Supervision Training, Practices, and Interests of California Site Supervisors

Gail E. Uellendahl and Maya N. Tenenbaum

In this descriptive study, the authors surveyed 220 California school counselor site supervisors of interns about supervision training, practices, and interests. Respondents overwhelmingly (71%) felt unprepared for this role and identified the need for more formal training and support. Results indicate a crucial leadership and advocacy role for counselor education programs.

Keywords: school counselors, intern supervision, supervision training, counselor education

School counseling site supervisors play a critical role in the clinical training of school counselor interns and are an important link between counselor education and professional practice (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP], 2009; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007). The clinical supervision provided by site supervisors supports the school counseling skill development of these interns (Herlihy, Gray, & McCollum, 2002). Site supervisors also serve as mentors and gatekeepers to ensure that school counselors entering the field are well trained and competent (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Roberts & Morotti, 2001). Although it is a state requirement in California that school counselor site supervisors must be qualified, credentialed school counselors, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) Common Standards (2008) offer no detailed guidelines other than that site supervisors are "trained in supervision" and "oriented to the supervisory role" (Standard 8). In fact, the CCTC Standards (CCTC, 2001) also state that "an average of one hour individual or one-and-one-half hours of small group supervision per week be provided by the site supervisor . . . *is suggested, not required*" (p. 85). California program standards for school counselor education also require that a plan for the intern's field experience is to be developed and "agreed upon by the field supervisor(s) and program faculty" (CCTC, 2001, p. 96). Our conversations with local site supervisors about the variation in counselor education program field requirements and practices led us to question whether these requirements and suggestions are being practiced.

Our investigation of other existing guidelines revealed that California state and national school counselor organizations have yet to create specific

Gail E. Uellendahl, Department of Counselor Education, and Maya N. Tenenbaum, Department of Political Science and Graduate School of Education, both at California Lutheran University. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Gail E. Uellendahl, Department of Counselor Education, California Lutheran University, 60 West Olsen Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91360 (e-mail: uellenda@callutheran.edu).

standards for the preparation and practice of this supervisory role. The 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) does state that counseling supervisors must have "relevant training in counseling supervision" (p. 14) and that "orientation, consultation, and professional development opportunities are provided by counselor education program faculty to site supervisors" (p. 14). The 2009 CACREP Standards also state that "counseling supervision models, practices, and processes" (p. 9) must be included in the curriculum. However, only six of the 32 school counselor education programs in California are CACREP accredited (CACREP, 2014).

There is some evidence that school counselors report inadequate supervision training through counselor education programs. DeKruyf and Pehrsson (2011) examined the relationship between hours of supervision training and school counselor site supervisor self-efficacy regarding their ability to supervise interns. Forty percent of respondents reported no supervision training, and most who did report training cited state and national conferences as their training settings. That study did not explore supervision training received through the supervisors' counselor education programs.

Other helping professionals in California, such as psychologists and marriage and family therapists, are required to complete at least 6 hours of formal supervision training to qualify as supervisors (California Board of Behavioral Sciences, 2012; California Board of Psychology, 2014). There are no similar expectations for school counseling beyond those written in the 2001 CCTC's program standards, which state that the "school-site supervisor understands the training objectives of the university training program and [is] skilled in the process of supervising and guiding skill development of candidates" (p. 64). The source and amount of supervision training is not specified. This lack of specificity and training oversight, may result in little, if any, training in supervision (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Studer & Oberman, 2006).

Several counselor education texts specific to the role of supervision in school counselor training have emerged (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Studer, 2006; Studer & Diambra, 2010; Wilczenski, Schumacher, & Cook, 2010). Additionally, several papers have been published on promising models of supervision for school counselors in training (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Luke & Bernard, 2006; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Roberts & Morotti, 2001; Stephens, 2008; Wood & Rayle, 2006), as well as guidelines and resources for site supervisors (Magnuson, Black, & Norem, 2004; Roberts & Morotti, 2001; Studer, 2006). The American School Counselor Association (ASCA; 2003) publication of the ASCA National Model was another significant addition to the field because this model informs both school counselor education and practice. Because many school counseling site supervisors were educated before these publications, the extent to which this topic was addressed in their counselor education training is unclear.

