

Article 69

Different CES Doctoral Student Experiences Endorsed by CACREP Program Flexibility: Implications for Monitoring Supervisor Effectiveness

Nicole M. Arcuri

Arcuri, Nicole M., PhD, LPC, ACS, NCC, DCC, SAC, is an adjunct assistant professor at Lock Haven University and a Military Liaison Counselor in south Texas. She has a strong passion for client advocacy. Currently, she is extremely interested in advocating for most effective practices for clients, starting with the training counselor educator and supervision doctoral students receive.

Abstract

The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) affords accredited programs with a great deal of flexibility in how they train their counselor education and supervision (CES) doctoral students. CES doctoral students receive training determined by the program attended and the faculty they have as instructors and supervisors. This article explores the variance in preparation received by CES doctoral students in the attempt to meet all CACREP objectives required for graduation. Additionally, effective educator and supervisor roles are explored. Currently, there is not a streamlined approach for CES faculty to evaluate their effectiveness in preparing their doctoral students. The author proposes the *CES Doctoral Intern Supervisor Efficacy Evaluation Form* as a resource for CES faculty when practicing ongoing evaluation and awareness of one's areas of strength and those in need of growth.

Keywords: counselor, educator, supervisor, identity, training

The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) expects counselor education and supervision (CES) doctoral degree students to be equipped to work as counselor educators, supervisors, researchers, and practitioners in both academic and clinical settings by the time of graduation (CACREP, 2015, Section 6.A.). Therefore, CACREP-approved programs expect CES doctoral students to receive advanced training in supervision, clinical practice, research, and teaching to be prepared as interns to educate and supervise master's-level students prior to entering the workforce as a professor (CACREP, 2015, Section 6.A.).

Currently there are 68 CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs in the United States (CACREP, 2016). All CES doctoral students are required to complete a minimum of 600 hours of clinical experience internship, which includes supervised experiences in

counselor education and supervision (CACREP, 2015, Section 6.C.7.). In previous research, CES doctoral interns reported a lack of clarification of their duties (Golde, 2005). During the internship phase, doctoral CES students must receive supervision in at least three of the five doctoral core areas: (a) counseling, (b) teaching, (c) supervision, (d) research and scholarship, as well as (e) leadership and advocacy (CACREP, 2015, Section 6.C.7.). Therefore, one CES doctoral student intern may be supervised while teaching a research course while another intern acts in the role of a counselor educator for a couples and family counseling course. The research course may be with first-year master's-level students, while the couples and family counseling course may include third-year master's-level counseling students. The activities for each course will differ as well as the way to effectively approach the students' capabilities (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2011).

CACREP (2015) requires all CES programs to meet eight standards: (a) Professional Orientation and Ethical Practice, (b) Social and Cultural Diversity, (c) Human Growth and Development, (d) Career Development, (e) Helping Relationships, (f) Group Work, (g) Assessment, and (h) Research and Program Evaluation. Guidelines in how CACREP-approved programs specifically should meet these standards are not outlined. According to CACREP (2015), doctoral programs should utilize their personal program strengths to determine how to insure the eight standards are met (Section 6.A.). "At minimum, programs must address all required content, but they may choose the level of emphasis placed on each content area" (CACREP, 2015, Introduction, para. 2), indicating that the supervision received by the CES doctoral interns by their faculty supervisors may vary in context to their courses taught as well as the areas of strengths of the program. The implication is that CES doctoral students receive varied counselor education and supervision training. Contrarily, "the 2016 CACREP Standards were also written with the intent to promote a unified counseling profession" (CACREP, 2015, Introduction, para. 3).

CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs' learning activities are only at the suggestion of the academic institution and are not a reflection of a formalized outline that all accredited programs must. In addition, CES doctoral graduates have reported feeling ill-prepared for their first position as professor (Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011). Perhaps there is a connection between the lack of CACREP-mandated specific activities and the evidence that CES doctoral graduates feel ill-prepared. When considering how people learn, social learning theory may provide insight into understanding how the lack of mandated specific activities may directly impact graduates' feelings of preparedness or lack of preparedness. Bandura's social learning theory implies that modeling and observation can have a profound effect on others (Bandura, 1974). Bandura's social learning theory suggests that not only do the master's-level students whom CES doctoral interns educate and supervise formulate personal perceptions about their experiences, but CES doctoral interns perceive their internship experiences based upon the experiences afforded to them by their supervisors.

