Supervisee

The intern, Mary (a fictitious name), was a 55-year-old Caucasian female who had previously worked for 22 years as a health care aide at a local hospital. In this position, she worked with ill youth and their parents, teaching and supporting them through the children's illnesses. Mary, finding the work to be stressful, determined that she would rather work with well children and returned to school to obtain her teaching degree. Subsequently she was hired to teach pre-school and later, second grade. Mary found herself interested in assisting her students and their families with their socio-emotional problems and began working towards a masters in school counseling.

Mary came to the internship experience with many strengths. She had just completed a 300 hour high school internship in the same school district and thus had some familiarity with the district's K-12 school counseling program. Having a teaching certificate and prior experience as a public school teacher provided her with classroom management and teaching skills along with an understanding of the school setting. Mary was also a very conscientious individual who approached all tasks with an inquisitive mind, the ability to use introspection and reflection to process her experiences, a willingness to ask questions when she was unsure of herself, and a drive to go above and beyond what was required to be successful. Her age and life experiences were an asset to her and she conducted herself professionally and maturely.

Several focus areas for growth during the internship included helping Mary to develop effective time management skills, set realistic expectations, assist students in
personal goal setting, balance home and work responsibilities, and to develop effective working relationships with staff members.

Supervisor's Overall Response to the Use of the PSCDM and Log (This section is written in first person.)

I found the model and log to be very beneficial for this supervisory experience. Knowing that Mary was taking time to fill out the supervision logs motivated me to be diligent in scheduling formal supervision sessions. In past supervision experiences, I would fall into the trap of considering the "on the spot" supervision that occurred throughout the day to be sufficient. Mary's thoughtful reflection as she recorded her strengths, weaknesses, and questions on the supervision log made it possible for our discussions during formal supervision time to have greater depth. Because she had already reflected on her activities and processed them internally to such a degree, our discussions seemed more meaningful. My feedback to her was more specific and targeted as she could remember with ease her questions and thoughts about her experiences.

The model and log also helped to structure Mary's time and ensure that she had experiences in a wide variety of activities related to comprehensive school counseling programs. The inclusion of the four developmental areas; legal/ethical; intrapersonal; interpersonal; and multicultural, kept those important areas in the spotlight. I found that we discussed issues in those areas to a much higher degree than I had with past supervisees where we did not use the model and log.

In the process of filling out the log, Mary was forced to evaluate and note her strengths as well as her weaknesses. I believe this to be a great benefit as it has been my experience that supervisees are reticent to list strengths, being more likely to focus on personal weaknesses. The evaluation by the supervisee of her developmental levels was less helpful than I had expected. Mary did not like to mark the levels and would often leave them off, complaining that they did not seem broad enough (the options were a 1, 2, or 3) and that she felt uncomfortable deciding on a number. She would often mark herself between a 2.5 and a 3, which seemed accurate in my estimation. Perhaps if the supervisee were less experienced or had more performance deficits, the developmental levels would be more meaningful to both supervisor and supervisee.

Overall, I found this to be my most rewarding and effective supervisory experience, due, I believe, to the use of the PSCDM and log. This experience was very influential in my decision to continue the study and use of such a model for my dissertation study.

Supervisee's Overall Response to the use of the PSCDM and Log

Mary completed a written response to 5 questions related to the use of the PSCDM and log. Her responses are included here.

(1) What is your overall reaction to the experience of using this Professional School Counselor Developmental Model and log during your supervision experience?
The overall experience of using the log has been a positive one. It is definitely more time consuming to write the logs up during busy days in the counseling office. Time has to be made to do them. It’s almost the case where the busier the day, the more time needs to be filling them out accurately to get the benefit later. I found that the closer to the actual event I made a note, the more benefit I gained later in supervision. The benefit gained however, was well worth the work. I was able to see “trends” and learning patterns in my counseling experience.

(2) How did this experience compare to past supervision experiences?