The ASCA National Model can serve as a contextual framework around which basic supervision skills and knowledge can be used. Miller and Dollarhide (2006) called for the use of supervision training based on the ASCA National

Model. Murphy and Kaffenberger (2007) outlined one school counselor education program's use of their model for the training of site supervisors. In their study of supervision practice differences between site supervisors who were trained and worked in schools using the ASCA framework and those who were not, Studer and Oberman (2006) found that 60% of the 73 respondents reported that they did not have any supervision training. They also found that school counselors who had been in the field "6 years or less were significantly more likely to have had a course in the ASCA National Model than were school counselors in the field for 7 or more years" (Studer & Oberman, 2006, p. 87). Those supervisors trained on the ASCA National Model were expected to have a clearer framework for useful supervision. Studer and Oberman (2006) suggested the need for further study to determine how school counselors learn about the practice of supervision and the ways in which they collaborate with counselor education programs. Miller and Dollarhide (2006) suggested the need for research about the preferred supervision training modalities of site supervisors.

Blakely, Underwood, and Rehfuss (2009) conducted a study of 181 school counseling supervisors to determine whether there were differences in supervisor readiness and supervision activities between those supervisors working in traditional school counseling programs and those working in schools with Recognized ASCA Model Programs (RAMPs). No differences were found between the groups on supervisor readiness, but Blakely et al. found a significant difference in the provision of supervisory activities, with those working in RAMPs providing more supervisory activities. In addition, they found that supervisors with more years of experience reported greater use of the ASCA National Model in supervision. It is not clear whether supervisors trained before the publication of the ASCA National Model significantly differ in their types of supervision practices from those who were trained using this model as a framework for practice.

In addition to limited training, there are other conditions that might affect intern supervision. School counselors, in general, are often burdened with high counselor-to-student ratios that might additionally limit their availability to adequately supervise school counseling interns. This is particularly true in California, which had the second highest ratio, with every one counselor assigned an average of 826 students during the 2012–2013 academic year (ASCA, n.d.) The ratio recommended by ASCA (2012) is 1:250. Limited studies suggest that reducing the ratio has an impact on student outcomes. For example, decreasing this ratio is associated with decreases in disciplinary referrals (Carrell & Carrell, 2006); academic achievement, as found by Whiston and Wachter (as cited in Whiston, Tai, Rahardja, & Eder, 2011); and increases in the percentage of 4-year college attendance rates (Hurwitz & Howell, 2013). If the counselor-to-student ratio affects student outcomes, it may follow that this ratio also affects the school counselor role and availability as intern supervisor. Studies exploring this impact are nonexistent, but Page, Pietrzak, and Sutton (2001) did report on the low percentage of school counselors who serve as site supervisors.

The call for increased training in supervision has appeared in the school counseling literature for over 2 decades, yet it is not clear how this call has informed counselor education and practice. This study offers the perspectives of school counselors engaged in the role of supervision—the missing elements of site supervisor preparation—and describes their supervision training, interests, and practices. This study also provides insight into what site supervisors think will support them in this important role. Specifically, four descriptive research questions guided our study: (a) How prepared are supervisors and what type(s) of supervisory training do participants report? (b) How many hours per week do supervisors with different counselor-to-student ratios report spending on a variety of supervision activities? (c) What type of contact between university and site supervisors do respondents report, and which types of contact are most encouraging for the creation of a plan for their intern's field experience, as required by the CCTC? and (d) Do counselors who were trained before the development of the ASCA National Model report different levels of supervisory practices from site supervisors who were credentialed after the model?

Method

Participants and Procedures

On approval from the institutional review board, we e-mailed 1,116 surveys to a convenience sample of school counselors throughout the state of California. We included a cover letter describing the purpose and significance of the study and a request for participation if recipients had served as a school counselor intern supervisor; a notice ensuring confidentiality preceded the survey. We e-mailed a follow-up reminder 2 weeks after the initial questionnaires to encourage a higher response rate (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2008).

