

September 2020

Supervision as the Signature Pedagogy for Counseling Leadership

Melissa Luke
Syracuse University

Harvey C. Peters
George Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/tsc>



Part of the [Counselor Education Commons](#), and the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Luke, Melissa and Peters, Harvey C. (2020) "Supervision as the Signature Pedagogy for Counseling Leadership," *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*: Vol. 2 : Iss. 2 , Article 4.

<https://doi.org/10.7290/tsc020204>

Available at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/tsc/vol2/iss2/4>

This article is brought to you freely and openly by Volunteer, Open-access, Library-hosted Journals (VOL Journals), published in partnership with The University of Tennessee (UT) University Libraries. This article has been accepted for inclusion in *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling* by an authorized editor. For more information, please visit <https://trace.tennessee.edu/tsc>.

DOI:

Supervision as the Signature Pedagogy for Counseling Leadership

Melissa Luke, Harvey C. Peters

The authors apply the signature pedagogies framework for pedagogical foundations in counselor education put forth by Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020) to counseling leadership. Accordingly, we first define counseling leadership and describe the limited literature focused on pedagogical practices related to counseling leadership. Next, we discuss supervision and use the notion of broad and specific features as discussed within Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020) to systematically examine whether there is a signature pedagogy for counseling leadership, and purport how supervision of counseling leadership largely fulfills the criteria. Finally, we discuss how supervision of counseling leadership can be utilized and further expanded, followed by a consideration of the subsequent implications for counseling leadership practice and future research.

Keywords: clinical supervision, counselor education, counseling leadership, signature pedagogy, supervision of leadership

The concept of *signature pedagogy* is documented across multiple disciplines, such as counseling, psychology, leadership, law, and anthropology (Brackette, 2014; Jenkins, 2012; Shulman, 2005a; Wayne et al., 2010). Over the past decade, the concept of signature pedagogy has been widely integrated within the counseling profession (Baltrinic & Wachter Morris, 2020; Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Brackette, 2014); however, despite the increased scholarly attention, there have been limitations in how it is understood and applied to specialty areas of counseling, such as counseling leadership. As a result, in this article, we apply the signature pedagogies framework for pedagogical foundations in counselor education put forth by Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020) to counseling leadership. Accordingly, we first define counseling leadership. Next, we describe the limited literature focused on pedagogical practices related to counseling leadership. We then discuss supervision and use the notion of broad and specific features as discussed by Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020) to systematically examine whether there is a signature pedagogy for counseling leadership. We ultimately determine that the supervision of counseling leadership largely fulfills the criteria. We subsequently purport that the

Supervision of Leadership Model (SLM) is a clinical supervision modality that can support supervision as the signature pedagogy of counseling leadership, as well as its congruence to the counseling signature pedagogy framework. Finally, we discuss how supervision of counseling leadership can be utilized and further expanded, followed by a consideration of the subsequent implications for counseling leadership practice and future research.

Counseling Leadership

Embedded within the literature on counseling leadership are multiple definitions of counseling leadership, each with overlapping and yet distinct conceptualizations of this essential aspect of counseling (Peters & Vereen, 2020). Sweeney (2012) defined counseling leadership as “actions that contribute to the realization of our individual and collective capacity to serve others competently, ethically, and justly” (p. 5). Storlie et al. (2015) expanded upon Sweeney’s (2012) definition to ensure the definition of leadership was reflective of the counseling profession’s multicultural values. With that, the authors defined multicultural counseling leadership as the “experiences in which professional counselors recognize their privilege, roles, and abilities to serve all

Melissa Luke, Syracuse University; Harvey C. Peters, George Washington University. Correspondence concerning this article should be directed to Melissa Luke, mmmluke@syr.edu

individuals and groups from a variety of diverse backgrounds in a competent, ethical, and just fashion” (p. 157).

Hill and Friedman (2019) contended that despite the vast body of interdisciplinary literature on professional leadership, the counseling leadership literature is in “a neophyte stage of development” (Hill & Friedman, 2019, pp. 171–172). Although research on counseling leadership is relatively new, the counseling profession’s literature on leadership has decidedly increased over the past decade (McKibben et al., 2017a). This documented growth is arguably timely, given the increased emphasis on preparing professional counselors across all specialties to serve as a leader, whether that be in a counseling and supervisory relationship, community, or the counseling profession (Chang et al., 2012; Storlie et al., 2019). To date, the developing body of literature on counseling leadership has addressed theory, context, development, and actions of counseling leadership foci (Chang et al., 2012; Gibson, 2016; Gibson et al., 2018; McKibben et al., 2017b; Peters et al., in press; Peters et al., 2018; Storlie et al., 2015; Wahesh & Myers, 2014).