Using the logs definitely gave me the advantage of learning more from the experiences I was having. In past supervision experiences, we would discuss whatever I could remember at the moment, sometimes something very urgent and sometimes not. It would turn out to be a more general type of discussion on counseling and specifics would not be addressed. By doing the logs we had focus for the supervision times. Like an outline or agenda to our meeting. I, very frequently, learned more from the side statements, or questions I posed on observations of the client, the supervisor, or myself. Discussions occurred during supervision time in regards to “these statements and questions” that in past supervision times would never have had the opportunity to be brought forward. As we would review the logs, I would state what I placed in one of the sections, just reading it more for review of what I stated than anything and my supervisor would pose questions from that statement to prompt me to further explore, or make statements in regards to her observations of my work, in regards to the specific session or subject. This would have much more direct meaning. This surprised me that so much learning could occur from one seemingly benign statement I made.

(3) What advantages and/or disadvantages did you find in using this model and log?

Advantages of using the log are that it provides both the supervisor and supervisee with an outline for the supervision time; providing a focus to the time set aside. It makes both parties much more accountable for the supervision time. It helps both parties to identify trends in the counseling experience and to relate to specific experiences. It is an aid in understanding the Michigan Comprehensive Counseling Model.

The disadvantages I can see is are that it takes time to fill out, and the logistics as to where to put it, keep it, carry with you, so that it can be filled out quickly and accurately for each item filled in. I found it needed to be “with” me most of the time to be of benefit to me. End of the day, filling it in was not as beneficial to me as filling it in as I went through the day. Other disadvantages are that that the sections do not match sections needed to be filled in on the 613 logs for class. This was one reason that I rarely kept track of the amount of time on these. Tracking two different time formats was confusing.
(4) Do you have any suggestions for improving the model or log?

I did comment at one time that having this as a computer form to fill out might be helpful, but in reviewing I have come to the conclusion that I needed to be able to write in it throughout the day, so I no longer feel that way.

I did rotate the sheet on the backside so that when I flipped it in my notebook, I would not have to turn the binder to read or write on it. Having logs in a spiraled notebook, 5 ½ “X 8 ½” might help. I would have liked to see more space for the four sections on the back, Counselor Developmental Factors.

Influence of Professional Work Sample on Dissertation Study

This supervision experience led to some changes in the model and log. Several components of the ASCA National Model which were not included have now been incorporated. Also, I have taken Mary’s suggestion and for this study, supervisees will be given a binder in which to keep the logs. Also, the back of the log will be rotated to make filling it out easier and more space is provided for the counselor developmental factors. Supervisees will also no longer be asked to keep track of time spent in each of the delivery systems as they normally keep a log of their hours as a university requirement. The developmental levels have been retained in an effort to see if they are more meaningful or useful with a wider variety of supervisees.
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Professional School Counselor Supervision Model
**Professional School Counselor Supervision Model (PSCSM)**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Levels:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self/Other Awareness:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Able to look at self and client to inform the work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation:</strong></td>
<td>Stable/Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy:</strong></td>
<td>Responsible/Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Focus on client/ empathic/not objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation:</strong></td>
<td>Variable/fluctuates/ gets stuck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy:</strong></td>
<td>Dependent/Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Focus: self/performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation:</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy:</strong></td>
<td>Dependent/Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Simplistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Professional School Counselor Log
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance Curriculum: DL___</th>
<th>My strengths, what I did well</th>
<th>Questions, concerns, areas for improvement</th>
<th>Understanding from supervision processing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What I've done this week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iv Student Planning: DL___</td>
<td>My strengths, what I did well</td>
<td>Questions, concerns, areas for improvement</td>
<td>Understanding from supervision processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I've done this week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive Services: DL___</td>
<td>My strengths, what I did well</td>
<td>Questions, concerns, areas for improvement</td>
<td>Understanding from supervision processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I've done this week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Support: DL___</td>
<td>My strengths, what I did well</td>
<td>Questions, concerns, areas for improvement</td>
<td>Understanding from supervision processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I've done this week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DL = Developmental Level

