

June 2024

Supporting Clinical Mental Health Counseling Doctoral Supervisors in Supervising School Counselors-in-Training: Challenges and Strategies for Integration

Yu-Hsun Peng
Syracuse University

Derron Hilts
Niagara University

Yanhong Liu
Syracuse University

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

Recommended Citation

Peng, Yu-Hsun; Hilts, Derron; and Liu, Yanhong (2024) "Supporting Clinical Mental Health Counseling Doctoral Supervisors in Supervising School Counselors-in-Training: Challenges and Strategies for Integration," *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*: Vol. 6 : Iss. 2 , Article 3.

<https://doi.org/10.7290/tsc06qsks>

Available at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/tsc/vol6/iss2/3>

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>.

Supporting Clinical Mental Health Counseling Doctoral Supervisors in Supervising School Counselors-in-Training: Challenges and Strategies for Integration

Cover Page Footnote

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Yu-Hsun Peng, Department of Psychology, California State University Bakersfield, 9001 Stockdale Highway, Bakersfield, CA 93311-1022 (email: ypeng3@csub.edu).

Supporting Clinical Mental Health Counseling Doctoral Supervisors in Supervising School Counselors-in-Training: Challenges and Strategies for Integration

Received: 01/02/24
Revised: 03/20/24
Accepted: 04/09/24
DOI: 10.7290/tsc06qsks

Yu-Hsun Peng , Derron Hilts , Yanhong Liu 

Abstract

This conceptual article underscores the critical need for tailored supervision for school counselors-in-training (SCITs), emphasizing challenges arising from differences in training, role ambiguity, and limited understanding of PK–12 educational contexts when overseen by doctoral supervisors with clinical mental health counseling (CMHC) backgrounds. We advocate for enhanced training and support for doctoral students from CMHC backgrounds to more effectively supervise SCITs. To bridge the gap between SCITs and counselor education doctoral training, we emphasize adjustments to supervision training and implications for the supervision of school counselor trainees.

Significance to the Public

This article highlights the pressing need to improve the supervision of school counselors-in-training (SCITs). The authors advocate for enhanced training for doctoral supervisors with clinical mental health counseling backgrounds to better support SCITs, ultimately fostering more effective and responsive school counseling supervision.

Keywords: school counseling supervision, school counselors-in-training (SCITs), clinical mental health, counselor education doctoral students

Despite the importance of having a common and unified professional counselor identity (Dollarhide et al., 2023), school counselors have distinct training needs that differ from those of clinical mental health counselors (CMHCs; Levy & Lemberger-Truelove, 2021). According to the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), school counselors require skills in program development, leadership, collaboration, and referral procedures (ASCA, 2019a). School counselor roles have evolved to encompass academic and career counseling, as well as addressing social and emotional needs of students from PK–12. Given

these unique roles, scholars argue that school counselors should adopt a collective professional identity, functioning both as educators and mental health professionals within schools (Levy & Lemberger-Truelove, 2021). The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) has acknowledged the need for relevant supervision and training experiences for school counselors-in-training (SCITs) to address their unique needs (CACREP, 2023). The imperative for effective school counseling supervision lies in emphasizing a robust, unified counselor-educator identity and

Yu-Hsun Peng, Department of Psychology, California State University, Bakersfield; **Derron Hilts**, Department of Counseling and Applied Psychology, Niagara University; **Yanhong Liu**, Department of Counseling and Human Services, Syracuse University. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Yu-Hsun Peng, Department of Psychology, California State University Bakersfield, 9001 Stockdale Highway, Bakersfield, CA 93311-1022 (email: ypeng3@csub.edu).

employing best practices to lead, coach, mentor, and instruct school counselor trainees (Levy & Lemberger-Truelove, 2021; Wilder et al., 2022). In this vein, scholars have acknowledged the inadequacy of supervision provided by school counselor practitioners as site supervisors who may not have received quality clinical supervision and focused supervision training (Carroll, 2014; Wambu & Meyers, 2019).

Counselor education programs are thus charged with ensuring that SCITs possess the necessary skills and knowledge to work with diverse students, integrate themselves into the school system, and effectively address systemic issues impacting youth (ASCA, 2019a; Hilts & Liu, 2023; Kozlowski & Huss, 2013). Similar to counselors-in-training (CITs) in general, SCITs may demonstrate challenges at various points of their development. For instance, they were noted to be highly anxious with low self-awareness in their early stage of development, and then they become more competent and conscious with integrating professional and personal identities (Lambie & Haugen, 2021). Supervision provided during practicum and internship are asserted to play an essential role in facilitating SCITs' professional development; however, the needs of SCITs may not be adequately addressed through traditional clinical training and supervisory models (e.g., Hilts, Peters, et al., 2022; Kozlowski & Huss, 2013). Additionally, while CACREP (2023) requires all counselor education programs to enlist site supervisors who have relevant supervision training, scholars have noted a lack of available supervision, qualified supervisors, and practice-based strategies for providing consistent and quality supervision within schools (e.g., Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Brott et al., 2021). To this end, intentional university supervision provided through counselor education programs can serve to augment existing site supervision provided by school counseling practitioners, cultivating SCITs' holistic development aligning with their dual counselor-educator identity. In counselor education programs with a doctoral program/track, doctoral students are often positioned as university supervisors under faculty supervision; the doctoral supervisors are

thus in a key position to advocate for and perform proper supervision of SCITs on a continual basis throughout their preparatory programs (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011).

While CACREP (2023) further stipulates a minimum of 1 hour of supervision per week, conducted by a counselor education program's core or affiliate faculty, a doctoral student under faculty supervision, or a fieldwork site supervisor in regular consultation with faculty as per the supervision agreement, it provides limited guidance on the specific training required. This leaves school counseling programs seeking uniformity and consensus to operationalize these essential learning experiences. Additionally, counseling programs that offer doctoral degrees need to ensure proper training for doctoral supervisors to more effectively meet clinical and developmental needs of emerging counselors. Although doctoral supervisors, especially those with a CMHC background, are typically trained to serve as clinical supervisors (Slaten & Baskin, 2014), challenges can arise when they provide supervision to SCITs (Pool et al., 2021). These challenges may include curricular differences, limited familiarity with school counselor roles and their educator-counselor identity, and differences between educational and clinical systems (DeKruyf et al., 2013; Frick & Glosoff, 2014; Levy & Lemberger-Truelove, 2021; Slaten & Baskin, 2014).