Leadership Development

Hill and Friedman (2019) suggested that counseling leadership development is “contingent on a robust and comprehensive interaction with the profession of counselor education” (p. 174). Scholars have identified professional role socialization, mentoring, service learning, emerging leader programming, and apprenticeship models as pathways for counseling leadership development (Gibson, 2016; Gibson et al., 2018; Lockard et al., 2014; Storlie et al., 2015; Peters et al., in press). Reflecting the importance of leadership as part of counselor professional identity, Lanning (1986) extended the discrimination model to include this as a fourth foci area for professional behavior, without much uptake over the past 25 years. Leadership is integral to counselor identity and practice (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and other Related Education Programs, [CACREP], 2015; Paradise et al., 2010). CACREP has identified leadership development as one of five primary foci for doctoral programs (Lockard et al., 2014), and has prioritized its development in the specialty areas as well. These changes have led to the supervision of counseling

leadership as a viable pedagogical practice, which has only been explored in the past decade (Glossoff et al. 2012; Peters & Luke, in review).

More recently, scholars have suggested that counseling leadership can and should be included in supervision (Evans et al., 2016; Lockard et al., 2014; Storlie et al., 2019). McKibben et al. (2017b) further encouraged the use of “intentional training with targeted learning outcomes that provide tangible leadership skills” (p. 62). Further refining the understanding of culturally responsive and social justice leadership, scholars have begun to understand the multidimensional processes involved in its development and enactment (Peters et al., in press; Storlie & Wood, 2014a, 2014b), including the need for “more opportunities” within training to “cultivate multicultural leadership development” (Storlie et al., 2015, p. 163). Regardless of the theory, philosophy, or principles underlying leadership, Gibson (2016) contended that “reliance on experts, experienced guides, supervisors, teachers, mentors, and/or faculty” (p. 34) was essential in the development of counseling leadership and that this required “expert information and direct supervision” (p. 36). There have been several supervision frameworks that have been specifically developed through which the supervision of counseling leadership is centered (Bedford & Gehlert, 2013; Peters & Luke, in review; Storlie et al., 2019).

Storlie et al. (2019) noted that “there is only one partial reference to supervisors’ intentional use of leadership skills” (p. 2) within the 2011 consensus document developed by the ACES Taskforce on Best Practices in Clinical Supervision. This observation echoed earlier assertions that the supervision of counseling leadership had been overlooked (Storlie et al., 2015), despite Borders et al.’s (2015) agreement that supervisors should foster supervisees’ felt sense of leadership over time and in a developmentally appropriate manner. With that, the definitions and current scope of the scholarship can be used to examine and further the profession’s knowledge of counseling leadership. For instance, despite the multiple facets of counseling leadership, there are gaps in the literature, such as the teaching, mentoring, and supervision of counseling leadership (Peters et al., in press). As a result, there is a need

for more sophisticated conceptual and empirical literature exploring how the profession can teach, mentor, and supervise the future leaders of our profession. One such mechanism could be the development of a signature pedagogy for counseling leadership.

Signature Pedagogy

Supervision, described as the signature pedagogy of mental health fields (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Brackette, 2014), has also been implicated as bridging the divide between training and practice (Luke, 2019). Despite the robust supervision literature, Luke (2019) discussed how there had been far less attention to “the systemic context of supervision (Garvis & Pendergast, 2012; Holloway, 1995) and even less that aims to assist supervisors to prepare for or navigate how their practice of supervision can vary across counselor education contexts” (p. 36). That said, akin to the definition of a signature pedagogy, Borders et al. (2015) described supervision as a unique domain within counselor education, justifying its own “consideration related to training and credentialing” (Evans et al., 2016, p. 2).

Shulman (2005a) reported that signature pedagogy is characterized by engagement, uncertainty, and formation, each of which is argued to be action-oriented (Shulman, 2005a).

In addition to the characterized aspects of a profession’s signature pedagogy, Shulman (2005b) reported three structural dimensions, which include surface, deep, and implicit structures. Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020) similarly defined signature pedagogy, but they framed these characteristics as broad and specific features. They suggested broad features are centralized around characteristics that are professionally distinct and pervasive across programs and curricula, whereas specific features are focused heavily on the pedagogy within a particular course or mode of instruction. Collectively, these characterized features and structures constitute a discipline’s signature pedagogy.

Toward a Signature Pedagogy of Counseling Leadership

As an international interdisciplinary field in itself (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Watkins & Milne,

2014), supervision has been purported to be the “single most powerful contributor” to counselor development and practice (Watkins, 2020, p. 2), earning its recognition as the signature pedagogy of the helping professions (Luke, 2019; Watkins, in press). Watkins (in press) argued that clinical supervision is the unique, characteristic form of instruction through which counselor learning takes place during both training as well as postgraduation and licensure. He further suggested that supervision “strives to cultivate and inculcate” (Watkins, 2020, p. 2) the interactional and transformative aspects of the requisite and interconnected cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills to effect change in practice. Shulman (2005a, 2005b) made similar assertions of all signature pedagogies, and suggested that learning for understanding is insufficient in professional education; instead, learning to engage in practice and effect change is needed. Together, these scholars have helped to articulate the inherent value in defining and building upon a profession’s signature pedagogy.

Scholars have identified clinical supervision as the signature pedagogy of counseling and counselor education (Baltrinic & Wachter Morris, 2020; Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Consistent with what Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020) noted about the paucity of pedagogical scholarship broadly, the focus on counseling leadership pedagogy is even more circumscribed. Nonetheless, scholars have noted that leadership competence integrates interaction across personal, interpersonal, and interpersonal aspects (Gibson, 2016; Luke, 2014), and that there is associated knowledge, awareness, and skills, as well as interpersonal and intercultural enactments (Sweeney, 2012). Like other aspects of clinical competence, counseling and counselor education recognizes that despite individual differences in propensity and prior learning, counseling leadership can be developed over time (Barrio Minton & Wachter Morris, 2012; Gibson, 2016; Glosoff et al., 2012; Lockard et al., 2014; McKibben et al., 2017b).