ASCA National Model

Delivery System
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation DL</th>
<th>Strengths/Concerns/Understandings</th>
<th>Leadership DL</th>
<th>Strengths/Concerns/Understandings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Activities/Situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management DL</th>
<th>Strengths/Concerns/Understandings</th>
<th>Advocacy/Diversity DL</th>
<th>Strengths/Concerns/Understandings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Activities/Situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability DL</th>
<th>Strengths/Concerns/Understandings</th>
<th>Collaboration/Interpersonal DL</th>
<th>Strengths/Concerns/Understandings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Activities/Situations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Description of Activities/Situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrapersonal DL</th>
<th>Strengths/Concerns/Understandings</th>
<th>Systemic Change DL</th>
<th>Strengths/Concerns/Understandings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Activities/Situations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Description of Activities/Situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASCA National Model Elements and Intrapersonal Issues</th>
<th>ASCA National Model Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DL = Developmental Level</td>
<td>Actual log printed on legal size paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Demographic Information Form – Supervisor
Supervisor Demographic Information Form

code no.

1. Gender ___

2. Age ___

3. Race/ethnicity _______________________

4. Number of years as a school counselor ___

5. Number of years in the schools ___ as a ____________________________
   (role other than school counselor)

6. Approximate number of interns previously supervised ___

7. Licenses/certification (check those that apply)
   ___ certified teacher
   ___ endorsed school counselor
   ___ school counselor license (for non-teachers)
   ___ Limited Licensed Professional Counselor (LLPC)
   ___ Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC)
   ___ Other ____________________________
   (please specify)

8. Prior training in supervision (check those that apply)
   ___ none
   ___ I've done some reading on my own
   ___ I've been to a brief program on supervision (1-4 hours)
   ___ I've been to an all-day training session on supervision
   ___ I've taken a multi-day training program
   ___ I've taken a graduate level course in supervision
   ___ Other ____________________________
   (please specify)
9. How would you rate yourself on the following statement: "I am very knowledgeable about the ASCA National Model"?

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly
Disagree Agree

10. How would you rate your program on the following statement: "Our school’s counseling program is in compliance with the ASCA National Model"?

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly
Disagree Agree
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Demographic Information Form – Supervisee
Supervisee Demographic Information Form

code no.

1. Gender ____

2. Age ____

3. Race/ethnicity __________________________

4. Number of years in the schools ____ as a ____________________
   (please name position or role)

5. Number of hours per week working as a school counseling intern ____

6. Licenses/certifications that you have or that you are seeking after graduation (check those that apply)
   ____ certified teacher
   ____ endorsed school counselor
   ____ school counselor license (for non-teachers)
   ____ Limited Licensed Professional Counselor (LLPC)
   ____ Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC)
   ____ Other _______________________________
   (please specify)

7. Prior experience as a counselor (check those that apply)
   ____ none
   ____ employment as a school counselor in another state
   ____ employment as a counselor in a non-school setting
   ____ Other _______________________________
   (please specify)
8. Prior experience in receiving counseling supervision (check those that apply)
   ___ none
   ___ supervised in my practicum
   ___ supervised in my previous employment as a counselor
   ___ other ________________________________
   (please specify)

9. Please rate yourself in relation to this statement: “My university program provided me with a solid foundation in and understanding of the ASCA National Model.”

   1  2  3  4  5
   Strongly Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly
   Disagree
   Agree
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Training Overview
Training Overview

1. Thank participants for their involvement in the study.

2. Provide a history and background of the origins of the PSCSM.

3. Describe the twelve domains of the PSCSM and explain how they were selected (provide a handout with a description of each of the twelve domains).

4. Describe the 3 developmental levels of the PSCSM and explain how the supervisee selects a level for completion of the log.

5. Explain the log and how it is to be used. Provide blank copies of the log for use during the study.

6. Provide a sample log that has already been completed.

7. Present the ASCA National Model manual and explain how this resource may be of service.

8. Provide an opportunity for study participants to ask questions.

9. Provide contact information if participants should have any questions and remind them of the follow-up check-in phone call in approximately two weeks.