Given the variability in programmatic and supervision structure, faculty expertise, and design, we specifically focus on scenarios where the incorporation of CMHC doctoral students as supervisors emerges from necessity, in other words, in programs that may grapple with providing SCITs access to supervisors with some background and training in school counseling. By addressing these identified gaps and exploring feasible solutions, we acknowledge the distinct challenges and opportunities presented when cross-specialty supervision becomes essential to overcoming counseling specialty area limitations. Therefore, we seek to broaden the discourses on school counseling supervision by advocating for tailored supervision by CMHC doctoral supervisors to oversee SCITs

effectively, which could be applicable across individual, triadic, and group supervisory formats. Emphasizing the necessity for doctoral supervisors to possess understanding of school counselors' roles and the cultural nuances within school settings, we propose strategies for enhancing their competency in this area (Dollarhide et al., 2014).

While our recommendations aim to enhance the training and support for CMHC doctoral supervisors, enabling them to effectively oversee SCITs, we recognize that their expertise in school counseling may not match the depth of knowledge held by supervisors who have dedicated their careers to school counseling. As such, we aim to provide research-informed suggestions, for example, infusing a school supervision model into supervision training for doctoral students, considering having school counseling internship experiences, familiarity with the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2019b), and integrating doctoral students' CMHC knowledge into a school counseling supervision context. Further, our recommendations aim not only to improve the supervision of SCITs but also to enrich school counseling supervision more broadly, even beyond the context of involving CMHC doctoral students as supervisors.

School Counseling Supervision

Research indicates that supervision plays a crucial role in supporting supervisees by offering a valuable platform for addressing challenges, accessing resources, and receiving constructive feedback for counseling skill enhancement (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Bledsoe et al., 2019; Brott et al., 2021; Slaten & Baskin, 2014; Tang, 2020). More specifically, school counseling supervision equips emerging and practicing school counselors with techniques to address challenges associated with comprehending school and district policies, maintaining healthy boundaries, coping with negative experiences in their work environment, and managing burnout and stress (Kovač et al., 2017); it can also serve as a safeguard against

burnout and vicarious trauma (Kovač et al., 2017). Moreover, clinical supervision is a crucial professional practice that plays a pivotal role in the professional growth, skill development, and socialization of school counselors (Luke, 2019), and it also contributes to their ongoing well-being (Smith & Koltz, 2015). Notably, school counselors who engage in supervision often report increased feelings of competence and empathy toward student issues (Randick et al., 2018). Other scholars have asserted that supervision may foster multicultural and social justice competence (Bledsoe et al., 2019) and school counseling leadership development (e.g., Hilts, Peters, et al., 2022; Li & Peters, 2022).

Within the realm of school counseling supervision, four distinct types are recognized: administrative, programmatic, peer, and clinical supervision (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Administrative supervision, often provided by building administrators, can be described as the focus on organizational and macro topics such as work performance, attendance, staff and community relations, and adherence to policies and procedures (Somody et al., 2008). Programmatic or developmental supervision, often provided by district coordinators or school counseling directors, focuses on school counseling programmatic services (Roberts & Borders, 1994). Peer supervision has been described as an organized, supportive endeavor in which counseling colleagues, in small groups or pairs, “use their professional knowledge and relationship expertise to monitor practice and effectiveness on a regular basis for the purpose of improving specific counseling, conceptualization, and theoretical skills” (Wilkerson, 2006, p. 62.) Lastly, clinical supervision, although rare in schools, is typically provided by trained counseling supervisors, and ideally, individuals competent in the realm of school counseling functioning (Bledsoe et al., 2019). This type of supervision often focuses on school counseling practitioners' microperformance such as client and issue conceptualization, interventions, and the overall counseling process (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006); it impacts counseling knowledge and skills and decreases the risk of unethical practice (Bernard

& Goodyear, 2019). In the realm of supervision practice, doctoral supervisors commonly prioritize clinical supervision over programmatic or administrative aspects. This tendency may arise from institutional role limitations or divisions within the academic structure. For the purposes of this article, we focus on intentional, holistic supervision to align with school counselors' dual counselor-educator identity (Levy & Lemberger-Truelove, 2021).

Although supervision is an essential component of school counseling, it remains underdiscussed in training SCITs (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Wilder et al., 2022). Supervision in school counseling has undergone significant changes over the years, which may have partially contributed to role ambiguity and incongruence for many SCITs (Cinotti, 2014). Although the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2019b) has been promoted to advocate for school counselors' practice, supervision, training, and professional development, the extent to which SCITs receive adequate or sufficient supervision is unclear (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Brott et al., 2021; Kozlowski & Huss, 2013; Pool et al., 2021; Wambu & Myers, 2019). Moreover, despite the acknowledged importance of supervision for SCITs and increased attention to this area in literature (e.g., Wilder et al., 2022), the specific nuances of doctoral clinical supervision in school counseling contexts remain underexplored (Bernard & Luke, 2015; Bledsoe et al., 2019).

Counselor Education Doctoral Supervision Training

CACREP (2023) mandates that counseling programs offering doctoral degrees include coursework in supervision theory and practice. In such programs, master's students often receive their practicum or internship supervision directly from doctoral supervisors in training. While there is a considerable volume of research on clinical supervision spanning over three decades (Bernard, 2005), there remains a significant gap in literature concerning the training and supervisory practices of doctoral students, including their developmental

journey toward becoming effective supervisors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). There is also an increasing demand for doctoral degrees in counselor education and supervision, with a 34% enrollment rise from 2017 to 2020 (CACREP, 2020). School counseling graduates constitute only about one-third of the doctoral enrollment (CACREP, 2022), leading to a scarcity of doctoral supervisors with school counseling expertise. This shortage is mirrored in the unfilled counselor educator positions with school counseling focus each year (Moran et al., 2022), suggesting that many SCITs receive their supervision and coursework from individuals primarily trained in CMHC (Betters-Bubon et al., 2021; Pool et al., 2021). The lack of studies on CMHC doctoral students providing clinical supervision to SCITs and the trend of school counseling being underrepresented in counseling preparation programs (Betters-Bubon et al., 2021; Pool et al., 2021) call for further investigation into improving support and training for these roles.