These assertions; however, have not been made about all specialty areas of counseling, such as leadership. As a result, Peters and Luke (in review) acknowledged this professional gap. They indicated

that clinical supervision may provide an ideal, pragmatic, and robust foundation to support counseling leadership and leadership development. The authors argued that due to the current programmatic and professional supervision requirements and infrastructures already embedded in counselor education, as well as the robust body of scholarship, clinical supervision could also serve as the signature pedagogy for counseling leadership. Building upon these assertions and Baltrinic and Wachter Morris' (2020) signature pedagogies framework for pedagogical foundations in counselor education, we use the existing supervision and leadership scholarship to highlight the potential for supervision to serve as the signature pedagogy for counseling leadership.

Supervision and Counseling Leadership

Strategies and Frameworks

Within the last decade, counseling scholars have concretized the relationship between counseling leadership and supervision by examining the synergy and proposing strategies, frameworks, and models that can support the intersection of supervision and leadership (Bedford & Gehlert, 2013; Peters & Luke, in review; Storlie et al., 2019). The following section provides a review and examination of the conceptual and empirical scholarship on the supervision of counseling leadership. While an in-depth analysis is outside the scope of this manuscript, the subsequent section examines supervision of counseling leadership strategies and frameworks for their congruence to the signature counseling pedagogy framework proposed by Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020). Although each of the supervisory frameworks and models are examined for their potential to function as a signature pedagogy, as proposed or historically utilized, there is not enough information about their specificity to fully assess their congruence.

To start, although Lockard et al. (2014) did not directly identify supervision as the clinical pedagogy of counseling leadership, they indicated that leadership training should be a "targeted priority" (p. 237) from the moment counseling students are admitted to counselor education programs. Given the standard synthesis of individual, triadic, and group supervision across training programs, Lock-

ard et al. (2014) contended supervision was the logical vehicle for pedagogical delivery. Consistent with the explanation of signature pedagogies articulated by Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020), Lockard et al. (2014) depicted supervision as the broad feature, and then they offered six activities, derived from the extant literature, as examples of what could be described as specific features. These included an open discussion of the importance of leadership immediately and throughout supervision; defining leadership clearly, and if possible, operationalizing for assessment; intentionally involving supervisees in leadership activities in organizations; adding leadership domains to every course, activity, and assignment; engaging experiential and creative learning opportunities related to leadership; and facilitating involvement in didactic professional development and workshops focused on leadership.

Evans et al. (2016) conceptually mapped supervision initiatives across leadership theories as follows: "competency-based initiatives (e.g., transformational leadership), situation-specific initiatives (e.g., situational leadership), and implicit initiatives (e.g., servant leadership" (p. 4). Evans et al. (2016) contended that Borders and Brown's (2005) three factors guide supervision, namely task behaviors, relationship behavior, and readiness level. Using Baltrinic and Wachter Morris' (2020) signature pedagogies work as a frame, these would constitute broad features within each of the leadership theory-driven supervision, with the specific features being counselor education program and supervisor collaboration with agencies as a business, administrative supervisors, and higher education settings and evaluating students.

Watkins (2017) proposed 20 educational strategies/principles that cut across all forms of counseling supervision; five strategies/principles make up each of four areas, critical change, the supervisee, the supervisor-supervisee relationship, and intervention. Taking up Watkins' (2017) call for his stimulus paper to serve as a "*starting point*" (p. 170), we argue that when examined through the signature pedagogies framework put forth with Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020), the four areas are broad features and that the 20 strategies/principles constitute specific features of the model. The broad

and specific features in Watkins' (2017) strategies/principles offer myriad opportunities to infuse counseling leadership across supervision.

Similarly, Storlie et al.'s (2019) P-MIEE model of site supervisors' leadership and advocacy provided an empirically grounded framework for supervisors to "make room" for leadership and advocacy within their site supervision (p. 10). The P-MIEE includes both broad and specific features, suggesting that broadly the supervisor must first push "through the limitations of their job (e.g., time constraints, resources, caseloads, crises)" to then model, involve, engage, and empower the supervisee (p. 10). Eight more specific features in the form of supervisory actions are explicated in the model, and these are linked to counselor leadership and advocacy development, paralleling the earlier work in counselor professional identity development (Gibson, 2016; Glosoff & Durham, 2010).

Watkins (2020) offered three categories on which supervisory actions are focused (e.g., relationship, reflection, reorganization) for the specific purposes of anchoring and grounding, educating and facilitating, and liberating and emancipating. In accordance with Baltrinic and Wachter Morris' (2020) discussion of signature pedagogy, these three actions are broad features. Within each category, Watkins (2020) explicated over a dozen different strategies that a supervisor can employ, arguably in response to the specific programmatic and course contexts in which supervision occurs, as well as across differing developmental and interpersonal needs (Luke, 2019). These strategies function as specific features of the signature pedagogy.

