Journal of Human Services: Training, Research, and Practice

Volume 6 | Issue 1 Article 4

9-28-2020

Infusing Counseling Theories with the Integrated Developmental Model: Strengthening Supervision Practices

Deena Shelton
Concordia University Irvine, deena.shelton@cui.edu

Anthony Zazzarino
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, asz28@shp.rutgers.edu

Abstract

Supervision is vital to all human services professions to help new professionals assimilate to their roles. There are many theory based supervisory methods to guide supervisors, and counseling professionals have suggested that the adoption of a developmental model of supervision prepares the supervisor to partner with supervisees to facilitate feedback related to developmental milestones. This paper explores the dynamics of combining the Integrated Developmental Model (IDM) of supervision with counseling theories that influence supervision styles and offers examples of how IDM is flexible in combining with theoretical approaches by providing examples and information related to its integration with solution-focused supervision and person-centered supervision. Included is a vignette to help bridge the concept from theory to practice, information on roles for the supervisor and supervisee, and cultural considerations to aid supervisors in practical implementation of the supervision strategies.

Infusing Counseling Theories with the Integrated Developmental Model: Strengthening Supervision Practices

Integral to the helping professions, supervision is the process by which tenured members of the field mentor new members and hold them accountable to ethical practice as they develop competence in practice (Watkins, 2011). This can occur as a part of licensing processes or within the context of job-specific training. During the process of supervision, the supervisee may be guided by the supervisor in case and theory conceptualization, client intervention, personal and professional development, standards of practice, ethics and legal issues, and other job-related requirements (Bornsheuer-Boswell et al., 2013). Just as human service professionals need to be competent in theories and practices for effective client services, supervisors should understand developmental and supervision models for human service professionals' growth (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Supervisors often have task-specific items they prioritize in supervision, but it is also beneficial to have adopted supervision theories or styles to guide the supervisory relationship. Bornsheuer-Boswell et al. (2013) suggested that the most effective counseling supervisors integrate counseling theory and supervision theory to effectively serve those under their supervision because it guides both engagement and tracking supervisee growth. This concept is beneficial and could be adopted beyond the counseling profession to strengthen supervision across all helping professions.

The purpose of this conceptual article is to provide a bridge from theory to practice for supervisors in the human services field. In this article, two theory-driven supervision styles are integrated with a developmental supervision model to help create an example for use with other theories as desired. The two theories were chosen because of their differences in approach to directiveness and engagement with the supervisee. While supervisors or educators may not only

focus on those theory-based supervision styles, the sample vignettes and application will help guide the connection between other theory-based supervision styles and a developmental framework for supervision. As such, human services professionals can strengthen the framework of their styles and preferences to reinforce the most effective outcomes for clients through well-developed guidance in supervision practice.

In this article, we will introduce and explain the Integrated Developmental Model (IDM) of supervision as an anchor for developmental tracking. While there are other developmental models, Stoltenberg, and McNeil's (2010) IDM provides a robust process of tracking the development of the professional competence of a supervisee while focusing on specific characteristics that can be used to guide supervisees in feedback. After briefly describing the two chosen theory-based supervision styles, we discuss how to connect them to a developmental model and provide learning vignettes for how those might unfold in a supervision situation. This article will provide the reader with a foundation for supervision theory integration and concepts related to practical application.

Integrated Developmental Model of Supervision

Stoltenberg's IDM was developed for counselors and provides a framework for supervisee development and supervisor interventions and guidance (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). As a tiered model, IDM includes three developmental stages experienced by counselors as they learn and grow (Boie & Lopez, 2011). Level 1 is characterized by a lack of training and experience as counselors upon entering supervision, and the counselors in training require more direct feedback from supervisors (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Level 2 counselors are less dependent on instructional supervision and can engage in a more leadership role in their growth (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Level 3 counselors focus more on the therapeutic process and

their client engagement rather than their insecurities and shortcomings, allowing for a richer supervision experience (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). A final level, Level 3i (integrated), is described as counselors who are confident and active across multiple domains during the counseling process (Boie & Lopez, 2011).