First, we e-mailed questionnaires to 763 current members of the California Association for School Counselors and members of a local county association for school counselors in southern California. We used memberships of these associations for ease of access because these potential participants were probably active Internet users, and because e-mail was the medium through which the associations typically communicated with members. Second, we accessed California elementary, middle, and high school websites to identify school counselors' e-mail addresses; those with e-mail addresses that were not password protected ($n = 353$) were invited to participate. A total of 220 practicing school counselors responded, and all met the criteria for participation in our study. This 20% response rate aligns with Page et al.'s (2001) national survey on school counselor supervision, which found that only 18% of their sample of 267 school counselors ($n = 48$) supervise interns.

Percentages in this section may not total 100 because of rounding. Of our sample, 77% held the school counseling credential for more than 5 years. Associated ranges were 1–5 years (21%), 6–10 years (26%), 11–15 years (24%), 16–20 years (12%), and 21 years or more (14%); 2% did not respond to this

question. Furthermore, only 8% had the ASCA-recommended counselor-to-student ratio of 1:250 or less, whereas the majority of respondents had ratios of 1:351–450 (25%) and 1:451–550 (29%); 9% had ratios of 1:250–350, 13% had ratios of 1:551–650, 15% had ratios of 1:651 or greater, and 2% did not respond to this question. The majority of respondents (56%) had supervised between one and five interns in their career, followed by 25% who had supervised between six and 10 interns, 10% between 11 and 15 interns, 2% between 16 and 20 interns, and 4% who had supervised 20 or more interns (2% did not respond to this question). On average, 86% of the respondents reported that they supervise between one and three interns per year.

Site Supervisor Questionnaire

We designed a 20-item questionnaire to assess the length of professional practice along with supervision training, practice, and training interests of California school counselor site supervisors. To develop questionnaire items, we reviewed previous studies on school counselor intern supervisors, had discussions with practicing site supervisors and fellow counselor educators, and used the first author's 20-year experience as a university supervisor of school counseling interns. Items included a combination of forced-choice, 4-point Likert-type scale questions ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*a great extent*), and open-ended questions, which were used to provide context and a deeper understanding of respondents' experiences. We enlisted an expert panel, including three counselor educators, one higher education doctoral faculty member, and two experienced school counselor site supervisors of interns, to review for construct and content validity and for administration considerations (e.g., ease of use, length of time of completion). On the basis of panel feedback, we reworded some items and deleted unclear items, as well as reordered some questions to avoid a response set.

For the final questionnaire, participants were asked to respond to a series of initial questions related to professional service followed by questions related to supervision training (e.g., graduate course, conference, workshop) and their interest in receiving additional supervision training and the types of training preferred (e.g., handbook, single-session workshop, conference, in-service training on-site). Last, there were two open-ended items that assessed for their ideas about ways in which they might be supported in their role as a school counselor site supervisor and recommendations for how counselor education programs might better prepare school counselors for the role of site supervisor.

Data Analysis

Given the descriptive focus of our research questions, we calculated frequencies and percentages for individual questionnaire items. Using SPSS, we produced cross-tabulations for variables of interest, along with the calculation of gamma for each cross-tabulation as a measure of substantive significance. The gamma statistic was chosen because it is used to test the strength of association between cross-tabulated variables measured at the

ordinal level (Johnson & Reynolds, 2011). We used a qualitative research approach (Merriam, 2009) to analyze participant responses to our two open-ended questions. Specifically, we reviewed complete narrative responses to the two items several times to gain an overall sense of the data. We used an open coding strategy to assign codes to keywords and phrases and then collapsed codes with shared meanings into categories. Salient categories included between 17 and 34 comments. The categories with only a few comments were excluded from the results.