Programs, educators, and supervisors can all incorporate theory and practice-focused examples of leadership development across the varied levels of leadership (Hill & Freidman, 2019) within supervision. Presuming that supervision is the signature pedagogy of counseling leadership, and the model of supervision itself is the broad feature, supervisors can utilize a range of additional examples of assignments and activities in the literature as specific features to promote counseling leadership (Meany-Walen et al., 2013; Storlie et al., 2019). Illustrating this, Barrio Minton and Wachter Morris (2012, pp. 260–262) identified five examples of leadership development activities that could be subsumed within

supervision, including self as a leader reflection and development plan, leadership in daily life reflections, leadership issues analysis, service-learning engagement, and leadership development activity. Similarly, Meany-Walen et al. (2013) suggested mentored student involvement in professional or organizational leadership, and Storlie et al. (2015) recommended experiential activities, service learning, and immersion opportunities. Collectively, these scholarly works are used to illuminate the potential for specific features within clinical supervision as the signature pedagogy of counseling leadership. Baltrinic and Wachter Morris' (2020) signature pedagogies framework, with both broad and specific features, provides a clear structure on which to build, with important prospects for the field.

Despite the documented synergy between counseling leadership and clinical supervision (Hill & Freidman, 2019; Meany-Walen et al., 2013; Storlie et al., 2019; Watkins, 2017, 2020), we argue that in their current form, none of the examined supervision of leadership frameworks or strategies meet the criteria for a counseling leadership signature pedagogy as defined by Shulman (2005a, 2005b) and Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020). Although this work introduced and advanced the prominence of counseling leadership, the individual strategies and frameworks fail to provide counselors, supervisors, or educators with a broad and specific structure that is unique and pervasive across counseling programs and curricula. Instead, it bridges these two bodies of scholarship and practice (Hill & Freidman, 2019; Meany-Walen et al., 2013; Storlie et al., 2019; Watkins, 2017, 2020). With that, we argue this scholarship provides a foundation to support the further development supervision to meet both the definition and process of a signature pedagogy for leadership. In fact, we encourage and anticipate that scholars and practitioners alike can and will expand, augment, and complexify much of this work to more fully and intentionally address the broad and specific features requisite in a signature pedagogy for counseling leadership (Baltrinic & Wachter Morris, 2020). These individual leadership strategies and frameworks may also serve as adjunctive pedagogical interventions that can assist in the practice of supervision of counseling leadership.

Supervision of Leadership Model

Because of this pedagogical gap in counseling leadership and the lack of an identified signature pedagogy in counseling leadership as defined by (Baltrinic & Wachter Morris, 2020), Peters and Luke (in review) developed the Supervision of Leadership Model (SLM) for counseling leadership supervision. The SLM offers an initial possibility for how a supervisory model can meet the broad and specific features of a signature pedagogy of counseling leadership (Baltrinic & Wachter Morris, 2020; Shulman, 2005a, 2005b). Peters and Luke (in review) developed the SLM as an outgrowth of a grounded theory study of socially just and culturally responsive counseling leadership (Peters et al., in press). They proposed the SLM as a second-generation supervision model (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019), as it is an extension of Peters et al.'s (in Press) Socially Just and Culturally Responsive Counseling Leadership Model (SJCRCLM) and Bernard's (1979, 1997) Discrimination Model (DM). The SLM used five leadership actions (i.e., personal, skill, relational, community cultural, group-system), three foci (i.e., intervention, conceptualization, personalization), and three roles (i.e., teacher, counselor, consultant) to address the supervision of counseling leadership.

Similar to the DM, the SLM's first step requires a supervisor or educator to familiarize themselves with the relevant counseling leadership and supervision literature, which should include the DM and SJCRCLM, as these are essential to the supervision of counseling leadership. The next step requires the supervisor or educator to purposefully and collaboratively identify their initial point of entry, which are the five leadership actions (i.e., personal, skill, relational, community cultural, group-system; Peters & Luke, in review). After identifying the best point of entry, a supervisor or educator must select their foci (i.e., intervention, conceptualization, personalization), which should be based on how they want to address their identified action (Bernard, 1979, 1997; Peters & Luke, in review). Next, a supervisor or educator is expected to intentionally identify the role (i.e., teacher, counselor, consultant) they believe will best support their supervisee's or student's skill and identity development.

Peters and Luke (in review) also identified contextual information to inform the utilization of the SLM. They acknowledged that the SLM did not dictate which action, foci, or role is best suited for the practice of supervision of counseling leadership; rather, they indicated that these decisions are to be negotiated between the supervisor or educator and their supervisee or student. They also reported that the utilization of the SLM is cyclical; thus, supervisors and educators should select multiple actions, foci, or roles throughout any supervision of leadership sessions. The authors also indicated the supervisor or educator should not blend, slide, or combine the actions, foci, or roles, as that can lead to confusion and potential ruptures in the supervisory relationship and processes (Peters & Luke, in review). Last, supervisors and educators should consider the specific context of their leadership training as well as the developmental levels of students and emerging leaders. Such considerations are essential given the leadership identity and development of an advanced doctoral student will likely differ from an advanced master's student. As a result, supervisors and educators utilizing the SLM must take a developmental approach to the supervision and training of counseling leaders. To further illustrate what the SLM can look like in action, Figures 1 through 5 provide concrete examples for each of the five points of entry and subsequent foci and roles, and they serve as evidence of both broad and specific features of a signature pedagogy (Baltrinic & Wachter Morris, 2020).