As a function of IDM, supervisors assess development in professional interactions across three markers of growth, including the new professional's self-other awareness, motivation, and autonomy (Boie & Lopez, 2011). New counselors must establish competence in eight professional domains as evaluated by the supervisor, specifically in intervention skills competence, assessment techniques, interpersonal assessments, client conceptualization, individual differences, theoretical orientation, treatment plans and goals, and professional ethics (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Finally, IDM offers both facilitative and authoritative interventions for supervisors that allow for theory integration and a wide array of options for facilitative development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). For facilitative interventions, Stoltenberg, and McNeill (2010) suggested cathartic interventions that elicit emotions and validation techniques that support the supervisee; Bernard and Goodyear (2014) added catalytic interventions to this category that include open-ended questions to facilitate client exploration. For directive interventions, Stoltenberg, and McNeill (2010) recommended prescribing advice and confronting the supervisee if the need for such direct interaction arises; Bernard and Goodyear (2014) also included a teaching component as an alternative to prescriptive interventions.

While portions of IDM are relegated to counselors and may not transfer to other helping professionals, the structure of domains of growth may be beneficial for any new human services professionals to have a clear understanding of how they will be evaluated. This process could be

altered by supervisors to meet the needs of their agency or supervisees. Additionally, the flexibility in intervention options provides the space for this model to be used beyond counseling professionals.

Solution-Focused Supervision

Solution-focused supervision (SFS) has roots in solution-focused brief therapy (SFBT), which has gained global attention for the empirical support it is receiving in the literature (Moro et al., 2016). Solution-focused therapy is a collaborative method that approaches clients as the experts of their lives and values their ability to make decisions for their improvement (de Shazer et al., 1986). Counselors partner with clients to support their choices and help challenge their thought processes to guide them into solutions that will have a lasting impact (de Shazer et al., 1986). Often, the solutions considered are small, but there are changes that the client can make to affect current and future areas of struggle (Moro et al., 2016).

Solution-focused supervision views the supervisor and supervisee as a team, even in terminology; the supervisee is referred to as the 'therapist' to honor the professional standing and competence (Benjamin, 2014). Solution-focused supervisors empower therapists by abdicating the position of authority and "leading from one step behind" to allow room for ownership of learning and growing (Bannick, 2014, p. 7). Though supervisees may need guidance in skills, they are seen as the expert of their situation and are encouraged to make thoughtful decisions. (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014).

In SFS, supervisors adopt a direct role in the development of skills but encourage supervisees to embrace their position as a professional and independent learner (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Supervisors may be acting as an authority figure in the development of solutions, but they still actively guide and monitor the growth process of the supervisee (Thomas,

2013). Supervisors actively evaluate the decisions and movements of their supervisees rather than accept any change as positive to ensure the best client outcomes (Bernard, 2014). In SFS, it is essential for the supervisor to provide direct and clear feedback while collaborating with the supervisee for solutions.

Person-Centered Supervision

The underlying foundation of person-centered supervision (PCS) is the idea that the supervisee already has the ability to be an effective and competent counselor, and with the right level of support the person will be able to thrive in the field (Schmid, 2015). The approach is grounded in the works of Carl Rogers and emphasizes the principles of empathy, congruence, and unconditional positive regard (Marich, 2016). Empathy pushes the boundaries of understanding the person's experiences, attempting to understand the individuals deeply held beliefs and feelings (Marich, 2016). Within the clinical supervision environment, empathy allows the supervisor to understand the perceptions and emotions the supervisee is experiencing throughout their development (Haley & Zazzarino, n.d.; Marich, 2016). Congruence allows the supervisor to check for agreement between a supervisee's words and actions or within the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee (Marich, 2016). When a supervisor elicits the idea of unconditional positive regard within the supervisory relationship, it allows the supervisee to take risks and grow professionally without judgments or conditions set forth from the supervisor (Haley & Zazzarino, n.d.; Marich, 2016).

With these three principles, a supervisor creates a safe, healthy environment for the supervisee to thrive and continue to develop as a counselor, a relationship that is directed by the supervisee (Perryman et al., 2016). Supervisors allow for a collaborative, non-directive process that affords supervisees to grow and develop at their own time and identify their needs in the

supervision relationship (Perryman et al., 2016). In a non-directive approach, the supervisor supports the supervisee's professional growth and development through collaboration, working through issues and not providing the supervisee with answers right away (Ivey et al., 2012). Furthermore, developing this relationship within the supervisory relationship, a supervisor models the power of relationship-building for the supervisee (Wong et al., 2013).