Results

Supervisory Preparation and Training

Of the 181 respondents who answered the survey item about how well their counselor education program prepared them for their role as an intern site supervisor, 41% ($n = 74$) felt "not at all" prepared by their counselor education programs for their role as a site supervisor, and 30% ($n = 54$) felt only "somewhat" prepared. Eighteen percent ($n = 33$) felt prepared to a "moderate" extent, and 8% ($n = 15$) felt prepared to a "great extent" (the remaining 3% ($n = 5$) did not answer this question). When asked to describe the nature of supervision training received in their graduate education programs, the majority (59%, $n = 130$) of the 220 respondents informed us that this role was either not addressed at all or only indirectly addressed, 15% ($n = 34$) discussed the supervisor role in one or more courses, 7% ($n = 15$) took one or more courses devoted to supervision, and 5% ($n = 10$) took one course with supervision as a component; 14% ($n = 31$) did not respond to this question. With regard to supervision training activities that participants accessed in addition to graduate courses, of the 188 who responded, 48% ($n = 91$) had read books or articles related to supervision, 19% ($n = 36$) had attended a workshop on supervision at a professional conference, 13% ($n = 25$) participated in a training course on supervision, 12% ($n = 23$) had attended an in-service training about this role, and 7% ($n = 13$) participated in a group training that focused on supervision. (Percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.)

When asked whether they receive regular supervision about their role as a supervisor, 78% ($n = 165$) of the 212 respondents to this item replied that they did not; 3% ($n = 7$) did not respond to this question. Of the 19% ($n = 40$) who did receive supervision about this role, half of those who were supervised on-site received this supervision from school administrators who did not hold the Pupil Personnel Services credential. The majority of 180 respondents (84%, $n = 151$) indicated that they are very interested or somewhat interested in receiving supervision training. When queried about the extent to which they were interested in various methods of supervision training, most (63%, $n = 113$) of the 180 respondents to this question were interested or very interested in a handbook for school counseling supervisors, followed by 59% ($n = 106$) who were interested in a single-session workshop at a local university, and 44% ($n = 79$) who were interested in a conference

on supervision. Fifty-nine percent ($n = 131$) of these respondents were least interested (i.e., not interested or somewhat interested) in a supervision course at a university, 52% ($n = 115$) in an online supervision course, or 52% ($n = 114$) in an in-service training at their school site.

The open-ended question that invited participants to "recommend how counselor education programs might better prepare school counselors for the role of site supervisor" revealed that, of 121 responses, 34 participants (28%) recommended supervision training during the counselor education program. One participant reflected,

> My initial thoughts . . . are that I find it developmentally inappropriate to have current graduate-level students even thinking about supervising others, when they, in fact, have not even been gainfully employed with any years of experience. However, when I pondered this question further, this could be a great reflective strategy. Posing the question "What makes a great supervisor?" can shed some light on what are the important characteristics of a good counselor, as well as a good leader/mentor.

Twenty-eight participants (23%) recommended that universities offer supervisor training and support. One participant stated, "Perhaps counseling programs could have a yearly meeting for potential and current supervisors [that] would serve to educate them about effective supervision and new information in the field of school counseling." Twenty-one participants (17%) recommended greater clarity, expectations, and guidelines for site supervision, and 17 (14%) recommended that supervision training would not be appropriate until individuals were involved in professional practice. An example of this alternative view was stated as follows:

> I believe a course on site supervision should be required before supervision is allowed. This course would be much more effective if completed AFTER the counselor has gained experience. It would not be meaningful if it is part of the credentialing program because newbies don't know what they don't know.

It is clear that the participants want more support and communication from counselor education programs. They also expressed a desire for training in supervision.

Counselor-to-Student Ratios and Differing Supervision Practices

Participants reported spending at least, and often exceeding, the recommended 1 hour of direct intern supervision per week. The data from these items were based on a 100% response rate from the 220 participants in this study. Those with ratios involving between 351 and 550 students (67%, $n = 147$) were more likely to spend more than 5 hours of direct supervision per week than counselors with either higher or lower ratios. When cross-tabulated, $\gamma = .098$ reveals that the association between the counselor-to-student ratio at a site and most types of intern supervision practices in which a counselor engages is not a statistically significant one ($p = .10$). The only practices that showed statistical significance were those of discussing techniques ($p \leq .05$), educating interns about site culture ($p = .03$), educating about policies and procedures ($p = .03$), and mentoring

through discussion of professional standards (p = .009). Although these relationships showed statistical significance, the gamma statistic shows little substantive significance. Association was most significant between the counselor-to-student ratio and the practice of mentoring an intern into the profession through discussion of standards (γ = .23, p = .01). This reveals a slight positive correlation between the counselor-to-student ratio and this supervision practice. In this case, knowing the counselor-to-student ratio for a respondent decreased our error in predicting their rank in mentoring through discussion of standards by 23%.