10. Thank study participants again for their time and participation in the study.
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Handout for Training Session: Description of Twelve Domains
Description of the Twelve Domains for the Developmental Supervision of Professional School Counselors Using the Professional School Counseling Supervision Model (PSCSM)

Guidance Curriculum

In the Guidance Curriculum component, the school counselor teaches, team teaches, or supports the teaching of structured activities that provide all students opportunities to master guidance and counseling competencies. This component also includes school-wide activities in which the counselor (usually in collaboration with others) organizes and conducts large group sessions (i.e., career days).

Individual Planning

The Individual Planning component includes activities and procedures that assist students in understanding and periodically monitoring their career, academic, and personal/social development. School counselors work with parents and teachers to develop, analyze, evaluate, and carry out educational, occupational, and personal goals and plans. The following methods are used to deliver the Individual Planning component:

- **Appraisal**: Student’s abilities, interests, skills, and achievements are assessed and interpreted.
- **Advisement**: Self-appraisal information along with personal-social, educational, career and labor market information is used to help students reach personal, educational, and occupational goals.
- **Placement and follow-up**: Counselors assist students in making transitions including school to school, school to work, or school to additional education and training.

Responsive Services

In the Responsive Services component, the counselor organizes guidance and counseling techniques, methods and resources to respond to problems students are experiencing personally, socially, and academically. The following strategies are used in the implementation of this component:

- **Consultation**: The counselor consults with parents, teachers, staff, and community agency personnel regarding strategies to help students manage and resolve personal/social, educational, and career concerns.
- **Personal counseling**: Counselors provide small-group and individual counseling for students who are struggling with relationships,
Referral: When appropriate, counselors use professional resources in other schools and in the community to refer students. This may include mental health agencies, employment and training programs, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile services, social services, and special school programs.

Crisis Intervention: Counselors understand the role of the school counselor and the school counseling program in the school crisis plan. The counselor provides team leadership to the school and community during a crisis and they initiate appropriate responses and a variety of intervention strategies to meet the needs of the individual, group, or school community before, during and after crisis response.

Systems Support

The Systems Support component involves the administration and management of the comprehensive guidance and counseling program. It includes activities such as the following:

- **Research and Development:** Program evaluation, follow-up studies, and the continued development and updating of guidance curriculum activities.
- **Professional Development:** Participation in school professional development activities, professional meetings, postgraduate coursework, and contributions to the professional literature.
- **Staff/Community Public Relations:** Orientation of staff, parents, and the community to the counseling program including activities such as newsletters, local media, presentations or in-service training to share expertise with other stakeholders.
- **Committee/Advisory Boards:** Serving on departmental curriculum committees and community committees or advisory boards.
- **Community Outreach:** Activities designed to help the school counselor to become knowledgeable about community resources, employment opportunities and the local labor market.
- **Program Management:** Planning and managing tasks performed to support the activities of a comprehensive guidance and counseling program.
Fair-share Responsibilities: Routine “running of the school” responsibilities shared by all members of the school.

Foundation

In the Foundation domain, counselors:

• Articulate and demonstrate an understanding of the beliefs, philosophies, and mission statements that align with current school improvement and school success initiatives at the school, district, and state level.

• Understand and use district, state, and national student standards and competencies for students’ academic, career and personal and social development to drive the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program.

• Understand and effectively apply the legal and ethical standards and principles of the school counseling profession and educational systems, including district and building policies. Legal and ethical issues may include:
  o Confidentiality and informed consent;
  o Understanding when and how to report abuse to Protective Service Agencies;
  o Effective and appropriate intervention for students who are a danger to themselves or others, and “duty to warn” laws;
  o Balancing parent’s rights and student’s rights;
  o Understanding school district policies and procedures as they affect the school counselor’s role (i.e., zero tolerance policies, supervision of students, homeless students, and dress code).

Management:

In this domain, counselors:

• Negotiate, develop, and present the school counseling management system.

• Participates in professional organizations, personal reflection, consultation and supervision to promote professional growth and development.