Integrating Counseling Theory with IDM

SFS and IDM

The integration of SFS and IDM as a comprehensive supervision approach is not a stretch, as both share similar goals. Specifically, both encourage the supervisor to lead from behind, as they allow the supervisee to explore solutions by questioning and guiding rather than directing them (Bannick, 2014; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Additionally, IDM suggests that new counselors are developing, and supervisors should support them and encourage them as they grow through the developmental stages (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). That core concept of IDM connects to SFS and its mission to elevate the supervisee to a position of authority in the decision-making process (Bannick, 2014). Finally, supervision is designed to aid new counselors in their competence so that they can practice ethically and proficiently without constant supervision (Watkins, 2011), which complements the basic solution-focused principle that suggests the helpee receive the least intervention necessary for positive change and lasting solutions (Thomas, 2013).

PCS and IDM

Like SFS, it is not difficult to incorporate PCS and IDM as there are commonalities between them. A significant focus of supervision is to refine the supervisee's ability to problem solve through their practice and identify clinical interventions that directly impact the client

(Haley & Zazzarino, n.d.). As the supervisor continues to create a collaborative relationship, the supervisor changes from the role of teacher or coach to the role of mentor or consultant (Marich, 2016). The supervisor is seen as a guide and not an expert, which allows the supervisee to learn and grow, moving from Level 1 to Level 3 in their development (Perryman et al., 2016; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Therefore, within each role, the supervisor is able to assess the supervisee's developmental level and choose the role that matches best (Perryman et al., 2016).

Relationship between Supervisor and Supervisee

The relationship between counselor and supervisor is the foundation of all work that supervision accomplishes, so it is vital for supervisors to build a strong working alliance with their supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Creating a working alliance between supervisor and supervisee is a complex process, and it directly influences the supervisee's satisfaction with the supervision process, but it may be the most influential change agent in the growth of new counselors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Crockett & Hays, 2015).

In building a positive working alliance, supervisors provide interactions that are task-oriented, interpersonally sensitive, and attractive; all of them overlap with the foundational discrimination model for supervision roles of teacher, consultant, and counselor respectively (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) provided evidence that supervisees indicated that an interpersonally-sensitive supervisor (or those who are more consultative) produce more satisfied supervisees at the end of the relationship. However, previous research supports all three as impactful in the working alliance (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). It is clear that creating and maintaining a healthy working alliance is multifaceted and requires management to be effective. Highly effective supervisors balance the styles mentioned above and use them to help maximize the time spent in supervision.

In IDM and SFS or PCS, the supervisor and supervisee are viewed as partners who facilitate the development of the supervisee (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Though both value a partnership, it would be naïve to ignore the power differential that exists when one professional is evaluating and recommending the other for acceptance into the field. Corey et al. (2010) defined power as the ability to influence another and authority as the right to exert power; both are present in the supervision relationship, and the supervisor's ability to manage the power differential is highly impactful to the experience of power. Both SFS and PCS with and IDM framework follow a constructivist approach to supervision by emphasizing the consultative role and a collaborative approach to issues discovered in the supervision process (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Constructive approaches deemphasize the hierarchy established by the supervision relationship and creates a safe environment to build a positive working alliance from the beginning of supervision (Guiffrida, 2015), which provides a foundation for supervisors to work alongside their supervisees instead of taking the role of the expert. Whiting (2007) expressed that supervisors' positions of authority make it easy for them to focus on impressing their supervisees with knowledge and direction rather than building complementary relationships with them. When supervisors engage in showing their competence rather than focusing on their supervisees' experience, it can increase supervisee resistance to the feedback as a natural response for self-protection (Guiffrida, 2015). According to Abernathy and Cook (2011), when supervisees feel inadequate, out of control, or insecure, resistance helps with anxiety evasion and reduction. Resistance may surface in many forms; the most common are verbal avoidance or power struggles, disengagement in sessions (physically or mentally), lack of task completion, or lack of follow-through with clients (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014).

Supervisor Roles and Responsibilities

In response to the rapidly changing specialty of clinical supervision, Borders et al. (2014) suggested best practices to guide the supervisory relationship and produce the best results. Supervision is a shared process, but supervisors have the responsibility to establish the collaborative relationships with their supervisees, guide goal setting, assess progress, and provide consistent feedback to the supervisee (Borders et al., 2014). Additionally, Borders et al. (2014) noted that it is the supervisor's responsibility to create structured sessions and notice the need for alterations in their supervision approach to meet the supervisee's needs.