The Association for Counseling Education and Supervision (ACES), through its Best Practices in Clinical Supervision (ACES, 2011), emphasizes the importance of having different approaches, formats, structures, and types of supervision in various settings. ACES (2011) further acknowledges that supervision in different contexts, such as universities, agencies, schools, and private practice, may require tailored approaches to address the challenges and demands specific to each setting (ACES, 2011). Doctoral students in CACREP-accredited programs must complete their supervision training through coursework and practical experience. As specified by CACREP (2023), in addition to the required coursework, doctoral students are obligated to undertake internships accumulating at least 600 hours. Nevertheless, CACREP does not dictate specific internship areas other than counseling, allowing for variability across different programs. Doctoral students engaging in internship activities, including providing supervision to master's students, are under the supervision of counselor education faculty members. Similarly, CACREP does not detail the precise training that faculty supervisors should

have, leaving room for interpretation by individual programs (CACREP, 2023).

Due to the lack of specification around the content and depth of supervision training, the extent to which doctoral supervisors are receiving concentrated training on supervising counselor trainees across different specialty areas could vary greatly among instructors and programs. The dearth of information on CMHC doctoral students engaging in clinical supervision training for SCITs highlights an area that requires exploration. This seems to parallel the extant literature that identifies school counseling as less prioritized and valued in counseling preparation programs (e.g., Betters-Bubon et al., 2021). SCITs also report receiving more clinically focused coursework and supervision that is not always applicable to a school counseling context (Pool et al., 2021). The existing body of literature reveals a lack of emphasis on school counseling supervision models, with a distinct focus on *site supervisors' training*, compared to the supervision provided to SCITs in a university context (Wambu & Myers, 2019; Wilder et al., 2022). Thus, it is not particularly surprising that SCITs and school counselor educators have identified this gap by sharing concerns about counselor educators' and doctoral supervisors' lack of nuanced understanding and experience of the school system (Betters-Bubon et al., 2021; Pool et al., 2021).

Recommendations for Doctoral Supervision Training

While challenges may arise when supervisors and SCITs come from different counseling concentrations (DeKruyf et al., 2013; Frick & Glosoff, 2014; Levy & Lemberger-Truelove, 2021; Slaten & Baskin, 2014), research indicates that master's-level students often report satisfaction with doctoral student supervisors, viewing them as more approachable and models they can emulate (Fernando, 2013). The literature reveals additional benefits of doctoral supervision embedded into master's-level curricula. First, doctoral students receive formal training in supervision prior to or

concurrently with their supervision practice. With supervision provided by experienced faculty, doctoral students can provide SCITs with comprehensive and structured clinical supervision, enriching the supervisory experience (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Second, their involvement as supervisors increases the capacity for supervision within counseling programs, which is crucial given the high demand for and scarcity of qualified supervisors. Third, this experience fosters versatility in the supervisory skills of doctoral students, preparing them for diverse future counselor educator roles. Last, as potentially recent students themselves, doctoral supervisors might possess a heightened sensitivity to the challenges and educational needs of SCITs (Fernando, 2013). Furthermore, counselor educators play a crucial role in monitoring the developmental progress of doctoral supervisors, not only in terms of supervisory techniques, skills, and styles, but also in recognizing their roles and responsibilities as supervisors in relevant contexts (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Subsequently, the following section outlines strategies aimed at bolstering the supervision capabilities of CMHC doctoral students to bridge any existing gaps.

Doctoral Supervision Curriculum

Scholars have increasingly called for transformation from conventional clinical training methods to more holistic and inclusive models that incorporates school counseling supervision needs, addressing the distinctive requirements of SCITs (Hilts, Peters, et al., 2022; Luke & Bernard, 2006). Despite various specialized supervision models for school counseling, there is a notable gap in focusing on vital, specialty-specific tasks beyond traditional supervision approaches, such as comprehending the multifaceted roles of school counselors (ASCA, 2019b). Although there are guidelines provided within a school counseling supervision context, their primary emphasis is on site supervisors (Studer, 2005), rather than university supervisors. However, CACREP (2023) emphasizes the importance of including topics on the skills required

for counseling supervision across various settings and modalities within the curriculum.

To address this gap and enhance supervision training in meeting supervisee needs, we propose a deeper integration of empirically supported school counseling supervision models into doctoral supervision curricula. This integration could manifest within doctoral supervision courses and training, where counselor educators equip doctoral supervisors with the knowledge and tools necessary for effective school counseling supervision through a range of resources, including readings, discussions, and hands-on activities (Slaten & Baskin, 2014). Intentional readings and assignments focused on key frameworks in school counseling should be a staple of the doctoral supervision course curriculum. Supervision models such as the School Counselor Supervision Model (SCSM; Luke & Bernard, 2006); the Adlerian Alliance Supervisory Model for School Counseling (Devlin et al., 2009), which infuses components of ASCA National Model and Adlerian supervision; the Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems Model (GFRS; Wood & Rayle, 2006); and the Model for Supervision of School Counseling Leadership (Hilts, Peters, et al., 2022) offer foundational perspectives that can significantly contribute to the training of doctoral supervisors, preparing them to better meet the unique needs of SCITs.