• Use leadership skills to establish and meet with an advisory council for the comprehensive school counseling program and subsequently analyze and incorporate advisory council feedback.
• Collect, analyze, and disaggregate relevant student outcome data in order to implement effective interventions and to identify policies, practices and procedures leading to student success, systemic barriers, and the need for systemic change to close the achievement, opportunity and information gap.

• Organize and manage time, including the development of calendars, to implement an effective school counseling program which includes an appropriate distribution of school counselor time based on the comprehensive school counseling model.

• Use academic and behavioral data to design and implement action plans to develop guidance curriculum and closing-the-gap interventions and can identify ASCA domains, standards and competencies that are addressed in the plan.

**Accountability:**

In this domain, counselors:

• Use formal and informal methods of program evaluation, including the use of data from results reports, to design, evaluate, and modify the comprehensive school counseling program.

• Collects process, perception, and results data attained from various avenues including, school guidance curriculum and closing-the-gap activities, and can use data to demonstrate the value the school counseling program adds to student achievement.

• Collaborate with the school counseling team and administration to determine how school counseling programs are evaluated and how results are shared.

• Advocates for appropriate school counselor performance appraisal based on school counselors competencies.

• Conduct self-appraisal.

• Conduct a program audit, identify areas for improvement, and share the results with appropriate stakeholders.

**Intrapersonal Issues**

These are issues that pertain to the school counselor individually and personally. For example, the school counselor may be dealing with personal issues such as:

• Unresolved mental health issues (i.e., substance abuse, depression);
• Unethical behavior (i.e., inappropriate self-disclosure, tardiness or unexcused absences);

• Lack of motivation, exhibited by a lack of initiative or enthusiasm related to the internship experience;

• Outside events of a personal nature which may be affecting the school counseling intern's performance.

Leadership

When displaying leadership, counselors:

• Collaborate with other professionals in the school and community to influence system wide changes and implement school reform to ensure success for every student.

• Understand and define leadership and its role in a comprehensive school counseling program.

• Identify and demonstrate professional and personal qualities and skills of effective leaders.

• Creates a plan to challenge the non-counseling tasks that are often assigned to school counselors.

Advocacy/Diversity

In this domain, counselors:

• Understand and define advocacy and its role in comprehensive school counseling programs.

• Actively support causes, ideas or policies that promote and assist student academic, career and personal/social needs.

• Actively identify underrepresented students and support them in their efforts to perform at their highest level of academic achievement. Counselors attend to issues such as a greater number of discipline referrals and suspensions, and/or a higher incidence of academic failure for students of color.
Additional topics that may arise in supervision related to this domain include:

- Discomfort on the part of the school counselor when counseling or providing services for students who are different from them (i.e., students of color or their families; or gay, lesbian, or bisexual students);

- Personal development of the school counselor in racial identity development and multicultural counselor development;

- Multicultural issues that may be present in the supervisor/supervisee relationship.

**Collaboration/Interpersonal Issues**

In this domain, which pertains to school counselors’ relationships with others, counselors:

- Establish rapport and work effectively with students, parents, teachers, administrators, community leaders and other stakeholders to promote and support student success.

- Build effective teams and a sense of community by encouraging collaboration among students, professional and support staff, parents or guardians and community members to work toward the common goals of equity, access and academic success for all students.

- Provide vital resources to parents or guardians, educators and community agencies in the areas of education, information and training to enhance the educational opportunities for students and their families.

- Understands how to facilitate group meetings to effectively and efficiently meet group goals.

- Work effectively in a supervisor/supervisee relationship.

**Systemic Change:**

In this domain, counselors:

- Understand the role of system change in the comprehensive school counseling program and that system change affects the entire system, is transformational, affects more than an individual or series of individuals, and that its focus is upon the dynamic of the environment, not the individual.
• Act as systems change agents who use leadership skills to involve all critical players in the creation of an environment promoting and supporting student success.

• Understand the impact of school, district and state educational policies, procedures and practices supporting and/or impeding student success and develop plans to deal with personal and institutional resistance impeding change processes.