SFS and IDM

Of all therapeutic supervision models, SFS provides a research base that offers suggestions for specific structure in supervision sessions and the supervision process as a whole (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). In SFS, the supervisor guides the supervision sessions through seven components (Hsu, 2009). Hsu (2009) discussed the need for the supervisor to open all sessions in a positive format and follow with a brief identification of the issue(s) that need to be addressed. Hsu (2009) suggested the supervisor should guide the supervisee into positive supervision goals, explore exceptions to problems (for the supervisee and clients), develop alternative options or possibilities to issues, and aid the supervisee in identifying how to approach the next sessions with their clients. Additionally, Hsu (2009) emphasized the importance of feedback and evaluation of the supervisor in sessions and follow-up in subsequent sessions.

Solution-focused supervision utilizes the consultant role of the counselor, as in a working partnership to meet the goals of the supervisee (Moro et al., 2016). Similarly, IDM requires that the supervisor use oversight and evaluative skills to facilitate the growth desired and needed in

the supervisee's development as a professional (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). The two theories are highly compatible with their goals and expectations for the supervisor and supervisee, and interventions overlap in a way that provides consistency in the developmental process of the supervisee (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014).

PCS and IDM

Person-centered supervision with IDM allows the supervisor to focus on the relationship between the supervisor and supervises that allows the supervisee to feel safe to grow. The supervisor could provide more structured supervisory sessions with direct feedback to address theory, techniques, and concepts. Supervisors could utilize supportive and catalytic interventions to affirm the supervisee's work and support their confidence and help the supervisee see there is no perfect approach to working with clients because everyone is an individual (Perryman et al., 2016).

As the process continues, the supervisor would have to consider the fluctuating motivation, attempt to be more independent, and attempts to balance out boundaries (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Stoltenberg and McNeill (2010) identified the need for a supervisor to be flexible and provide a sense of humor during level 2. Person-centered supervision allows for the flexibility to challenge the supervisee and problem solve some ethical dilemmas (Bornsheuer-Boswell et al., 2013). The supervisor can focus on the identified supervisee's goals and reinforce the relationship during potentially turbulent times (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014).

Lastly, the supervisor must continue to focus on the congruence of the relationship and review goals and evaluate progress. As the supervision relationship continues, the supervisor can focus on any discrepancies in feelings, attitudes, and behaviors while gaining a deeper level of empathy within the relationship (Marich, 2016). Throughout this last level of development, the

goal should be to work through any underlying issues to ensure a competent counselor and uphold the supervisor's responsibility of gatekeeping (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Ziomek-Daile & Christensen, 2010).

Types of Techniques and Intervention

According to Stoltenberg and McNeill (2010), the most appropriate techniques and interventions for use within the IDM framework are those that can be adapted to each of the developmental phases of the supervisee. Any interventions or techniques used under IDM should gauge and monitor growth in self-other awareness, motivation, and autonomy in the supervisee (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). All techniques should be used to supplement self-report, helping to guide the supervisee into later levels of counselor development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014).

Solution-focused supervision and PCS practices are tolerant of many techniques as long as the focus remains on pragmatism and the supervisee's future goals (Marich, 2016; Thomas, 2013). Supervisors who use SFS or PCS also maintain a core belief in the supervisee's resourcefulness and their expertise from their experiences (Marich, 2016; Thomas, 2013). According to Berg and Miller (1992), a central theme in the solution-focused approach is the focus on change actions, emphasis on short-term changes, and the frequent disconnect between the stated problem and the needed changes of the supervisee (as cited in Moro et al., 2016). Meanwhile, researchers highlight the primary emphasis within PCS is allowing the supervisee to guide the change process and for the supervisor to remain flexible (Perryman et al., 2016). Ultimately, one aspect that connects IDM with SFS or PCS is the freedom for supervisors to determine techniques and interventions, as long as they support the overall goal of the supervisee (Marich, 2016; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010; Thomas, 2013). Though it may be comfortable to have a list of approved techniques or interventions, the relationship between the supervisor and

supervisee is the focus for IDM with SFS or PCS, even in selecting techniques used (Marich, 2016; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010; Thomas, 2013).