Although the correlation is weak, it is interesting to look at the frequencies for more specific differences in practice. We anticipated that a high counselor-to-student ratio would be associated with less engagement in each of the supervisory practices because of presumed time constraints associated with high ratios. Surprisingly, the distributions of levels of practice for each type of supervision practice according to counselor-to-student ratio revealed that counselors with ratios between 351 and 550 (the middle two categories) are most likely to engage in the following practices to a great extent: observing, discussing theory, role-playing, discussing techniques, modeling with observations, reviewing reports, educating about site culture, educating about policies and procedures, mentoring through participation in professional associations, mentoring through discussion of standards, mentoring by encouraging political awareness, and coleading a group. Of the total 220 respondents to these items, counselors with a student ratio between 351 and 550 engaged in almost all of these practices more frequently than counselors with either a higher or lower student ratio.

University Contact and Helping Interns Create a Plan

Cross-tabulations using gamma revealed a weak relationship between the nature of contact between participants and university supervisors and the extent to which respondents help interns create a plan for their experiences. Based on the responses from 216 participants, this finding is neither statistically significant nor substantively significant (γ = .068, p = .46). Open-ended results strengthened our understanding of participants' experiences with universities. For the question that asked about "ways in which you might be supported in your role as a school counseling site supervisor," we identified several categories. The themes of greater clarity of expectations, training, and support, and increased contact with university/faculty supervisors emerged. Of 96 total responses, 31 (32%) expressed a desire for greater clarity of university expectations, guidelines, and standards. One participant suggested "setting up or locating standard procedures . . . that describe what is expected of a counselor and supervisor," and another suggested "better alignment/understanding of expectations of the site, intern, and graduate program." Twenty-nine participants (30%) expressed a desire for training and support for their role as site supervisors. One participant thought, "It would be beneficial

to have opportunities to attend trainings/workshops/conferences 'to-gether' to engage in discussions on professional development and how the ideas/activities can be embedded into the current program at the site." Twenty-seven participants (28%) expressed a desire for increased contact with university supervisors/program faculty. Two respondents revealed the following: "Better communication and more collegial relationship between the university student's supervisor and the supervising counselor at the school site [are] needed" and "I've worked with three different universities and all three had very little contact with the intern and [me] at the site." The remaining responses were diverse and did not fall into coded categories.

Supervision Practices for Pre- and Post-ASCA National Model

Counselors credentialed before 2003 appear slightly more likely than those credentialed after 2003 to observe an intern's session and provide feedback. The following data are based on the 216 respondents to this survey item. The modal category for post-2003 counselors was that they observe to a moderate extent (41%, $n = 89$), whereas the modal category for those credentialed before 2003 was that they observe to a great extent (32%, $n = 69$). Both groups were equally unlikely to review taped sessions with feedback, with the modal category for both being "not at all." Both groups of counselors engaged in the practice of role-playing with interns to the same extent, with both groups reporting that they engage in role-playing to some extent as their modal category (40%, $n = 86$). Likewise, counselors appeared to be similar in the extent to which they discussed counseling theory with interns. When it comes to discussing counseling techniques, both groups reported that they do so to a great extent as their modal category; 43% ($n = 93$) for counselors trained before 2003 and 41% ($n = 89$) for counselors trained after 2003.

No difference was noted between groups in the extent to which they engage in any of the other supervision practices queried, with the exception of the extent to which they model skills with an intern observing them in session. In this area, there was a modest and statistically significant relationship ($\gamma = .26$, $p = .02$) between how long counselors have been credentialed and their likelihood to engage in this practice. Because $\gamma = .26$, knowing whether site supervisors were credentialed before or after the ASCA National Model was presented in counselor education programs reduces the error in predicting their rank in the dependent variable (i.e., the extent to which they model skills with an intern observing them in session) by 26%.