Peters and Luke (in review) also argued that the SLM provided the counseling profession with a distinct bridge between counseling supervision and counseling leadership literature, training, and practice. Extending this, we argue that unlike earlier scholarship that explored the relationship between counseling leadership and supervision, the SLM meets the criteria for a signature pedagogy as put forth by Shulman (2005a) and Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020), given the SLM has both broad and specific features that can be implemented across counseling programs and curricula. More specifically, because supervision itself has been described as "the most important mechanism for enabling the acquisition of competencies" (Stoltenberg, 2005, p. 858) in counseling broadly, and the SLM extends the foci and role structure of the DM

*Teaching and Supervision in Counseling * 2020 * Volume 2 (2)*

with five research-grounded leadership actions, we assert that the SLM meets Baltrinic and Wachter Morris' (2020) definition of signature pedagogy broad features as centralized, professionally distinct

Figure 1

SLM Point of Entry: Personal Action

	Teacher	Counselor	Consultant
Intervention	The supervisor reads the supervisee's weekly reflective leadership journal entry and addresses each of their identified questions in supervision.	The supervisor reflects the supervisee's struggles in identifying their strengths and resiliencies as an emerging leader.	The supervisor and supervisee discuss which upcoming leadership webinars will support the supervisee's personal-professional leadership development.
Conceptualization	The supervisor reviews the tenets of the supervisee's self-identified leadership theory.	The supervisor validates the supervisee for working toward holding themselves accountable for their self-directed goal of reading an article on leadership theory each week.	The supervisor and supervisee codevelop a list of similarities and differences between the supervisee's identified leadership theory and their personal narrative of leadership.
Personalization	The supervisor supports the supervisee in selecting a leadership theory that is personally-professionally congruent.	The supervisor explores the supervisee's personal narrative of counseling leadership to assist them in having increased self-awareness.	The supervisor and supervisee work together to process and identify activities that will facilitate the supervisee's strengths and resilience as an emerging leader.

Figure 2

SLM Point of Entry: Skill-Oriented Action

	Teacher	Counselor	Consultant
Intervention	The supervisor introduces the supervisee to literature on different counseling skills, behaviors, and actions.	The supervisor reflects upon the supervisee's binary thought process regarding what constitutes effective leadership, and then they talk about it.	The supervisor and supervisee work together to develop an outline for an informal needs assessment for a leadership project in their counseling department.
Conceptualization	The supervisor introduces the concept of dialectics, and the role it can play in leadership, as the supervisee is struggling with perspective-taking and openness.	The supervisor and supervisee explore the intersections of the supervisee's identity and the administrative tasks they have been assigned as a leader in their university chapter of Chi Sigma Iota.	The supervisor and supervisor reflect upon core conditions and microskills, and the role they play in leadership.
Personalization	The supervisor addresses the supervisee's frustration with a group leadership project. Given the reported lack of group communication, the supervisor explores communication skills and their role in leadership.	The supervisor unpacks the supervisee's ambivalence about using communications skills to address people not fulfilling their agreed-upon roles on the leadership board.	The supervisor and supervisee collaboratively explore the supervisee's preconceived notions of data collection and the potential benefits and drawbacks of collecting data to support their current leadership responsibility.

and pervasive across counseling programs. Arguably, the SLM also provided specific features (Baltrinic & Wachter Morris, 2020), as it accommodates a variety of contextual factors (e.g., development,

course/setting, modality) and offers an adaptable framework that explains the particular roles and functions of a supervisor and supervisee and the many potential ways of implementing the model during the supervision of counseling leadership. As such, the SLM can be used by supervisors and educators to simultaneously systematize the training of counseling leadership and as a pedagogical frame to meet leadership accreditation standard at the master's and doctoral levels (CACREP, 2015), while also meeting the definition of holding specific features that are contingent on and responsive to the types of pedagogy within a particular course or mode of instruction.

Consistent with the patterns of development in other signature pedagogies, we expect that with additional scholarly examination and empirical investigation that additional features and outgrowths of the SLM will emerge. Further, we also anticipate that, in addition

to further development of the earlier reviewed frameworks and models for the supervision of counseling leadership, scholars will generate entirely new supervisory models for counseling leadership that intentionally include the broad and specific features of signature pedagogy as described by Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020). Additionally, we encourage scholars to design robust investigations that examine the supervision of counseling leadership broadly and develop scholarly works that differentiate the impact of the broad and specific features of such signature pedagogy to support the continued development of counseling leadership.

Implications and Conclusion

As a signature pedagogy, supervision of counseling leadership can be enacted in individual, triadic, and group supervision modes (Glossoff et al., 2012).