Learning Vignette

This section will outline a sample vignette of supervisee development in the domain of theoretical orientation throughout the IDM developmental levels with the incorporation of SFS and PCS techniques and general supervision practice. Anna is a 25-year-old Hispanic female who recently graduated from a graduate program in counseling and is receiving supervision during provisional licensure as she works at a community counseling agency. She completed a counseling theories class and was required to take a cognitive behavioral therapy course (CBT), which she practiced during her practicum. The following section outlines a general description of the supervisee related to her concerns with theory use throughout supervision and sample interventions within an aligned framework for the supervisor to help develop the supervisee's theoretical orientation.

Level 1

Anna was excited and aware of the need for a theoretical approach but was not trained beyond an introduction to approaches other than CBT. During her pre-supervision interview, she suggested that she used CBT because it is what she was taught. Anna was not sure CBT fits best with her clients and the way she practices, so she wanted to work on that during supervision and establish a confidence in her theoretical orientation.

SFS Interventions in IDM Level 1

The supervisor began by asking the miracle question (an SFS specific technique) regarding what would be different if her theory concerns were solved. Anna stated that she would know she was practicing in an effective theory when she felt confident that she chose a

theory based on full understanding rather than unintended exposure, and the techniques she used worked with her clients. Anna expressed that she was overwhelmed when she tried to read about theories independently, so the supervisor worked with Anna to develop specific goals for theory exposure beyond CBT, including a schedule for reviewing one new theory per week via a video series suggested by the supervisor. The supervisor and Anna developed a scaling measure for Anna to use to determine how well the theory she reviewed each week fits with her style and her client population. Additionally, the supervisor provided direct compliments for Anna's understanding that theory development is vital to effective practice and encouraged her to gather additional resources for theories she was interested in as she watched the videos.

PCS Interventions in IDM Level 1

As Anna sought support, her supervisor focused on their role as a teacher. Anna explored her feelings of being overwhelmed and seek education on different theoretical approaches. The supervisor shared with Anna experiences from the supervisor's past where the supervisor experienced similar feelings. Collaboratively, the supervisor and Anna discussed strategies that would help Anna learn best. The supervisor then asked Anna to develop a plan on how she will enhance her knowledge of the different theoretical orientations. By the time Anna approached Level 2, she established a preference for family systems theory, as her clients were primarily children and adolescents, and she felt confident in the techniques she used with her clients.

Interventions at Level 2

Anna learned to integrate family systems theory approaches, but often became frustrated with herself due to the lack of success she saw with some clients. Anna began to wonder if she was a successful counselor. This feeling led Anna to think about referring a few clients to a more experienced counselor.

SFS Interventions in IDM Level 2

The supervisor worked during those frustrations to help her review exceptions to the instances that frustrated her so that she realized she was achieving more success than failure. Additionally, the supervisor guided Anna into a new goal-setting phase to account for the growth she experienced and redeveloped the plan to focus on the future. During Level 2, the supervisor suggested that Anna secure permission to video or audio record sessions with the identified clients and transcribe the interactions that were frustrating for review in supervision. That process allowed for connective work between the supervisor and Anna in her most difficult cases, and they provided an opportunity for the supervisor to help Anna identify the positive aspects of the sessions, even amidst her internal struggle. The supervisor provided targeted feedback that helped the supervisee identify her resources that worked with clients and built Anna's confidence in her ability to work within her theoretical orientation.

PCS Interventions in IDM Level 2

The supervisor continued to focus on creating a safe environment, so Anna felt comfortable sharing her frustrations without feeling judged. Throughout this time, the supervisor normalized Anna's experiences and shared that there are times when supervisors also get frustrated. The supervisor guided a conversation centering on the causes Anna's frustrations and the strategies and skills Anna possessed to overcome these struggles. Additionally, the supervisor coached Anna on the change process in counseling and reinforced the client's role in creating that change, similar to Anna's role in supervision. As Anna neared the end of Level 2, she began to take a more active role in supervision and felt more confident in her skills as a counselor.

Interventions at Level 3

By Level 3, Anna was confident in her ability to think through her technique decisions and could verbalize her reasoning for incorporating specific techniques. However, she verbalized personal goals to better understand her clients with whom the traditional techniques do not seem to work. She expressed the idea that there may be a difference in the exposure to trauma that changes how her child and adolescent clients engage with family systems techniques.