This article is intended to (a) explore effective counselor educator and supervisor considerations in relation to each of the eight CACREP core standards, (b) stimulate counselor educators' and supervisors' reflection of their own strategies utilized to promote effective student understanding of each standard, and (c) identify effective monitoring strategies of CES faculty preparing CES doctoral students for the

professoriate. The reflection process is hoped to instigate counselor educators and supervisors to critically think about how teaching and supervising approaches can impact CES doctoral learner internship experiences. Currently there are counselor effectiveness rating scales, but there is not a formalized, consistent, supervisor evaluation rating scale available. This author proposes a rating form that would help CES supervisors evaluate their effectiveness and provide a systematic checklist to indicate areas of growth and actions needed to support supervisees in feeling confident as interns and eventual professors.

Effective Counselor Educator and Supervisor Considerations

Counselor educators have the responsibility to promote student learning (American Counseling Association [ACA], 2014, F.8.a) as well as engage students in the learning process (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2011). Counselor educators ultimately set the tone for the courses they teach, including the internship courses for doctoral CES students. Counselor educators are expected to teach their courses in accordance with their institution's program requirements. CACREP-accredited "core counselor education program faculty have the authority to determine program curricula and to establish operational policies and procedures for the program" (CACREP, 2015, Section 1.Y). Some counselor educators can even be responsible for developing the courses (ACA, 2014, F.7.a). In turn, the counselor educators with the authority to develop courses for CACREP-accredited programs must ensure the courses' competencies align with CACREP's (2015) standards in order to ensure that students have the opportunity to develop a professional counselor identity and can effectively act in the professional counselor role. Calley and Hawley (2008) noted that,

Implied in the professional identity related to counselor educators are the primary activities that contribute to one's role as an academician: teaching, scholarship, and service. These critical activities and their interactions with the tenets related to the counseling profession's identity are worthy of exploration because they directly relate to the transmission of professional identity. . . . Each of these aspects may also indirectly shape the professional identity of counseling students. (pp. 6–7)

Therefore, understanding the preparedness a CES intern feels in regard to serving in the role of counselor educator and supervisor is a necessity since this preparedness helps to develop their professional identity, which directly affects the students they serve.

Since CES doctoral CACREP-approved programs are not provided with specific outlines in how to meet the outcomes needed for their CES doctoral students, the institution's design of the program, syllabus details, and CES instructor teaching and supervision philosophy can be inferred to be flexible in nature. When considering the CACREP eight core content areas, there are multiple ways of addressing the objectives and multiple styles of CES program educators and/or supervisors. Educators and supervisors who understand how students are motivated and can structure the course in regards to the students' motivators will ultimately create an environment that fosters learning, engages learners, and motivates students (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2011).

Students can be motivated by either intrinsic or extrinsic motivators. Extrinsically motivated students become active in a course for an external reward while intrinsically

motivated students partake in the experience for the pleasure of learning the subject area (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2011). In order to foster students' intrinsic motivation, the educators and supervisors need to understand the students' motivators that ultimately require counselor educators and supervisors to modify their teaching styles in accordance with the needs of their students. When counselor educators work with students in the supervisory capacity, the faculty members ethically must be aware of each of the students' self-growth experiences (ACA, 2014, F.8.c.) in order to effectively provide students with supervision to meet their needs (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2011).

When CACREP-accredited CES program doctoral faculty members consider student progress, opportunities must be afforded to the students that match their level of competence (CACREP, 2015, Section 3) in order to safeguard the welfare of the client (ACA, 2014, F.1.a.) while also considering the level of competency expected at the students' stage of their doctoral program (ACA, 2014, F.9.a.). When programs are in accordance with CACREP (2015) standards, faculty are expected to provide students with ongoing evaluation and remediation (ACA, 2014, A.9.) to promote student growth (ACA, 2014, F.8.c.), fostering the production of effective professional counselors (CACREP, 2015). Even though gatekeeping is standardized, doctoral students in CES programs reported there to be a lack of clarification in their duties (Golde, 2005) and do not feel confident entering their first positions as professors (Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011).