Further, counselor educators can familiarize doctoral students with the SCSM (Luke & Bernard, 2006). SCSM as an extension of the Discrimination Model (DM; Bernard, 1979), may be applied into the curriculum while introducing DM to doctoral students. Counselor educators can extend the discussion from the DM to SCSM, employing its tenets while overseeing SCITs. This includes understanding the various supervisory roles (e.g., teacher, counselor, consultant) and focus areas (e.g., intervention, conceptualization, personalization), in conjunction with elements integral to a comprehensive school counseling program, such as broad-based interventions, counseling and consultation, and individual and group advisement, coupled with planning, coordination and assessment. These concepts could be explored

through case studies, role-playing, or homework assignments that prompt CMHC doctoral students to apply the SCSM in hypothetical scenarios. For instance, when analyzing session recordings with SCITs, they could discern the multifaceted roles that SCITs embody within their practicum or internship sites, employing the SCSM framework to pinpoint a principal focus area that aligns with the SCIT's tasks. This method aims to illustrate how roles outlined in the model, like functioning as a teacher, can be naturally woven into the daily duties of a school counselor, effectively merging theoretical insights with their practical execution in educational settings.

Moreover, due to the systemic nature of the field, the school counseling profession can be best understood using an ecological lens (Hilts, Liu, et al., 2022; Ieva et al., 2022), therefore, multicultural competence in a school context should be incorporated into supervision. SCITs need to recognize and address their implicit biases and social justice issues in schools and communities (Dollarhide et al., 2014). To assist SCITs in addressing equity, diversity, and inclusion, it is crucial for doctoral supervisors to possess awareness and knowledge in working with youth within the school environment (Slaten & Baskin, 2014). Doctoral supervision curricula should incorporate various multicultural models and address pertinent issues to ensure comprehensive training for SCITs. Tadlock-Marlo et al. (2013) identified four domains of multicultural competence: assessment of the school environment, reflection of personal culture, interpersonal relationships, and collaboration. Counselor educators may guide discussions with doctoral supervisors, enabling them to apply these domains effectively and foster understanding of demographics and cultural issues. Furthermore, the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC; Ratts et al., 2016) can serve as a framework for promoting multicultural competence, social justice, and school counseling leadership within the school counseling context by recognizing the privilege, power, and marginalization experienced by both students and school counselors. When utilized in school

counseling supervision, MSJCC may support SCITs in reflecting on how the intersectionality of students' identities shape their lives and that of their families. It allows for an examination of power and privilege, further facilitating leadership and advocacy in response to multicultural and social justice issues in American schools (Ratts & Greenleaf, 2017). Moreover, it is essential to recognize and incorporate an antiracist approach throughout supervision sessions. For example, the Antiracist Inclusive Model of System Supervision (AIMSS; Ieva et al., 2022) offers a framework for promoting the knowledge, skills, and dispositional development of school counselors' antiracist lens and critical consciousness (Ieva et al., 2022). The AIMSS addresses the complex roles that SCITs can play within a school context (i.e., counselor, educator, active learner, and challenger) and the interaction with the system (i.e., school, community and stakeholders, counseling programs, systems). Counselor educators can assign related readings and encourage doctoral supervisors to more deeply understand ecosystems within a school context.

In addition to integrating school counseling supervision models into training, the diverse backgrounds of doctoral students and faculty should be considered to broaden the application of these models across different specialties. For instance, discussions could explore doctoral students' and faculty's training backgrounds, and how to adapt the model for use in schools, community agencies, college counseling centers, or with counselors-in-training who specialize in areas such as family and couples therapy, veteran services, or rehabilitation counseling. Additionally, inviting doctoral student peers, especially those with a school counseling background, to provide feedback may cultivate doctoral supervisors' self-efficacy (Frick & Glosoff, 2014). Moreover, guest speakers with supervision specialties from various counseling backgrounds, including school counseling, can be valuable for doctoral supervisors, faculty, and peers, leading to important perspectives and insights that enrich the learning experience and application of supervision models in diverse contexts. Additionally, a significant portion of counselor training and practice revolves around the application of

counseling knowledge and skills (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Some of the intervention skills are required for successful counseling and consultation, and can be shared across the setting while conducting counseling.

Finally, the supervisory relationship is one of the important elements for school counseling supervision success (Bledsoe et al., 2019). Therefore, it is essential to provide culturally sustaining strategies for conducting clinical supervision (CACREP, 2023). Doctoral supervisors' *broaching* is an effective strategy to cultivate multicultural awareness and skills among doctoral supervisors. Broaching involves explicit discussions on how cultural and sociopolitical factors influence a client's experiences, and it explores the counselor's own racial identity development and its impact on the counseling process (Day-Vines et al., 2007). Broaching can also be a valuable tool for addressing specialty differences within the supervisory relationship. This approach involves an open gesture to learn about specialties of counseling, fostering cultural humility, and understanding the professional context within diverse specialties. The use of broaching in supervision can significantly enhance SCITs' multicultural competence, leading to an understanding of cultural factors impacting the supervisory relationship (Jones et al., 2019), and therefore, enriching the training experiences of doctoral students and fostering a more nuanced understanding of the complexities inherent in school counseling.

ASCA National Model in Supervising SCITs

Despite nuances associated with the plethora of previously mentioned school counseling supervision models, we highlight ways in which the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2019b) may be utilized to ground the clinical supervision of SCITs for CMHC doctoral supervisors. The ASCA Professional Standards and Competencies (ASCA, 2019a) emphasizes the need for emerging and practicing school counselors to utilize supervision to enhance their professional growth and development. The

ASCA asserts that supervision should be aligned with principles undergirded in professional standards and competencies (ASCA, 2019a). Considering the breadth of ethical standards that emerging school counselors are expected to use to inform their thought- and decision-making, it is not surprising that supervision is referenced 48 times in the ASCA Ethical Standards (ASCA, 2022). Taken collectively, the previously mentioned set of standards that define school counseling underscore the critical role that both school counseling training programs and SCITs' supervisors play in training the next generation of school counselors to meet the diverse needs of PK–12 students in the 21st century.