SFS Interventions in IDM Level 3

The supervisor recognized the self-determined goal and aided Anna in creating plan to explore information related to the client's specific cases. At this point in supervision, the supervisor relied primarily on self-report of success, as Anna was more self-aware and able to accurately express her experiences (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). As Anna neared the end of her supervision requirements, she expressed that her goals had been met and she felt as though her theoretical orientation provided a structure for her to understand her clients, but did not determine all of her interactions, as she practiced effective research to connect with her clients' needs. The supervisor encouraged her to create a written plan for continued training and education and reviewed the plan after Anna completed it.

PCS Interventions in IDM Level 3

The supervisor acted more as a mentor by discussing an example of a former client and guiding a conversation with Anna about how different techniques and modalities can support the client. Throughout the conversation, the supervisor continued to encourage Anna's thinking and decisions, supporting the idea that there is more than one way to work with a client. As Anna ended her time with the supervisor, she could understand the importance of supervision and requests to continue a consultative relationship with the current supervisor. Creating this trusting

relationship continued to help Anna provide effective care as she navigated different modalities and techniques.

Evaluation Practices

Regardless of supervision style used, proactive feedback should be provided to supervisees during all stages of supervision for success notation and direction for improvement (Cummings et al., 2015). Supervisors frequently serve in a role that is protective of their profession, so they must evaluate and provide feedback regularly to ensure new members of the profession are qualified for practice (O'Donovan et al., 2012). In the role of gatekeeper, supervisors have an obligation to plan and implement evaluation and feedback in a manner that provides optimal growth opportunity for supervisees and adequate documentation of impairment if they are not suited for licensure or the specific position of employment (Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010).

Just as graduate-level programs implement screening and disclosure procedures that clearly state the requirements of success, individual supervisors can follow similar guidelines by providing comprehensive informed consent and making expectations and evaluation measures available for supervisee review (Foster & McAdams, 2009; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). Supervisors should use evaluation measures that fit into the model of supervision development chosen and implement the strategies with wisdom for each client stage of development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Because many supervision models accept a broad range of techniques, evaluation processes are open for supervisor preference and decision (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010; Thomas, 2013). Within evaluation development, it is beneficial for supervisors to utilize both formative and summative evaluation measures to provide the most comprehensive guidance at each developmental level.

Formative evaluations are designed to provide ongoing information for growth to the supervisee, offer feedback after implementation, and support the supervisee by developing new skills and professional interactions (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Formative feedback and evaluation should be the primary intervention strategy in supervision unless supervisee actions are negligent enough to warrant swift disciplinary actions or dismissal from supervision (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Formative evaluation measures coincide easily with the goals of most supervision models as they provide room for supervisors and supervisees to partner in goals, track progress, and move towards the place of professionalism that the supervisee desires (O'Donovan et al., 2012).

Summative feedback measures are more definitive in the expectations for supervisee behaviors, and there are inventories that are excellent resources to guide supervisors in summative feedback (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Summative feedback measures provide written documentation of proficiency (or lack of proficiency) in a way that produces more anxiety for the supervisee, so they must be handled carefully (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). However, Trepal et al. (2010) found that students were very complimentary of summative feedback processes when handled collaboratively, even if suggestions for growth were provided.

Ethical and Multicultural Considerations

It is essential for supervisors and supervisees to address culture and general cultural competence as critical aspects of the relationship and professional growth in the helping professions (Borders et al., 2014). Cultural conversations often require a sensitive approach, and supervisors should seek to create a safe environment to explore personal culture development (Berkel et al., 2007). Supervisor modeling is a powerful force in shaping the supervisee's cultural awareness (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). For example, the supervisor's role in leading

conversations about how culture impacts the supervisory relationship is helpful for the supervisee to experience. In turn, the supervisee can explore the impact of culture within the therapeutic relationship.

To highlight cultural awareness, supervisors should maintain an open mind and respect for culturally different supervisees (Borders et al., 2014). Though there are essential aspects of supervisee treatment and understanding, respect and openness are foundational principles that guide the relationship into a safe place and a strong working alliance (Burkard et al., 2009). Supervisors intentionally provide unconditional acceptance of all supervisees regardless of cultural background, since building a strong relationship is vital to the growth process of the counselor and the overall wellness of the clients (Borders et al., 2014). Supervisors should also maximize any opportunity to increase cultural competence in the supervisee, as cultural awareness is a facet of development that supervisors should monitor in their supervisees (Association for Counseling Education and Supervision, n.d.).