Counselor educators and supervisors indicated a sense of feeling prepared for this role when provided with the following opportunities as doctoral students: (a) teach an entire course, (b) teach under supervision, (c) afforded occasions to ask faculty questions about the role, (d) be observed and receive feedback, and (e) receive mentoring (Hall, 2007). Thirty-eight counselor educator assistant professors in their first year participated in a study concerning their experiences as new professors; participants frequently noted a lack of preparation for their new role as professor (Magnuson, 2002). In 1994, Carter et al. found that only 43% of 200 study participants, who were counselor educators teaching in CACREP-accredited doctoral and/or master's level training programs, reported feeling very well prepared for this role and suggested that programs examine how well they prepare these graduates. However, it is now 2016, and there is no known framework to help counselor educators and supervisors evaluate their effectiveness in training CES doctoral students for the role.

Effective Supervisors According to ACES

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) is a division of ACA, which is expected to uphold ACA's ethical standards. However, results of a 2002 ACES member survey indicated that supervisors would like to have more specific guidance for *best*, everyday supervisory practice in addition to the ACA code of ethics; thus, the ACES Best Practices in Clinical Supervision Taskforce was formed (ACES, 2011). This taskforce has detailed best practices for supervisors working with counselors in training, including CES doctoral interns. ACES stresses that supervisors need to engage in self-reflection and ongoing personal professional development to provide supervisees with the best, most effective supervision experience (ACES, 2011, Section 11.d.). This guideline suggests supervisors must understand the needs of their supervisees and take those into consideration when supervisees indicate there is a lack of clarification

in their duties (Golde, 2005) or feel ill-prepared to enter the professoriate (Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011).

Not only are supervisors expected to provide feedback to CES doctoral interns, but they are also expected to help them process the feedback (ACES, 2011, Section 3) and evaluate both intern strengths and areas of growth while providing remediation when needed (ACES, 2011, Section 9). When supervisors decipher areas their supervisees would benefit from with interventions to further development, supervisors are ethically responsible to meet the needs of the supervisees. Helping supervisees work on indicated areas of growth can support CES doctoral interns in preparing for the role of professor.

How do supervisors assess their role effectiveness. As indicated earlier, supervisors ethically should follow the best practice of monitoring their effectiveness for working with supervisees. Understanding feedback of doctoral students entering the field should guide current counselor educators and supervisors to reassess their areas of impairment (ACA, 2014, F.5.b.) in training future counselor educators and supervisors. When supervisees indicate they are unclear of their specific role duties or feel ill-prepared to enter the field as a counselor educator and supervisor, supervisors need to address how they can modify their supervision practices to support supervisee growth (ACES, 2011, 11.A.xi.). Keeping in mind CACREP's eight standards that each program must meet and that CES doctoral interns must understand how to implement in the role of a CES prior to graduation, understanding how to assess supervisory effectiveness is imperative. Currently, there is not a standardized assessment scale or instrument utilized to rate and monitor CES supervisor effectiveness in supporting supervisees to feel confident upon graduation to enter the field of the professoriate. The author has proposed an effectiveness rating form for CES supervisors to utilize for ongoing personal evaluation of effectiveness for supporting supervisees in their professional growth.

CES Doctoral Intern Supervisor Efficacy Evaluation Form. The CES Doctoral Intern Supervisor Efficacy Evaluation Form will be explored to help supervisors have a measurable means to evaluate personal strengths and areas needed for growth in order to prepare CES doctoral interns for the professoriate effectively. The form was created from the complementation of both ACA'S 2014 *Code of Ethics*, Section F, which addresses supervision, training, and teaching and ACES's (2011) *Best Practices in Clinical Supervision*. The form should be utilized on an ongoing basis to effectively monitor effectiveness and acknowledge areas needing attention to help support supervisees in their growth efforts. This form and the process of ongoing evaluation are mindful of Bandura's social learning theory by advocating for most effective supervisor practices and ongoing regulation to ensure supervisees receive the most effective supervision with no regards to the program's designated areas of strength.

Each area on this form provides supervisors with the opportunity to evaluate if they have addressed an area ethically necessary to support supervisees to be effective professors upon graduation despite their program's areas of strengths. This form is intended to make sure the supervisees receive a well-balanced supervision experience in which they feel confident when entering the field as a graduate who is supervising counselors in training.