Given that professional school counselors are expected to design and implement a comprehensive school counseling program to cultivate the academic, career, and personal-social development of all students (ASCA, 2019b), it is critical that the ASCA National Model is woven into the supervision of SCITs (ASCA, 2020). This may be especially important given that many existing models of supervision may not reflect updates to what supervisees need to know and do to facilitate PK–12 students' development and success in the 21st century. As such, counselor educators can embed the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2019b) into supervision practices or curricula to help doctoral supervisors intentionally organize discussion- and experiential-based activities that facilitate a more in-depth understanding of each of the four distinct components of the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2019b). Grounded in the ASCA standards, we offer some concrete recommendations for supervision of SCITs around each of the four ASCA National Model components: *define*, *manage*, *deliver*, and *assess* (ASCA, 2019b).

Define

The *define* component outlines the expectations to which school counselors must ascribe to effectively develop, implement, and assess their school counseling programs (ASCA, 2019b). It comprises three overarching standards: mindsets and behaviors for student success (ASCA, 2021), ethical standards for school counselors (ASCA, 2022), and school

counselor professional standards and competencies (ASCA, 2019a). During supervision, the doctoral supervisor can assess the extent to which the supervisee uses mindsets and behaviors (ASCA, 2021) to guide their delivery of direct and indirect services. For example, doctoral supervisors can initially encourage SCITs to engage in self-reflection, focusing on their attitudes toward self-acceptance and their understanding of inclusiveness. This process may not only foster increased self-awareness but also address the emotional challenges frequently encountered in clinical supervision (Lambie & Sias, 2009). Additionally, supervisors can assist SCITs in identifying specific interventions or counseling techniques that resonate with the selected mindset, ensuring their practices are aligned with principles of inclusivity and self-awareness. Supervisors can also assist SCITs in devising strategies to evaluate the effectiveness of their approaches in nurturing this mindset amongst students. Doctoral supervisors can also assign homework or tasks that require the SCIT to further acclimate themselves to the respective policies and procedures of their practicum/internship site, which may promote their adherence to ethical practices and behaviors. Throughout such activities and to further cultivate a healthy supervisory relationship, doctoral supervisors should invite SCITs to share instances in which they encounter a sense of self-doubt and challenges encountered with other educational partners (e.g., students, teachers). In addressing such issues, doctoral supervisors may lean into their selected supervision model to help inform their approach including whether the focus might be on the SCIT's intervention, conceptualization, or personalization skills (Bernard, 1979).

Manage

The *manage* component emphasizes that school counseling programs need to be efficiently and effectively managed to be comprehensive in scope and improve student outcomes (ASCA, 2019b). The overarching organizational tools that fall under this component include the program focus (e.g., vision statement, mission statement) and program planning

(e.g., annual administrative conference, advisory council). In a supervision context, doctoral supervisors can invite SCITs to reflect on their individual beliefs about students and other educational partners and how this may impact the educational process and their working relationships with their partners and their students (Li & Peters, 2022). Additionally, the supervisee can reflect on their time management skills and brainstorm how the use-of-time assessment can be used as an advocacy tool during other program planning functions (e.g., advisory council meetings, annual administrative conference; ASCA, 2020). Since doctoral students generally have enhanced training in advocating for clients at the individual and systemic levels (CACREP, 2023), sharing their own challenges and successes with advocacy may both encourage and validate SCITs' experiences with doing the same.

Deliver

The *deliver* component emphasizes that school counselors implement appropriate services with and on behalf of students aimed at facilitating students' development of the ASCA mindsets and behaviors for student success (ASCA, 2021). These activities are organized by direct (e.g., instruction, counseling) and indirect (e.g., consultation, collaboration) services (ASCA, 2019b). This component may be the most accessible and familiar to CMHC doctoral supervisors. Given their enhanced training in teaching topics such as curriculum design and instructional delivery (CACREP, 2023), doctoral supervisors may be well-positioned to support SCITs with watching and/or discussing the SCIT's experiences related to classroom or group instruction (ASCA, 2020). To this end, feedback can be provided based on the SCIT's pedagogical and group facilitation skills, including cultural relevance of the lesson to diverse learners. Likewise, doctoral supervisors may review and offer feedback on their supervisees' lesson plans including targeted ASCA student standards (ASCA, 2021), corresponding student learning objectives, and the teaching and practice content. For instance, the doctoral supervisor can review the

extent to which the supervisee is both aligning their approach to counseling and corresponding techniques to a specific theoretical orientation. Relatedly, the SCIT can role-play scenarios that they anticipate encountering but are less familiar with or believe would challenge their current counseling skills. Throughout the supervisory process, SCITs should reflect on and explore how issues of power, privilege, oppression, and aspects of the SCIT's identity may influence their engagement in leadership practices (Hilts, Liu, et al., 2022). Relatedly, the SCIT may be encouraged to holistically consider how sociocultural factors may influence their experience as a school counselor (Hilts, Liu, et al., 2022).

As it relates to indirect service delivery, since professional school counselors must be invested in their school community and be present at relevant school and district committees and events, the supervisor may incorporate assignments that require the supervisee to attend, observe, and reflect on their experiences with such activities (ASCA, 2020). Last, because SCITs will work with and provide consultation to various school partners (e.g., teachers) regarding student issues, doctoral supervisors can facilitate conversations around such processes and offer guidance on navigating various relational and political dynamics that may be especially salient.

Assess

The *assess* component accentuates that school counselors must regularly assess their program to showcase how their services are benefiting students and improve or expand upon existing programs (ASCA, 2019b). This component is comprised of two overarching tools to guide school counselors' assessment and appraisal: program assessment (i.e., school counseling program assessment, annual results reports) and school counselor assessment and appraisal (i.e., professional standards and competencies assessment, performance appraisal template). There are various activities that doctoral supervisors can employ to cultivate supervisees' familiarity of and competence with assessment in clinical supervision. For example, through

collaborative discussions with their supervisor, the SCIT can establish short- and long-term professional development goals based on their reflection on and completion of school counselor performance appraisal (ASCA, 2019b). This may help to emphasize to SCITs the importance of engaging in self-reflection and assessment to promote their personal and professional development.