Discussion

This study was conducted not only to assess the supervision training of current California school counseling site supervisors but also to identify their supervision practices and to ascertain their interest in receiving training on supervision and their preferences for how this training might be delivered.

Within this broad purpose, we were also interested in determining whether supervisors who had been trained before the publication of the ASCA National Model and after the change in CCTC Standards for school counseling preparation programs differed in these areas from those who had been trained after the introduction of the new model and standards.

The 2001 CCTC Standards state that school counselor education programs must provide candidates with "knowledge of models of supervision used to mentor pre-professionals in practica and field experience placements" (CCTC, 2001, p. 64). Although there is evidence that some of the participants in this study received an introduction to supervision in their counselor education programs, of 181 respondents to this question, only 8% ($n = 15$) felt well trained in this area. Our finding that 41% ($n = 74$) of 220 respondents reported receiving no training in supervision is consistent with previous studies, with one study reporting that 54% received little or no training (DeKruf & Pehrsson, 2011) and another reporting that 60% of school counseling site supervisors received no training (Studer & Oberman, 2006). This training gap creates a dilemma in that there are no other formal structures in California for ensuring such training. Unlike other helping professionals, California school counselors are not required to have specific, formal training to become supervisors, nor are there ongoing continuing education requirements to maintain their credentials, which could provide them access to such training. Miller and Dollarhide (2006) have argued for a developmental, contextual introduction of supervision to candidates in the early stages of their school counselor education. This early introduction can set the stage for their understanding of skills and approaches they might use in their roles as future supervisors.

The issue of supervision training was not included in the updated ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2012) or in the current CCTC Standards (CCTC, 2008). Although the CCTC requires that site supervisors be trained in supervision, our results indicate that most site supervisors in our study had no such training. We recommend that the CCTC and ASCA add specific standards and postcredential requirements for school counselors who serve as intern supervisors. Over 43% of our participants reported spending between 2 and 5 hours per week supervising interns, which exceeds the minimum suggested by the CCTC (2001) and required by CACREP (2009). We anticipated that those with a counselor-to-student ratio higher than ASCA recommended (1:250) would spend less time on supervision of interns. This was not the case, as those with between 351 and 550 students were most likely (67%, $n = 147$) to spend over 5 hours per week on supervision. Supervisors with these ratios were also more likely to engage in a variety of supervision practices to a greater extent than counselors with higher or lower ratios. This might indicate some sort of happy medium or ideal balancing point in terms of the number of students who engage counselors sufficiently to warrant or inspire mentorship while not overwhelming their time or energy to the point of precluding them from engaging such practices.

The nature of contact between site supervisors and counselor education programs was quite varied. Participants reporting more face-to-face contact with

university supervisors were more likely than those with other types of contact, or no contact, to help create a plan for interns' field experience, as required by the CCTC. Although statistically significant differences were not found for type of contact and internship plan development, the frequencies for university contact and the development of field experience plans were concerning. Most models of supervision affirm the importance of a structured plan that includes personal/professional goals early on in the internship, which will be revisited throughout the field experience (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; CCTC, 2001). We also found that, of the 208 respondents, some participants (16%, $n = 34$) had no contact with the university. Both CCTC (2001) and CACREP (2009) have discussed the importance of collaboration between the university and site supervisor. If site supervisors are serving as gatekeepers (Roberts & Morotti, 2001) for those entering the profession, contact with the university is essential, particularly when interns need remediation.

Although site supervisors trained before the appearance of the ASCA National Model do not differ from those trained after the model on the use of most supervision practices, they are more likely to model working with students while interns observe. Supervisors trained after the ASCA National Model are more likely to observe interns in practice and offer feedback. The literature does not address these particular differences in practice, and it may be useful to explore this further.