Information for this document is based on the following resources:


Appendix H

Check-In Phone Contact Guidelines
Guidelines for Check-In Phone Contact

After approximately two weeks of supervisor/supervisee use of the model and log, the researcher will contact each participant by phone to ensure understanding and compliance with the model. The phone conversation may include the following:

1. Greet participant and thank them again for their participation.

2. Ask if there are any questions or concerns related to the use of the model and/or log.

3. Answer or respond to any questions or concerns they may have.

4. Remind them of the projected timeframe for the final interview meetings.

5. Assure them that they may call with any questions and check to be sure they have the researcher’s contact information.
Appendix I

Individual Interview Guide
Interview Guide for Individual Interviews with Supervisor/Supervisee

1. Overall, how was this supervision experience for you?

2. How did this supervision experience compare to other supervision experiences in which you have participated?

3. What did you like best about this supervision model?

4. What did you like least about this supervision model?

5. What did you like best about the supervision log?

6. What did you like least about the supervision log?

7. Are there ways that you think the supervision model could be improved?

8. Are there ways that you think the supervision log could be improved?

9. How do you think use of this particular supervision model and log affected your relationship with your supervisor/ supervisee?

10. How has the use of this supervision model and log influenced your development as a school counselor/ supervisor?

11. Is there anything else you would like to add that I haven’t asked you about?

12. Is there anything that you have shared today that you wouldn’t be comfortable discussing in the interview with the two of you together?
Appendix J

Conjoint Interview Guides
Interview Guide for Conjoint Interviews with Supervisors and Supervisees

Is there anything that the two of you would like to add in addition to what you have already shared with me during your individual interviews?

I would like to summarize some of what I learned and some of the impressions I have gained from my contacts with you thus far: (Here the researcher will summarize information gleaned from the pair thus far and any impressions gained. The supervisee and supervisor will be invited to respond to this summary and ensure that the researcher’s impressions and information are accurate.)

Other possible topics we could touch on might include:

- Your growth as a school counselor/supervisor over the study time period and whether or not the model and log facilitated or hampered this growth.

- How you feel the model and log affected your relationship with one another.

- What you liked most and least about the supervision experience while using the PSCSM and log.

Is there anything else that you would like to add that I haven’t asked you about or that we haven’t touched on?
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Informed Consent Form
Participant Informed Consent

I am invited to participate in a research project entitled "Applying an ASCA-Informed School Counselor Supervision Model for the Supervision of School Counseling Interns.

This research is designed as a collaborative effort with supervisee/supervisor pairs to develop a supervision framework that uses a model and log that informs the practice of the supervision for professional school counseling interns.

This study will take place within a six to eight week time frame, during which I will be asked to participate in the following activities: (1) initial training in use of the school counselor supervision model and the supervision log, 30 to 60 minutes; (2) brief phone contact with a researcher after 2 weeks of use of the supervision model and log; (3) individual interview with a researcher after a minimum of 6 weeks of use of the supervision model and log, 30 to 60 minutes; (4) combined interview with supervisor and supervisee following the individual interview, 30 to 60 minutes; (5) possible brief follow up contact following the completion of the study for clarification; (6) supervisee sharing of log with researcher. The interviews will be audio-recorded, and the recordings will be destroyed after they are transcribed and verified by the investigator.

There are no foreseen risks or discomforts involved in participation in this research, other than the inconvenience of time as a cost of participation. The total time costs to me for training and interviews would be approximately 1.75 to 3.25 hours. In addition, supervisees will be asked to complete the supervision log on a weekly basis prior to meeting with their supervisor; completion of the log takes approximately 20 minutes. I will be asked to use the supervision log during my regularly scheduled supervision sessions during the semester. It should be noted that supervisors and supervisees will be meeting with one another weekly throughout the semester; a requirement by the university as part of the school counselor intern's training.