Figure 3

SLM Point of Entry: Relational-Oriented Action

	Teacher	Counselor	Consultant
Intervention	The supervisor addresses how the supervisee can build a relationship with diverse community stakeholders for an upcoming fundraiser and training.	The supervisor explores the supervisee's desire to build meaningful and loyal relationships within their university chapter of Chi Sigma Iota.	The supervisor and supervisee develop a list of actions to foster the supervisee's relationship with a marginalized community they are looking to serve.
Conceptualization	The supervisor addresses the role relationships and networks play in engaging alumni in the supervisee's university chapter of Counselors for Social Justice.	The supervisor explores the supervisee's affective experience with other leaders and how that influences how they build relationships as a leader.	The supervisor and supervisee discuss why members of their university chapter of Chi Sigma Iota may be connected or disconnected from the leadership team.
Personalization	The supervisor offers a few potential interpretations of the supervisee's reaction to the constructive feedback they received from community stakeholders.	The supervisor explores the supervisee's reaction to a recent rupture in a relationship with a fellow leader.	The supervisor and supervisee brainstorm what the supervisee can do with the constructive feedback they received from their Chi Sigma Iota chapter faculty advisor.

Figure 4

SLM Point of Entry: Community Cultural Action

	Teacher	Counselor	Consultant
Intervention	The supervisor provides the supervisee with constructive feedback about centering on the community they are seeking to serve, rather than their own interests.	The supervisor shares their perceptions regarding what the supervisee did well during a recent social justice advocacy event.	The supervisor and supervisee codevelop a list of ways the supervisee can confront and disrupt issues of injustice on their campus.
Conceptualization	The supervisor offers some examples of how the supervisee can address issues of diversity, equity, and critical-consciousness in their recruitment of new leaders and members.	The supervisor assists the supervisee in clarifying their understanding and self-awareness of the role power and privilege play in their leadership.	The supervisor and supervisee complete a Venn diagram on the similarities and differences between promoting equality and equity within their leadership.
Personalization	The supervisor suggests the supervisee may have some discomfort when being challenged about their use of space and language when working with marginalized persons and communities.	The supervisor explores the supervisee's affective experiences of being a leader with multiple intersecting marginalized identities.	The supervisor shares their ideas about what might be causing the supervisee's frustration with acknowledging the impact their identity has on their leadership and asks the supervisee if their impression resonates with them.

Figure 5

SLM Point of Entry: Group-Systems Action

	Teacher	Counselor	Consultant
Intervention	The supervisor watches a recording of the supervisee's leadership and guides the supervisee in identifying ways in which they can more appropriately attend to group-systems norms, processes, and interactions.	The supervisor reflects the supervisee's avoidance of addressing group dynamics and asks them to talk about it.	The supervisor requests the supervisee share their knowledge of and previous experience with group facilitation and counseling skills to discuss areas where the supervisee might need additional support and guidance.
Conceptualization	The supervisor reviews the different group-systems levels and how the supervisee might intervene at each level.	The supervisor addresses the supervisee's group facilitation and counseling skills, asking the supervisee to reflect upon what they believe fosters and hinders group norms, processes, and interactions.	The supervisor and supervisee explore ways the supervisee can invite and link members to foster positive and diverse group-systems interactions.
Personalization	The supervisor suggests the supervisee might be playing a role in the maintenance of the group-systems homeostasis.	The supervisor explores the supervisee's experiences on the board and how that is influencing their ways of engaging with the group-systems.	The supervisor asks the supervisee to listen to the recording of their leadership to identify times where they felt supported and encouraged, as well as times where they felt shut down and judged. Together, they collaborate about how the supervisee can respond in future situations.

While it is logical to assume that the supervision of counseling leadership can also occur across computer-mediated supervisory modalities (e.g., real-time, recorded, email), this remains unexamined to date. Related, although research reveals that leadership is already incorporated in supervision (Glosoff et al., 2012; Storlie et al., 2019), few supervisors have received formal educational experiences in counseling leadership supervision models, and there is a lack of formal policies and procedures. Therefore, these areas merit further professional attention and inquiry as a next step.

As supervision of counseling leadership expands, accreditation agencies and professional organizations need to address and formalize these within their specific institutional and organizational contexts (Storlie et al., 2019). As part of this growth, they could consider developing interorganizational collaborations focused on counseling leadership and the supervision thereof. For example,

CACREP or other credentialing agencies could partner with counseling professional organizations such as the Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors (ACES), Chi Sigma Iota (CSI), and the National Board for Certified Counselors Foundation (NBCCF) to formalize the ways supervision of leadership experiences are embodied within formal leadership training and emerging leader programs (Peters & Luke, in review). Given the centrality of leadership in the practice of all counselors (Chang et al., 2012; Peters & Vereen, 2020; Storlie et al., 2019), it is possible that in the future,

counseling leadership activity hours could be parsed, with a requisite number of leadership hours formally required to be supervised as part of counseling practicum and internships. The supervision of leadership could also be addressed or included as part of the doctoral-level leadership and advocacy and clinical supervision course or related programmatic requirements. As such, counselor education programs may need to adjust or refine more localized policies related to supervision contracts, the recording of leadership activities supervision, the amount and scope of supervision required, leadership and supervisory note-taking (reflective/process), and the potential value of supervision of supervision.