Results of our study make clear the need for both training and support of school counseling site supervisors. Although there are some useful resources for these supervisors (Studer, 2006), the profession lacks a formal structure and process for ensuring that all practicing site supervisors are trained and competent in this role. Counselor education programs are in a unique position to play a useful role in both the training and support of site supervisors. Participants in this study desired increased collaboration with counselor education program faculty, and universities can offer workshops and conferences for school counselors from schools/districts where their interns are placed. Respondents suggested that handbooks for site supervisor practice would also be useful. Additionally, regular support through online discussion boards, blogs, and other electronic resources can provide the ongoing support that supervisors in our study desired (Butler & Constantine, 2006). Buono, Uellendahl, Guth, and Dandeneau (2011) and Studer (2006) have discussed the use of various technology tools for the supervision of counselors-in-training, some of which might also be used to support site supervisors. This would be particularly helpful for school counselor supervisors such as those in our study, who reported receiving little or no supervision about this important role.

School counselor education programs can take a leadership role in addressing this need for site supervisor training by identifying and evaluating supervision models that are appropriate for the complex role of the school counselor and advocating for increased clarity in the state standards as well as those recommended and published by state and national associations. Last, given the current economy in the state of California and across the country, counselor education programs might collaborate and pool their talent and

resources to provide in-service training for school counseling site supervisors within their regions, thus ensuring a consistently trained, qualified pool of supervisors for all school counselors-in-training. Consistent with Miller and Dollarhide's (2006) report, although interested in supervision training, our participants were least interested in attending a supervision course, which might be a result of time and financial constraints.

Limitations

The relatively small sample size, limited to the state of California, prevents generalizability of results to the larger population of school counselors serving as site supervisors of interns. Some participants were recruited from professional associations, and there might be training and practice differences between those who are more active in the field and have access to relevant resources and training opportunities and those who are nonmembers. Our sampling procedure, although convenient and efficient, did not allow for the calculation of response rate, because we were unable to determine how many of the school counselors who received recruitment e-mails were also serving as site supervisors and were eligible to participate. A discrete list of intern site supervisors in California was not available. A final limitation relates to the self-report nature of the study, which allows participants to answer questions in ways that they think are socially desirable.

Future Research

Although the CCTC Standards require school counselor education programs to include supervision models in their curricula, many participants in our study reported receiving little, if any, training in supervision. The fact that these same untrained counselors are being approved as intern site supervisors is concerning. Future studies to determine the extent to which school counselor education programs are including supervision in their curricula and responding to CCTC standards are recommended, particularly because participants reported a lack of collaboration with university programs. Additionally, qualitative studies with those supervisors who feel most prepared and supported by cooperating universities would shed light on successful links among education, training, and practice.

Our finding about the ability of supervisors with higher than recommended counselor-to-student ratios to provide more than the recommended time on direct intern supervision might be explored further. The ASCA-recommended 1:250 ratio refers to the ratio seen as necessary for effective school counseling, not for supervision. We suggest that accrediting bodies revisit the recommended hours spent on direct supervision of interns, particularly considering that school counselors hold a variety of complex functions beyond individual and group counseling.

Finally, we recommend further research into the ways in which counselor education programs can support site supervisors in practice. Also, continued research on models of supervision specifically developed for school coun-

selors, and the impact of their use on supervisor effectiveness and intern skill development, is needed.

Summary

It will take the collaborative efforts of counselor educators, state credentialing programs, professional associations, and practicing school counselors to move this much-needed initiative forward. Because there has been such a long-standing call for attention to this issue, with few significant changes being made, counselor educators are called on as the most likely change agents to put such transformation in motion. It is time that counselor educators take the lead in modeling and mentoring effective site supervision to support school counseling candidates as they develop the knowledge and skills required to meet the increasing challenges in today's schools and to support the academic success of all students.

References

American School Counselor Association. (n.d.). *Student-to-counselor ratio 2012–2013.* Retrieved from http://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/home/Ratios12-13.pdf

American School Counselor Association. (2003). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

American School Counselor Association. (2012). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.

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

Blakely, C., Underwood, L. A., & Rehfuss, M. (2009). Effectiveness of school counselor supervision with trainees utilizing the ASCA Model. *Journal of School Counseling, 7,* 1–26. Retrieved from files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ886144.pdf

Buono, L., Uellendahl, G., Guth, L., & Dandeneau, C. (2011). The use of technology in counselor education. In G. McAuliffe & K. Eriksen (Eds.), *Handbook of counselor preparation: Constructivist, developmental, experimental approaches* (pp. 377–392). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Butler, S. K., & Constantine, M. G. (2006). Web-based peer supervision, collective self-esteem, and case conceptualization ability in school counselor trainees. *Professional School Counseling, 10,* 146–152.