This study has potential benefits to me and to the school counseling profession. As a participant I will be provided with and trained in the use of a framework for school counselor supervision based on a developmental model of supervision and the ASCA National Model. My familiarity with and use of this model of supervision and the associated supervision log have the potential to have a positive impact on my current and future development as a counselor and/or as a supervisor. Each supervisor/supervisee pair will receive one copy of the ASCA National Model manual (2006) and each supervisee will receive the necessary blank copies of the PSCSM log. The school counseling profession has the potential to benefit from this research in that there are currently a limited number of frameworks that provide guidance to supervisors who provide supervision to school counselors in training.
All of the information collected from me is confidential. This means that neither my name nor any other identifying information will appear on any papers on which this information is recorded. The forms will be coded, and the investigators will keep a separate master list with the names of participants and the corresponding code numbers. Once the data are collected and analyzed, the master list will be destroyed. All other forms will be retained on a computer disk (CD) in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s work office for the duration of this study.

I may refuse to answer a question or to participate, and I may quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty or risk of any loss of service that I would otherwise have. If I have questions or concerns about this study, I may contact Dr. Gary Bischof at (269-387-5108) or Janet Glaes at (269-501-4452). I may also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 with any concerns that I have.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.

My signature below indicates that I have read and/or had explained to me the purpose and requirements of the study and that I agree to participate.

_________________________________________  ___________________________
Signature                              Date

Consent Obtained by: ___________________________  ___________________________
Investigator's initials              Date
Appendix L

Demographic Information for Participants
Table I

Demographic Information for Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Prior Years as a School Counselor</th>
<th>Current School Setting</th>
<th>License/Certification</th>
<th>Number of Interns Supervised</th>
<th>Prior Supervision Training</th>
<th>Knowledgeable about the ASCA National Model</th>
<th>School Program comply with the ASCA National Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>ESC, LPC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>reading</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>reading</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>SCL, MSW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>reading</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>ESC, LLPC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a ESC = Endorsed as a School Counselor on a Teaching Certificate; SCL = School Counselor License; LPC = Licensed Professional Counselor; LLPC = Limited License Professional Counselor

b Prior Supervision Training. Possible answer choices: None; Reading = I've done some reading on my own; Brief = Attended a brief program; All-Day = Attended an all-day training session; Multi-Day = Attended a multi-day training session; Course = Taken a graduate level course; Other = Participant lists an additional option

c How would you rate yourself on the following statement: "I am very knowledgeable about the ASCA National Model". Possible answer choices: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree, Strongly Agree

d How would you rate your program on the following statement: "Our school's counseling program is in compliance with the ASCA National Model". Possible answer choices: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree, Strongly Agree
**Table 2**

*Demographic Information for Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Years worked in a school setting</th>
<th>Building level during internship experience</th>
<th>License/certification seeking after graduation (a)</th>
<th>Prior experience as a counselor (b)</th>
<th>Prior experience receiving supervision (c)</th>
<th>University provided solid training in ASCA National Model (d)</th>
<th># of hours per week at site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>SCL, LLPC, LPC</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>practicum</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4/I6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>HS/Elem</td>
<td>SCL, LLPC, LPC</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>practicum</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a ESC = Endorsed as a School Counselor on a Teaching Certificate; SCL = School counselor License; LPC = Licensed Professional Counselor; LLPC = Limited License Professional Counselor

b Prior experience as a counselor. Possible answer choices: None, Another State = Employed as a school counselor in another state; Non-School = Employed as a counselor in a non-school setting; Other = Participant lists additional option.

c Prior experience in receiving counseling supervision. Possible answer choices: None, Practicum = Supervised in my practicum; Previous Employment = Supervised in my previous employment as a counselor; Other = Participant lists additional option.

d Please rate yourself in relation to this statement: "My university program provided me with a solid foundation in and understanding of the ASCA National Model. Possible answer choices: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree, Strongly Agree
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Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
Letter of Approval
Date: September 10, 2008

To: Gary Bischof, Principal Investigator
Janet Glaes, Student Investigator for dissertation
Shawn Bultsma, Student Investigator

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number: 08-08-20

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled “Applying an ASCA-Informed School Counselor Supervision Model” has been approved under the expedited category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: September 10, 2009