The doctoral supervisor can also collaborate with the site supervisor to evaluate the supervisee's competence with data and identify focus areas where the SCIT may need further support. For example, given CMHC doctoral students often have expertise with treatment planning, they may effectively model how SCITs can write programmatic goals that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. Because school counseling preparation programs should prepare SCITs with collecting pre-assessment and post-assessment data to evaluate the impact of their interventions, supervision can serve as an ideal space for supervisees to engage in assessment work. After collecting intervention data, SCITs may be encouraged to identify factors that facilitated or inhibited the impact of their intervention(s).

Exposure to Working With Youth in PK–12 Settings

Further considerations to supervision training is needed such as creating opportunities for doctoral students to learn more about working with youth and supporting educational and mental health professionals in the school setting. For instance, since doctoral students typically receive advanced training in counseling including the completion of fieldwork in a counseling setting (CACREP, 2023), doctoral programs may encourage doctoral students to work in settings that expand their current knowledge and skill base. Doctoral training programs can establish partnerships with site supervisors with advanced degrees (i.e., PhD) from local schools and pair doctoral CMHC students with them for completion of practicum and/or internship requirements. Through such collaboration, doctoral students may be able to better examine and reflect

on the various roles and responsibilities assumed by various educational partners including school counselors, administrators, and teachers. It may also offer them important insights related to current or prospective supervisory work supporting SCITs. Another opportunity for doctoral supervisors to further cultivate their knowledge of school counseling may be done by observing or coteaching a school counseling course with a school counselor educator. Unlike having school counseling faculty overseeing their supervision, incorporating teaching mentorship goes beyond just supervision instruction; it encompasses teaching style, school counseling knowledge and skills, career and psychological mentoring as well (Baltrinic et al., 2018). Therefore, it may be beneficial for CMHC doctoral supervisors to have a teaching mentor from a different specialty background. For instance, during their teaching internships, doctoral students could be matched with faculty members who have a background in school counseling and coteach related coursework. This pairing can serve to deepen the doctoral students' understanding of school counseling knowledge, mentorship approaches, and the nuances of career development within this specialty area.

Formats of Supervision

The previously mentioned supervision activities could be addressed through SCITs' practicum and internship coursework, or individual, triadic, or small group supervision contexts. The extant research suggests that SCITs benefit from receiving feedback from their fellow school counseling peers in a group setting (Minor & Duchac, 2023; Pool et al., 2021), therefore, if afforded the option, doctoral supervisors may advocate for the use of triadic or small group supervision with SCITs (Minor & Duchac, 2023; Pool et al., 2021). Doctoral supervisors may assume an additional role of a process observer and facilitator with varied levels of involvement based on group needs and dynamics (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Further, doctoral supervisors have a responsibility to co-establish a supportive environment where supervisees support one another through peer evaluation and feedback

on their counseling performance and counseling skills (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Because school counselors often do not have access to consistent and quality supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Brott et al., 2021), these specific types of supervision formats may model skills to provide feedback, and the importance of seeking out peer consultation and supervision. Additionally, opting to choose triadic or small group supervision may serve as a buffer in the school counseling–specific knowledge gap that may exist for doctoral supervisors with a CMHC background.

Assessment, Evaluation, and Case Conceptualization

The literature highlights a lack of valid and reliable competency-based evaluative instruments for SCITs, posing a challenge to seek rigorous and standardized assessment tools specific to the context of school counseling (Burgess et al., 2023). There is a call for a more systematic and evidence-based approach to assessment and evaluation in practicum and internship classes for SCITs. Thus, in a school counseling practicum or internship course, doctoral supervisors and counselor educators may advocate for the use of school counseling–specific assessment tools. For example, the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS; Burgess et al., 2023) could be used to evaluate the roles and responsibilities of counselor trainees working in a PK–12 educational setting (e.g., knowledge of ethical and legal decision-making with minors, engagement of students in classroom lessons). Similarly, to promote SCITs' conceptualization skills as they prepare and deliver case presentations or showcase their counseling skills, doctoral supervisors can create a school counseling conceptualization template. For instance, when considering the presenting issue(s) of the PK–12 student, a conceptualization prompt might be provided that asks, *What are some potential multisystemic levels of advocacy that may be beneficial to support this student (e.g., programs, services, school activities)?* Another example might be: *How do you understand how individual and systemic factors (e.g., school climate) could be*

influencing the PK–12 student's ability to achieve their goals, as aligned with the ASCA Mindsets & Behaviors for Student Success (ASCA, 2021).

Future Research

Scholars have highlighted that school counseling is often undervalued in the counseling profession, with school counselor educators facing an inconsistent identity and emerging school counselors being deprioritized in counseling programs (Betters-Bubon et al., 2021; Levy & Lemberger-Truelove, 2021). Therefore, there is a pressing need for future research to delve into the perspectives and experiences of emerging and practicing counselor educators teaching in specialty areas other than their own (Betters-Bubon et al., 2021). Similarly, researchers could seek to better understand SCITs' supervision experiences with doctoral students and counselor educators without master's training in school counseling and the potential impact of school counseling–specific training on their school counseling self-efficacy and related domains. Researchers could also consider better understanding the path to becoming a supervisor for doctoral students, especially in terms of identity formation in cross-specialty supervision. Case study or qualitative methods can be considered to deepen understanding of their subjective experiences about cross-specialty supervision.

Conclusion

Recognizing the nuances in supervision training for counselor trainees with distinct specialties and backgrounds is critical to contributing to a more adept and responsive training paradigm. School counseling supervision plays a critical role in preparing SCITs to navigate the multifaceted responsibilities expected of the 21st century school counselor. This article provides foundational recommendations for counseling programs to consider, highlighting the imperative of reassessing doctoral supervision training, particularly for

individuals with a CMHC background, to ensure the provision of effective supervision for SCITs. Counselor educators are recognized as playing a critical role in developing and implementing training programs that instill a nuanced understanding of the unique demands of school counseling training, which not only ensures responsive preparation for SCITs receiving supervision from doctoral students but also refines the training paradigm to cultivate a deeper understanding of the school counseling specialty among emerging counselor educators. While we advocate for the strategic inclusion of CMHC doctoral students as part of a broader supervisory framework, we also underscore the importance of continuous efforts to increase attention in school counseling supervision.