California Board of Behavioral Sciences. (2012). *Marriage and family therapist intern/trainee supervision.* Retrieved from http://www.bbs.ca.gov/licensees/imf_supervision.shtml

California Board of Psychology. (2014). *Supervision at a glance.* Retrieved from www.psychology.ca.gov/applicants.quickref_laws.pdf

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2001, January). *Standards of quality and effectiveness for Pupil Personnel Services credentials: School counseling, school psychology, school social work, child welfare and attendance.* Sacramento, CA: Author.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2008). *Standards: Common.* Retrieved from www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/STDS-common.html

Carrell, S. E., & Carrell, S. A. (2006). Do lower student-to-counselor ratios reduce school disciplinary problems? *Contributions to Economic Analysis & Policy, 5,* 1–24. Retrieved from www.econ.ucdavis.edu/faculty/scarrell/counselors2.pdf

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2009). *2009 standards.* Retrieved from www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/2009-Standards.pdf

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2015). *2016 CACREP standards.* Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/2016-CACREP.Standards.pdf

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2014). *Directory.* Retrieved from www.cacrep.org/directory/?state=CA&dl=M&pt_id=&kewords=&submitthis=

DeKruyf, L., & Pehrsson, D. E. (2011). School counseling site supervisor training: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 50,* 314–327.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2008). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Dollarhide, C.T., & Miller, G.M. (2006). Supervision for the preparation and practice of school counselors: Pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45,* 242–318.

Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2012). *Developing and managing your school guidance and counseling program* (5th ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Herlihy, B., Gray, N., & McCollum, V. (2002). Legal and ethical issues in school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 6,* 55–60.

Hurwitz, M., & Howell, J. (2013). *Measuring the impact of high school counselors on college enrollment.* Retrieved from College Board Advocacy & Policy Center website: http://media. collegeboard.com/digitalServices/pdf/advocacy/policycenter/research-brief-measuring-impact-high-school-counselors-college-enrollment.pdf

Johnson, J., & Reynolds, H. (2011). *Political science research methods* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Luke, M., & Bernard, J. M. (2006). The School Counseling Supervision Model: An extension of the Discrimination Model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 46,* 282–295.

Magnuson, S., Black, L. L., & Norem, K. (2004). Supervising school counselors and interns: Resources for site supervisors. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory & Research, 32,* 4–15.

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, G. M., & Dollarhide, C.T. (2006). Supervision in schools: Building pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45,* 296–303.

Murphy, S., & Kaffenberger, C. (2007). ASCA National Model: A foundation for supervision of practicum and internship students. *Professional School Counseling, 10,* 289–296.

Page, B. J., Pietrzak, D. R., & Sutton, J. M., Jr. (2001). National survey of school counselor supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41,* 142–150.

Roberts, W. B., & Morotti, A. A. (2001). Site supervisors of professional school counseling interns: Suggested guidelines. *Professional School Counseling, 4,* 208–215.

Stephens, D. L. (2008). *The site supervision of school counselors-in-training: An interview study of promising practices* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Fielding Graduate University, Santa Barbara, CA.

Studer, J. R. (2006). *Supervising the school counselor trainee: Guidelines for practice.* Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Studer, J. R., & Diambra, J. F. (Eds.). (2010). *A guide to practicum and internship for school counselors-in-training.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Studer, J. R., & Oberman, A. (2006). The use of the ASCA National Model in supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 10,* 82–87.

Whiston, S. C., Tai, L. L., Rahardja, D., & Eder, K. (2011). School counseling outcome: A meta-analytic examination of interventions. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 89,* 37–55.

Wilczenski, F. L., Schumacher, R. A., & Cook, A. L. (2010). *School counseling principles: Mentoring and supervising.* Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.

Wood, C., & Rayle, A. D. (2006). A model of school counseling supervision: The goals, functions, roles, and systems model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45,* 253–266.