Supervisors may also wish to consider how to adapt apprenticeship models (Luke & Gordon, 2016), similar to the senior-junior coleader structure that is often used in group leadership development (Luke & Hackney, 2007), to their supervision of

Teaching and Supervision in Counseling * 2020 * Volume 2 (2)

counseling leadership activity. The senior-junior coleadership model has been described as having a high level of utility, given that it permits direct access to modeling, immediate feedback, and in vivo observation, all of which can be further processed outside of the leadership activity in supervision. Although the few existing models and frameworks for the supervision of counseling leadership are empirically grounded (Bedford & Gehlert, 2013; Peters & Luke, in review; Storlie et al., 2019), there remains a need to explore their utility in practice. Researchers should consider designing both qualitative and quantitative examinations focused on supervisee and supervisor development, as well as directly measuring leadership outcomes (McKibben et al., 2017a). One would presume that much of the supervisory knowledgebase would transfer to the supervision of counseling leadership (Glosoff et al., 2012); however, the complexity resulting from the interface of multidimensional intrapersonal, interpersonal, and systemic factors may complicate and confound both supervision and leadership. As with any conceptual or nonempirical assertions, counseling leaders, scholars, educators, and supervisors, as well as practitioners and students are cautioned to intentionally evaluate the potential costs and benefits of the supervision of counseling leadership, and to proceed intentionally and responsibly (McKibben, 2016; Peters & Luke, in review).

References

- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Taskforce on Best Practices in Clinical Supervision. (2011). *Best practices in clinical supervision*. <https://acesonline.net/knowledge-base/aces-best-practices-in-clinical-supervision-2011/>
- Baltrinic, E. R., & Wachter Morris, C. (2020). Signature pedagogies: A framework for pedagogical foundations in counselor education. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*, 2(2), 1–11.
- Barrio Minton, C. A., & Wachter Morris, C. A. (2012). Leadership training: Entry-level and doctoral curricula. In C. Y. Chang, C. A. B. Minton, A. L. Dixon, J. E. Myers, & T. J. Sweeney (Eds.), *Professional counseling excellence through leadership and advocacy* (pp. 245–266). Routledge.
- Bedford, C., & Gehlert, K. M. (2013). Situational supervision: Applying situational leadership to clinical supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 32, 56–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2013.778727>
- Bernard, J. M. (1979). Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 19, 60–68.
- Bernard, J. M. (1997). The discrimination model. In C. E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 310–327). Wiley.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2019). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision*. Lahaska/Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Borders, L. D., Glosoff, H. L., Welfare, L. E., Hays, D. G., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., & Page, B. (2015). 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>
- Brackette, C. M. (2014). The scholarship of teaching and learning in clinical mental health counseling. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 139, 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20103>
- Chang, C. Y., Barrio Minton, C. A., Dixon, A. L., Myers, J. E., & Sweeney, T. J. (2012). *Professional counseling excellence through leadership and advocacy*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2015). *2016 CACREP standards*. <http://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards/>
- Evans, A. M., Wright, S., Murphy, P., & Maki, J. (2016). *Incorporating leadership models into counseling supervision: Recommendations to strengthen services. Article 51*. VISTA Online. https://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/vistas/article_5124f227f16116603abcacff0000bee5e7.pdf?sfvrsn=4&sfvrsn=4
- Garvis, S., & Pendergast, D. (2012). The importance of supervision in higher education: Key lessons learned in a relational approach. In A. Carlie (Ed.), *Whisperings from the corridor: Stories of teachers in higher education* (pp. 25–34). Sense.
- Gibson, D. M. (2016). Growing leaders: The parallels of professional identity and leadership identity development in counselors. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 3(1), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2015.1114435>
- Gibson, D. M., Dollahide, C. T., Moss, J. M., Aras, Y., & Mitchell, T. (2018). Examining leadership with American Counseling Association presidents: A grounded theory of leadership identity development. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 96(4), 361–371. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12219>
- Glosoff, H. L., & Durham, J. C. (2010). Using supervision to prepare social justice counseling advocates. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 50(2), 116–129. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2010.tb00113.x>
- Glosoff, H. L., Durham, J. C., & Whittaker, J. E. (2012). Supervision: Promoting advocacy and leadership. In C. Y. Chang, C. A. Barrio Minton, A. L. Dixon, J. E. Myers, & T. S. Sweeney (Eds.), *Professional counseling excellence through leadership and advocacy* (pp. 185–205). Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Hill, N. R., & Friedman, E. N. (2019). Professional leadership at the state, regional, national, and international levels. In J. E. Atieno Okech & D. J. Rubel (Eds.), *Counselor education in the 21st century: Issues and experiences*. American Counseling Association.
- Holloway, E. (1995). *Clinical supervision: A systems approach*. SAGE.
- Jenkins, D. M. (2012). Exploring signature pedagogies in undergraduate leadership education. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 11(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.12806/V11/I1/RF1>
- Lanning, W. (1986). Development of the supervisor emphasis rating form. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 33, 294–304.
- Lockard, F. W., Laux, J. M., Ritchie, M., Piazza, N., & Haefner, J. (2014). Perceived leadership preparation in counselor education doctoral students who are members of the American Counseling Association in CACREP-accredited programs. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 33(2), 228–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2014.992270>
- Luke, M. (2014). Effective group leadership interventions. In J. L. Delucia-Waack, C. L. Kalonder, & M. T. Riva (Eds.), *Handbook Teaching and Supervision in Counseling* * 2020 * Volume 2 (2)