References

- American School Counselor Association. (2019a). *ASCA school counselor professional standards & competencies*. <https://www.schoolcounselor.org/getmedia/a8d59c2c-51de-4ec3-a565-a3235f3b93c3/SC-Competencies.pdf>
- American School Counseling Association. (2019b). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (4th ed.). Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2020). *Making supervision work*. Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2021). *ASCA student standards: Mindsets and behaviors for student success*. <https://www.schoolcounselor.org/getmedia/7428a787-a452-4abb-afec-d78ec77870cd/Mindsets-Behaviors.pdf>
- American School Counselor Association. (2022). *ASCA ethical standards for school counselors*. <https://www.schoolcounselor.org/getmedia/44f30280-ffe8-4b41-9ad8-f15909c3d164/EthicalStandards.pdf>
- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. (2011). *Best practices in clinical supervision*. ACES Taskforce on Best Practices in Clinical Supervision. <https://acesonline.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/ACES-Best-Practices-in-Clinical-Supervision-2011.pdf>
- Baltrinic, E. R., Moate, R. M., Hinkle, M. G., Jencius, M., & Taylor, J. Z. (2018). Counselor educators' teaching mentorship styles: A Q methodology study. *The Professional Counselor*, 8(1), 46–59. <https://doi.org/10.15241/erb.8.1.46>
- Bernard, J. M. (1979). Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 19(1), 60–68. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1979.tb00906.x>
- Bernard, J. M. (2005). Tracing the development of clinical supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 24(1–2), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1300/J001v24n01_02
- Bernard, J., & Goodyear, R. (2019). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (6th ed). Pearson Education.
- Bernard, J. M., & Luke, M. (2015). A content analysis of 10 years of clinical supervision articles in counseling. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 54(4), 242–257. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12024>
- Bettters-Bubon, J., Goodman-Scott, E., & Bamgbose, O. (2021). School counselor educators' reactions to changes in the profession: Implications for policy, evaluation, and preparation. *Journal of School-Based Counseling Policy and Evaluation*, 3(2), 40–50. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25774/gkr1-j228>
- Bledsoe, K. G., Logan-McKibben, S., McKibben, W. B., & Cook, R. M. (2019). A content analysis of school counseling supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, 22(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X19838454>
- Brott, P. E., DeKruyf, L., & Patterson-mills, S. (2021). The critical need for peer clinical supervision among school counselors. *Journal of School-Based Counseling Policy and Evaluation*, 3(2), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.25774/nr5m-mq71>
- Burgess, M., Goodman-Scott, E., Gülşah Kemer, Carlisle, K., & Carlisle, R. (2023). Development and evaluation of the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale. *Professional School Counseling*, 27(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759x221150004>
- Carroll, M. (2014). *Effective supervision for the helping professions* (2nd ed.) SAGE.
- Cinotti, D. (2014). Competing professional identity models in school counseling: A historical perspective and commentary. *The Professional Counselor*, 4(5), 417–425. <https://doi.org/10.15241/dc.4.5.417>
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2020). *CACREP vital statistics 2019: Results from a national survey of accredited programs*. <https://www.cacrep.org/>
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2022). *CACREP vital statistics 2021: Results from a national survey of accredited programs*. <https://www.cacrep.org/>
- Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2023). *2024 CACREP standards*. <https://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2024-cacrep-standards/>
- Day-Vines, N. L., Wood, S. M., Grothaus, T., Craigen, L., Holman, A., Dotson-Blake, K., & Douglass, M. J. (2007). Broaching the subjects of race, ethnicity, and culture during the counseling process. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 85(4), 401–409. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2007.tb00608.x>
- DeKruyf, L., Auger, R. W., & Trice-Black, S. (2013). The role of school counselors in meeting students' mental health needs: Examining issues of professional identity. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(5), 271–282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X0001600502>
- DeKruyf, L., & Pehrsson, D. E. (2011). School counseling site supervisor training: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 50, 314–327. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb01918.x>
- Devlin, J. M., Smith, R. L., & Ward, C. A. (2009). An Adlerian alliance supervisory model for school counseling. *Journal of School Counseling*, 7(42), 1–23. <http://jsc.montana.edu/articles/v7n42.pdf>
- Dollarhide, C. T., Bowen, N., Baker, C., Kassoy, F., Mayes, R., & Baughman, A. (2014). Exploring the work experiences of school counselors of color. *Professional School Counseling*, 17(1), 52–62. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1034654>