Supervisors who purposively facilitate a discussion regarding culture with the supervisee early in the supervisory relationship set precedence in supervision for future conversations regarding client cultural concerns (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). According to Dressel et al. (2007), there is a body of literature to support the importance of supervisors' guidance of the discussion, especially the act of an intentional conversation (Garrett et al., 2001). For cultural expression in supervision to be effective, the supervisor must gain a solid knowledge of the supervisee's culture and worldview and hold an active interest in gaining knowledge of cultural differences and competence in skills (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). The commitment to learning sets an excellent example for the supervisee throughout the supervision relationship (Garrett et al., 2001).

As a model for supervision, IDM provides enough structure to require multicultural conversations and competence as a factor in the evaluation process (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). However, because IDM provides extensive flexibility for how the supervisors work within the client's developmental framework, it is adaptable to supervisees from various backgrounds (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Similarly, SFS approaches supervisees as competent, denies resistance, and charges the supervisor with helping supervisees identify their goals (Moro et al., 2016), which lends the space to explore the influence of culture and increase the likelihood of the supervisor and supervisee connecting at a cultural level early in the relationship. Supervisors who choose models that are culturally sensitive help train culturally aware counselors from a variety of cultural backgrounds, which enhances our service to clients.

Conclusion

As the helping professions continue to develop and evolve, especially regarding supervision practice and support, tenured members of the field must explore and suggest optimum methods for training and evaluating the next generation of helping professionals. This article attempts to create a bridge from theory to practice by providing the reader with a foundation for supervision theory integration and concepts related to practical application. Supervision training requirements vary by state, but new supervisors would benefit from structured approaches that provide a foundation for new supervision practices. Developmental models effectively track supervisee growth, but intervention and assessment are often guided by theoretical orientation. As new helping professionals, we allow our theoretical framework to guide our work and support our feelings of uncertainty. By using the learning vignette, it highlights the usefulness of supervisors to reinforce those theories, like SFS or PCS, and pair it with a developmental model to enhance the supervisees' development. It would be beneficial for

helping professionals to provide suggestions to integrate developmental and theoretical supervision models.

References

Abernathy, C., & Cook, K. (2011). Resistance or disconnection? A relational-cultural approach to supervisee anxiety and nondisclosure. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health, 6*(1), 2-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/15401383.2011.560067

Association for Counseling Education and Supervision (n.d.). *Standards for counseling supervisors.* http://www.acesonline.net/sites/default/files/aces_stds_for_counseling_supervisors_jcdv69n1-1.pdf

Bannick, F. (2014). *Handbook of positive supervision: For supervisors, facilitators, and peer groups.* Hogrefe.

Benjamin, B. A. (2014). Solution-focused supervision: A resource-oriented approach to developing clinical expertise. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 42*(2), 229-232. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2014.880622

Berg, I. K., & Miller, S. D. (1992). *Working with a problem drinker: A solution-focused approach.* Norton.

Berkel, L. A., Constantine, M. G., & Olson, E. A. (2007). Supervisor multicultural competence: Addressing religious and spiritual issues with counseling students in supervision. *Clinical Supervisor, 26*(1), 3-15. https://doi.org/10.1300/J001v26n01.02

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2014). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (5th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Boie, I. & Lopez, A. (2011). Supervision of counselors working with eating disorders: Utilizing the integrated developmental model. *The Clinical Supervisor, 30*(2), 215-234. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2011.607744

Borders, L. D., Glosoff, H. L., Welfare, L. E., Hays, D. G., Dekruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., & Page, B. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Evolution of a counseling specialty. *The Clinical Supervisor, 33*(1), 26-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2014.905225

Bornsheuer-Boswell, J. N., Polonyi, M. M., & Watts, R. E. (2013). Integrating Adlerian and integrated developmental model approaches to supervision of counseling trainees. *Journal of Individual Psychology, 69*(4), 328-343.

Burkard, A. W., Knox, S., Hess, S. A., & Schultz, J. (2009). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual supervisees' experiences of lgb-affirmative and nonaffirmative supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*(1), 176-188. https://doi.org/10.1037/70022-0167.56.1.176

Corey, G., Haynes, R., Moulton, P., & Muratori, M. (2010). Clinical supervision in the helping professions: A practical guide. (2nd ed.). American Counseling Association.