- of group counseling and psychotherapy (2nd ed.; pp. 107–119). SAGE.
- Luke, M. (2019). Supervision in the Counselor Education Context. In J. Okech & D. Rubel (Eds.), *Counselor Education in the 21st Century* (pp. 35–52). American Counseling Association.
- Luke, M., & Gordon, C. M. (2016). Clinical supervision via email: A review of the literature and suggestions for practice. In T. G. Rousmaniere & E. Renfro-Michele (Eds.), *Using technology to enhance clinical supervision* (pp. 117–134). American Counseling Association Press.
- Luke, M., & Hackney, H. (2007). Group co-leadership: A critical review. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 46, 280–293. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2007.tb00032.x>
- McKibben, W. B. (2016). The content and process of counseling leadership: Implications for research and practice. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 3, 147–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2016.1147396>
- McKibben, W., Borders, L., & Ackerman, T. A. (2017a). Development of the dynamic leadership in counseling scale-self-report. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 4(2), 147–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2017.1333048>
- McKibben, W. B., Umstead, L. K., & Borders, L. D. (2017b). Identifying dynamics of counseling leadership: A content analysis study. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 95(2), 192–202. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12131>
- McKibben, W. B., Webber, W. B., & Wahesh, E. (2017c). Exploring CSI chapter leaders' development toward leadership excellence. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 4, 52–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2017.1282332>
- Meany-Walen, K., Carnes-Holt, K., Barrio Minton, C. A., Purswell, K., & Pronchenko-Jain, Y. (2013). An exploration of counselors' professional leadership development. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 91, 206–215. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2013.00087.x>
- Paradise, L. V., Ceballos, P. T., & Hall, S. (2010). Leadership and leader behavior in counseling: Neglected skills. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 32(1), 46–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-009-9088-y>
- Peters, H. C., & Luke, M. (in review). Supervision of leadership model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*.
- Peters, H. C., Luke, M., Bernard, J., & Trepal, H. (in press). Socially just and culturally responsive leadership within counseling/counseling psychology: A grounded theory. *The Counseling Psychologist*. https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Socially-Just-and-Culturally-Responsive-Counseling-Leadership-Model_fig1_338716949
- Peters, H. C., Luke, M., & Kozak, K. T. (2018). Adapting Chi Sigma Iota principles and practices of leadership excellence to a school counseling leadership context. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 5(2), 95–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2018.1461035>
- Peters, H. C., & Vereen, L. G. (2020). Counseling leadership and professional counselor identity: A phenomenological study. *Journal of Counselor Leadership & Advocacy*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2020.1770143>
- Shulman, L. S. (2005a). *The signature pedagogies of the professions of law, medicine, engineering, and the clergy: Potential lessons for the education of teachers*. National Research Council Center for Education.
- Shulman, L. S. (2005b). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0011526054622015>
- Stoltenberg, C. D. (2005). Enhancing professional competence through developmental approaches to supervision. *American Psychologist*, 60, 857–864.
- Storlie, C. A., Baltrinic, E., Aye, M., Wood, S. M., & Cox, J. (2019). Making room for leadership and advocacy in site supervision. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 6(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2019.1575778>
- Storlie, C. A., Parker-Wright, M., & Woo, H. (2015). Multicultural leadership development: A qualitative analysis of emerging leaders in counselor education. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 2(2), 154–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2015.1054078>
- Storlie, C., & Wood, M. (2014a). Developing social justice leaders through Chi Sigma Iota: A phenomenological exploration of chapter leader experiences, Part 1. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 1(2), 166–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2014.935984>
- Storlie, C., & Wood, M. (2014b). Developing social justice leaders through Chi Sigma Iota: A phenomenological exploration of chapter leader experiences, Part 2. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 1(2), 181–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2014.955991>
- Sweeney, T. J. (2012). Leadership for the counseling profession. In C. Y. Chang, C. A. Barrio Minton, A. L. Dixon, J. E. Myers, & T. J. Sweeney (Eds.), *Professional counseling excellence through leadership and advocacy* (pp. 3–20). Taylor & Francis.
- Wahesh, E., & Myers, J. E. (2014). Principles and practices of leadership excellence: CSI chapter presidents' experience, perceived competence, and rankings of importance. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 1(1), 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2014.886977>
- Watkins, C. E. (2017). On principles of educational change and principled action in psychotherapy supervision. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 47, 163–172. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10879-016-9355-2>
- Watkins, C. E. (2020). The psychotherapy supervisor as an agent of transformation: To anchor, educate, facilitate, and emancipate. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.20190016>
- Watkins, C. E. (in press). Psychotherapy supervision an ever-evolving signature pedagogy. *World Psychology*.
- Watkins, C. E., & Milne, D. (Eds.). (2014). *International handbook of clinical supervision*. Wiley.
- Wayne, J., Bogo, M., & Raskin, M. (2010). Field education as the signature pedagogy of social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 46(3), 327–339. <https://doi.org/10.5175/JSWE.2010.200900043>