- Dollarhide, C. T., Gibson, D. M., Brashear, K. L., Huynh, J., Marshall, B., & Robinson, K. (2023). Lessons from professional identity development literature: A qualitative content analysis. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 62(3), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12269>
- Dollarhide, C. T., & Miller, G. M. (2006). Supervision for preparation and practice of school counselors: Pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 45(4), 242–252. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00001.x>
- Fernando, D. M. (2013). Supervision by doctoral students: A study of supervisee satisfaction and self-efficacy, and comparison with faculty supervision outcomes. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 32(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2013.778673>
- Frick, M. H., & Glosoff, H. L. (2014). Becoming a supervisor: Qualitative findings on self-efficacy beliefs of doctoral student supervisors-in-training. *The Professional Counselor*, 4(1), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.15241/mhr.4.1.35>
- Hilts, D., & Liu, Y. (2023). School counselors' perceived school climate, leadership practice, psychological empowerment, and multicultural competence before and during COVID-19. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 101(2), 193–203. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12464>
- Hilts, D., Liu, Y., Li, D., & Luke, M. (2022). Examining ecological factors that predict school counselors' engagement in leadership practices. *Professional School Counseling*, 26(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X221118042>
- Hilts, D., Peters, H. C., Liu, Y., & Luke, M. (2022). The model for supervision of school counseling leadership. *Journal of Counselor Leadership & Advocacy*, 9(2), 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2022.2032871>
- Ieva, K. P., Johnson, K., Shillingford-Butler, A., & Steen, S. (2022). Antiracist inclusive model of systems supervision (AIMSS). In Holcomb-McCoy (Ed.), *Antiracist schools and communities*. (pp. 189–203). American Counseling Association.
- Jones, C. T., Welfare, L. E., Melchior, S., & Cash, R. (2019). Broaching as a strategy for intercultural understanding in clinical supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 38(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2018.1560384>
- Kovač, J., Krečič, M. J., Čagan, B., & Mulej, M. (2017). Effect of supervision on stress and burnout in school counsellors: A case of action research. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 30(4), 395–406. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11213-016-9400-9>
- Kozlowski, K. A., & Huss, S. (2013, March 22–24). *Training of school counselors*. American Counseling Association Conference. Cincinnati, OH.
- Lambie, G. W., & Haugen, J. S. (2021). The assessment of school counseling competencies as a tool to support school counseling students, supervisors, and training programs. *Professional School Counseling*, 25(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X20981050>
- Lambie, G. W., & Sias, S. M. (2009). An integrative psychological developmental model of supervision for professional school counselors-in-training. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 87(3), 349–356. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2009.tb00116.x>
- Levy, I. P., & Lemberger-Truelove, M. E. (2021). Educator-counselor: A nondual identity for school counselors. *Professional School Counseling*, 24(1, Part 3), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X211007630>
- Li, H., & Peters, H. C. (2022). Supervision of school counseling leadership for school counselors in training. *Professional School Counseling*, 26(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X221087658>
- Luke, M. (2019). Supervision in the counselor education context. In J. E. Okech & D. J. Rubel (Eds.), *Counselor education in the 21st century: Issues and experiences* (pp. 35–52). Wiley.
- Luke, M., & Bernard, J. M. (2006). The school counseling supervision model: An extension of the discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 45(4), 282–295. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00004.x>
- Minor, J. S., & Duchac, N. E. (2023). Professional development for school counselors: A novel experience. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 96(3), 89–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2023.2173130>
- Moran, D., Brookover, D. L., & Goodman-Scott, E. (2022). School counselor educators: A grounded theory of career interest and satisfaction. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 62(1), 21–39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12257>
- Pool, A., Dickens, K. N., Lyons, M., & Herlihy, B. (2021). Supervision experiences of school counselors-in-training: An interpretative phenomenological study. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*, 3(1), 66–77. <https://doi.org/10.7290/tsc030107>
- Randick, N. M., Dermer, S., & Michel, R. E. (2018). Exploring the job duties that impact school counselor wellness: The role of RAMP, supervision, and support. *Professional School Counseling*, 22(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X18820331>
- Ratts, M. J., & Greenleaf, A. T. (2017). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies: A leadership framework for professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling*, 21(1b), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X18773582>
- Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nassar-McMillan, S., Butler, S. K., & McCullough, J. R. (2016). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies: Guidelines for the counseling profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 44(1), 28–48. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12035>
- Roberts, E. B., & Borders, D. (1994). Supervision of school counselors: Administrative, program, and counseling. *The School Counselor*, 41(3), 149–157.
- Slaten, C. D., & Baskin, T. W. (2014). Contextual school counseling: A framework for training with implications for curriculum, supervision, practice, and future research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 42(1), 97–123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000012473952>
- Somody, C., Henderson, P., Cook, K., & Zambrano, E. (2008). A working system of school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, 12(1), 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X0801200103>
- Studer, S. (2005). Supervising school counselors-in-training: A guide for field supervisors. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(4), 353–359. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42732630>
- Smith, A., & Koltz, R. L. (2015). Supervision of school counseling students: A focus on personal growth, wellness, and development. *Journal of School Counseling*, 13(2). <http://www.jsc.montana.edu/articles/v13n2.pdf>
- Tadlock-Marlo, R. L., Zyromski, B., Asner-Self, K. K., & Sheng, Y. (2013). One school, many differences: An assessment tool for school counselors and multicultural counseling. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 35(3), 234–250. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-012-9179-z>
- Tang, A. (2020). The impact of school counseling supervision on practicing school counselors' self-efficacy in building a comprehensive school counseling program. *Professional School Counseling*, 23(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X20947723>

- Wambu, G., & Myers, C. E. (2019). School counselor site supervisors' perceptions of preparedness and training needs. *Journal of School Counseling, 17*(14). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1217460.pdf>
- Wilder, C. R., Smith, A. R., Money-Brady, J., Ebersole, D. B., Cazares-Cervantes, A., Hannor-Walker, T. L., & Justice, J. (2022). School counseling site supervision: Training recommendations to benefit school counselor interns and site supervisors. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision, 16*(1). <https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/jcps/vol16/iss1/4>
- Wilkerson, K. (2006). Peer supervision for the professional development of school counselors: Toward an understanding of terms and findings. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 46*(1), 59–67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00012.x>
- Wood, C., & Rayle, A. D. (2006). A model of school counseling supervision: The goals, functions, roles, and systems model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*(4), 253–266. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00002.x>

Author Information

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

The authors reported no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

The authors have agreed to publish and distribute this article in *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling* as an open access article distributed

under the terms of the Creative Commons – Attribution License 4.0 International (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly attributed. The authors retain the copyright to this article.

Yu-Hsun Peng, PhD, NCC, is an assistant professor in counseling psychology at California State University, Bakersfield. 

Derron Hilts, PhD, NCC, NCSC, is an assistant professor and school counseling program coordinator in the Department of Counseling and Applied Psychology at Niagara University. 

Yanhong Liu, PhD, NCC, is an associate professor in counseling and counselor education at Syracuse University. 

How to Cite this Article:

Peng, Y.-H., Hilts, D., & Liu, Y. (2024). Supporting clinical mental health counseling doctoral supervisors in supervising school counselors-in-training: Challenges and strategies for integration. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling, 6*(2), 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.7290/tsc06qsk>