Council for the Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs [CACREP] (2016). *2016 CACREP standards.* http://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards/

Crockett, S., & Hays, D. G. (2015). The influence of supervisor multicultural competence on the supervisory working alliance, supervisee counseling self-efficacy, and supervisee satisfaction with supervision: A mediation model. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 54*(4), 258-273. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12025

Cummings, J. A., Ballantyne, E. C., & Scallion, L. M. (2015). Essential processes for cognitive behavioral clinical supervision: Agenda setting, problem-solving, and formative feedback. *Psychotherapy, 52*(2), 158-163. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038712

de Shazer, S. Berg, I. K., Lipchik, E., Nunnally, E., Molnar, A., Gingerich, W., & Wiener-Davis, M. (1986). Brief therapy: Solution-focused development. *Family Process, 25*, 207-221. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.1986.00207.x

Dressel, J. L., Consoli, A. J., Kim, B. S. K., & Atkinson, D. R. (2007). Successful and unsuccessful multicultural supervisory behaviors: A delphi poll. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 35*(1), 51–64.

Fernando, D. M., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2005). The relationship of supervisory styles to satisfaction with supervision and the perceived self-efficacy of master's-level counseling students. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44*(4), 293-304.

Foster, V. A., & McAdams, C. R., III. (2009). A framework for creating a climate of transparency for professional performance assessment: Fostering student investment in gatekeeping. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 48*(4), 271–284.

Garrett, M. T., Borders, L. D., Crutchfield, L. B., Torres-Rivera, E., Brotherton, D., & Curtis, R. (2001). Multicultural supervision: A paradigm of cultural responsiveness for supervisors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 29*(2), 147-158.

Guiffrida, D. (2015). A constructive approach to counseling and psychotherapy supervision. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology, 28*(1), 40-52. https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.922911

Haley, M., & Zazzarino, A. (in press). Theories of supervision. In B. Flamez & S. Lenz (Eds.). *Practical approaches to clinical supervision across settings: Theory, practice, and research.* Pearson

Hsu, W.-S. (2009). The components of the solution-focused supervision. *Bulletin of Educational Psychology, 41*(2) 475-496.

Ivey, A. E., D'Andrea, M. J., & Ivey, M. B. (2012). *Theories of counseling and psychotherapy: A multicultural perspective* (7th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Marich, J. (2016). *Clinical supervision: A person-centered approach*. Sacramento, CA: NetCE.

Moro, R. R., Scherer, R., Ng, K.-M., & Berwick, A. C. (2016). Addressing personalization issues with trainees using solution-focused supervision. *International Journal of Solution-Focused Practices, 4*(1), 10-19. https://doi.org/10.14335/ijsfp.v4i1.28

O'Donovan, A., Halford, W. K., & Walters, B. (2012). Towards best practice supervision of clinical psychology trainees. *Australian Psychologist, 46*(2), 101-112. https://doi.org/10/.1111/j.1742-9544.2011.00033.x

Perryman, K. L., Moss, R. C., & Anderson, L. (2016). Sandtray supervision: An integrated model for play. *International Journal of Play Therapy, 25*(4), 186-196. https://doi.org/10.1037/pla0040288

Schmid, P. F. (2015). Encounter-oriented learning programs for person-centered psychotherapists: Some learnings from decades of experience and their theoretical background, Person-Centered and Experiential Psychotherapies, 14(1), 100-114. https://doi.org/10.1080/14779757.2014.1001914

Stoltenberg, C. D., & McNeill, B. W. (2010). *IMD Supervision: An integrative developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Thomas, F. N. (2013). *Solution-focused supervision: A resource-oriented approach to developing clinical expertise.* Springer.

Trepal, H.C., Bailie, J., & Leeth, C. (2010). Critical incidents in practicum supervision: Supervisee's perspectives. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory & Research, 38*(1), 29-38.

Watkins, Jr., C. E. (2011). Does psychotherapy supervision contribute to patient outcomes? Considering thirty years of research. *The Clinical Supervisor,* 30, 235-256. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2011.619417

Whiting, J. B. (2007). Authors, artists, and social constructionism: A case study of narrative supervision. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 35*, 139–150. https://doi.org/10.1080/01926180600698434

Wong, L. C. J., Wong, P. T. P. & Ishiyama, F. I. (2013). What helps and what hinders in cross-cultural supervision: A critical incident study. *The Counseling Psychologist, 41*(1), 66-85. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000012442652

Ziomek-Daigle, J., & Christensen, T. M. (2010). An emergent theory of gatekeeping practices in counselor education. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88*(4), 407-415. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00040.x