Figure 1. CES Doctoral Intern Supervisor Efficacy Evaluation Form

Directions: During Counselor Educator and Supervisor's supervisory relationship with CES doctoral intern supervisees, supervisors have the ethical responsibility to monitor effectiveness with supporting supervisees to feel confident upon graduation to enter the field of professoriate.

	Need Further Development to Support Supervisee	Strength in Supporting Supervisee Development	Actions Needed <i>(If none, please indicate N/A)</i>
F.1. Counselor Supervision and Client Welfare (ACA, 2014)			
F.1.a. Client Welfare			
F.1.b. Counselor Credentials			
F.1.c. Informed Consent and Client Rights			
F.2. Counselor Supervision Competence (ACA, 2014) Supervisor Preparation: Supervision Training and Supervision of Supervision (ACES, 2011, Section 12)			
F.2.a. Supervisor Preparation			
F.2.b. Multicultural Issues/Diversity in Supervision			
F.2.c. Online Supervision <i>(Indicate N/A if not applicable)</i>			
F.3. Supervisory Relationship (ACA, 2014) The Supervisory Relationship (ACES, 2011, Section 5)			
F.3.a. Extending Conventional Supervisory Relationships			
F.3.b. Sexual Relationships			
F.3.c. Sexual Harassment			
F.3.d. Friends or Family Members			
F.4. Supervisor Responsibilities (ACA, 2014) Initiating Supervision (ACES, 2011, Section 1)			
F.4.a. Informed Consent for Supervision			
F.4.b. Emergencies and Absences			
F.4.c. Standards for Supervisees			
F.4.d. Termination of the Supervisory Relationship			
F.5. Student and Supervisee Responsibilities (ACA, 2014) Initiating Supervision (ACES, 2011, Section 1) and Ethical Considerations (ACES, 2011, Section 7)			
F.5.a. Ethical Responsibilities			
F.5.b. Impairment			
F.5.c. Professional Disclosure			
Conducting Supervision (ACES, 2011, Section 4) and Supervision Format (ACES, 2011, Section 10)			
a. The supervisor adheres to appropriate professional standards (e.g., accreditation, certification, and licensure regulations) in establishing the frequency and modality of supervision sessions.			
b. The supervisor provides a safe, supportive, and structured supervision climate.			
c. The supervisor uses a variety of supervisory interventions.			

d. The supervisor chooses a group supervision format for multiple reasons; time efficiency is not a primary rationale.			
e. The supervisor chooses a triadic supervision format for multiple reasons; time efficiency is not a primary rationale.			
f. The supervisor employs technology in ways that enhance the supervisory process and the development of the supervisee.			
g. In both academic and post-degree supervision, the supervisor actively evaluates the course of supervision on an ongoing basis.			
F.6. Counseling Supervision Evaluation, Remediation, and Endorsement (ACA, 2014) Goal-Setting (ACES, 2011, Section 2), Giving Feedback (ACES, 2011, Section 3), Documentation (ACES, 2011, Section 8)			
F.6.a. Evaluation			
F.6.b. Gatekeeping and Remediation			
F.6.c. Counseling for Supervisees			
F.6.d. Endorsements			
F.7. Responsibilities of Counselor Educators (ACA, 2014) Diversity and Advocacy Considerations (ACES, 2011, Section 6) and Ethical Considerations (ACES, 2011, Section 7)			
F.7.a. Counselor Educators			
F.7.b. Counselor Educator Competence			
F.7.c. Infusing Multicultural Issues/Diversity			
F.7.d. Integration of Study and Practice			
F.7.e. Teaching Ethics			
F.7.f. Use of Case Examples			
F.7.g. Student-to-Student Supervision and Instruction			
F.7.h. Innovative Theories and Techniques			
F.7.i. Field Placements			
F.8. Student Welfare (ACA, 2014)			
F.8.a. Program Information and Orientation			
F.8.b. Student Career Advising			
F.8.c. Self-Growth Experiences			
F.8.d. Addressing Personal Concerns			
F.9. Evaluation and Remediation (ACA, 2014) Evaluation (ACES, 2011, Section 9)			
F.9.a. Evaluation of Students			
F.9.b. Limitations			
F.9.c. Counseling for Students			
F.10. Roles and Relationships Between Counselor Educators and Students (ACA, 2014) The Supervisory Relationship (ACES, 2011, Section 5)			
F.10.a. Sexual or Romantic Relationships			
F.10.b. Sexual Harassment			
F.10.c. Relationships With Former Students			
F.10.d. Nonacademic Relationships			
F.10.e. Counseling Services			
F.10.f. Extending Educator–Student Boundaries			

11. The Supervisor (ACES, 2011, Section 7)			
a. The supervisor is competent in providing clinical supervision			
b. The supervisor can clearly describe the purpose of clinical supervision and distinguish it from the counseling process as well as from administrative and program supervision.			
c. The supervisor has a collaborative relationship with additional supervisors with whom the supervisee may be working (e.g., clinical, administrative, and/or program supervisor at the university, practicum or internship site, and/or work setting).			
d. The supervisor engages in self-reflection and other avenues of personal and professional development.			
e. The supervisor manages supervisory relationship dynamics competently and appropriately.			

Summary

This article asks counselor educators and supervisors to consider supervisor approaches with their supervisees that can impact CACREP CES doctoral learner internship experiences as well as levels of confidence upon graduating and becoming a professor. CACREP’s 2016 standards indicate that CES doctoral interns must be able to educate and supervise counseling students in academic and clinical settings prior to graduation (2015, Section 6A.). CACREP-accredited programs must be able to train CES doctoral students to educate and supervise counseling students in all eight standards. Yet, graduates are reporting feeling a lack of confidence to begin their careers as professors. Since CACREP allows accredited doctoral programs flexibility in how the standards are met (CACREP, 2015, Section 6A.), could this be effecting the variance in those who report feeling prepared while others do not?

When considering Bandura’s (1974) social learning theory, the experiences the CES doctoral students are provided may affect how they, as future counselor educators and supervisors, will instruct the next generation of professional counselors. Yet, permitting CES doctoral students to experience counselor educators with varying philosophies and approaches to teaching and supervising can showcase the creativity permitted within the field. This may be helpful in order for future counselor educators to also individualize their teaching and supervision philosophy while meeting the needs of their students.

This article has the purpose of inciting critical thinking among current counselor educators and supervisors when working with CES doctoral interns. How do you believe your approach to working with CES doctoral interns will impact their internship experience? How do you believe it will prepare them with the confidence needed to become a professor?

References

- American Counseling Association. (2014). *ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision [ACES]. (2011, April 22). Best practices in clinical supervision, adopted by the ACES Executive Council. Retrieved from <http://www.acesonline.net/sites/default/files/ACES-Best-Practices-in-clinical-supervision-document-FINAL.pdf>
- Bandura, A. (1974). Behavior theory and the model of man. *American Psychologist*, 29(12), 859–869.
- Calley, N. G., & Hawley, L. D. (2008). The professional identity of counselor educators. *Clinical Supervisor*, 27(1), 3–16. doi:10.1080/07325220802221454
- Carter, R. B., Bowman, R. L., Kher, N., Bowman, V. E., Jones, R. L., & Tollerud, T. R. (1994). Counselor educators' perceptions of satisfying and dissatisfying teaching experiences. *Education*, 114, 439–450.
- Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2015). *2016 CACREP standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/2016-Standards-with-Glossary-rev-2.2016.pdf>
- Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2016). *Directory*. Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/directory/?state=&dl%5B%5D=D&pt_id=&pc_logic=any&keywords=&submitthis=
- Golde, C. M. (2005). The role of the department and discipline in doctoral student attrition: Lessons from four departments. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(6), 669–700.
- Hunt, B., & Weber Gilmore, G. (2011). Learning to teach: Teaching internships in counselor education and supervision. *The Professional Counselor*, 1(2), 143–151.
- Hall, S. F. (2007). *Counselor educators' perceptions of their doctoral level teaching preparation* (Order No. 3261598). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304836684)
- Magnuson, S. (2002). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their 1st year. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 41(4), 306–320.
- Svinicki, M. D., & McKeachie, W. J. (2011). *McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers* (13th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Note: This paper is part of the annual VISTAS project sponsored by the American Counseling Association. Find more information on the project at: <http://www.counseling.org/knowledge-center/vistas>