Spring 2019

The Psychometric Properties of the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale

Melanie Ann Burgess
Old Dominion University, mevan032@odu.edu

THE PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF

THE SCHOOL COUNSELING INTERNSHIP COMPETENCY SCALE

By

Melanie Ann Burgess
B.S. 2013, Old Dominion University
M.S.Ed. 2016, Old Dominion University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

COUNSELOR EDUCATION AND SUPERVISION

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
May 2019

Approved by:

Emily Goodman-Scott (Chair)

Gülşah Kemer (Methodologist)

Kristy Carlisle (Member)

Robert Carlisle (Member)

ABSTRACT

THE PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF
THE SCHOOL COUNSELING INTERNSHIP COMPETENCY SCALE

Melanie Ann Burgess
Old Dominion University, 2019
Chair: Dr. Emily Goodman-Scott

Counselor education programs aim to adequately train competent pre-service counselors to fulfill a myriad of roles and responsibilities associated with their specialty area. In accordance with professional organizations, gatekeeping is an ethical responsibility of counselor educators and supervisors to protect the welfare of clients and the health of the counseling profession through ongoing evaluation of pre-service counselors. Presently, no standardized evaluation tool exists to assess school counseling interns comprehensively, attending to school counseling competencies, dispositions, roles, and responsibilities. The purpose of the study is to attend to the gap in literature through the creation and validation of The School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS). This study utilized an exploratory sequential mixed method approach with qualitative inquiry to create the instrument and exploratory factor analysis to determine the latent factor structure with 230 university and site school counseling supervisors. Data analysis revealed that the 48-item instrument accounted for 65.5% variance explained by a five-factor solution. Sub-scales included *Direct Services and Data-Driven Practices, Academic Advising and Special Education Process, Collaboration and Consultation with Stakeholders, Cultural Competence and Advocacy,* and *Professional Dispositions and Behaviors*. The SCICS has strong internal consistency as well as evidence for content, factorial, convergent, concurrent, and incremental validity. Implications for school counselor education, university and site supervisors, pre-service school counselors, and the school counseling profession are included.

This dissertation is dedicated to my grandmother, Mary Evans, for instilling a sense of curiosity, adventure, and compassion in me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Of all the sections in this dissertation, I find the acknowledgements most difficult to articulate because my words feel insufficient as I reflect on the many strong, compassionate mentors who have supported me throughout this process. To my dissertation committee as a whole, I am forever grateful for your unwavering support and fierce devotion to seeing this accomplishment reach fruition. You have my sincerest gratitude.

Dr. Emily Goodman-Scott, what a ride we have been on, and it's only just beginning. We have successfully cycled through many professional roles together and I can only hope to emulate your leadership and collegiality in my future faculty position. Thank you for your encouragement, compassion, patience, authenticity, and constructive feedback that has helped shape my professional identity. As we close this chapter and enter the next, your mentorship will have lasting ripples, positively impacting all the students and colleagues I will work with in my career. Dr. Gülşah Kemer, your valuable insights and supportive nature have been instrumental in my success as a doctoral student. Thank you for always having an open door and always providing a unique constructive lens that has supported me as a researcher and an academic. Dr. Kristy Carlisle, you have been a source of calm in the storm, reassuring and validating me throughout my doctoral studies. I appreciate your insights regarding my research and future career, as they have been invaluable during this process. Dr. Rob Carlisle, I appreciate you for coming at the 11th hour without hesitation and rallying alongside me to recruit participants to make this dissertation happen.

Thank you to my supportive friends and mentors who have encouraged me throughout this personal and professional journey. Dr. Liz Boyd and Dr. Stacey Fernandes, you have been two of my favorite parts about this doctoral program. I am grateful for your friendship and how a simple text, phone call, or dinner date can result in feelings of validation, laughter, tears, and joy. I am grateful for both of you. Additionally, I am thankful to Drs. Chris Sink, Dan St. John, Sandi Logan, Anthony Vajda, Chi Li, and T'Airra Belcher. I also express my gratitude to Stephanie Smith-Durkin, Zahide Sunal, Sonja Lund, Betsy Zimmerman, Frankie Rivas, Kathleen Brown, Ne'Shaun Borden, Rawn Boulden, Liz Mahek, and Sakon McQuown.

My parents always said: find something you love and find something you are good at; hopefully, they are the same thing. Mom and Dad, I did it. I have found a career path that I am both exceedingly passionate about and exceedingly competent in. I am grateful to my parents for cultivating a love of learning that propelled me into graduate studies and sustained me through the completion of my doctorate. Thank you, Mom and Dad, for your unconditional love and support that helped make this doctorate a possibility. And to my brother, Matthew, thank you for making me laugh during the stressful days and knowing exactly how to encourage me.

Most importantly, my dearest Gregory, what a beautiful adventure we have been on together. I am so grateful for the life we have created for ourselves and I can't wait to see our next chapter unfold. I couldn't ask for a more supportive and encouraging partner throughout this process. We've climbed literal and figurative mountains over these years of doctoral studies, and I am forever grateful for your unconditional love and the way that you selflessly prioritize my needs. We have each grown significantly throughout this process and I am so fortunate that we have intentionally grown together. Thank you for always believing in me and making me feel unstoppable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the researcher will provide an overview of the problem, as well as the purpose and significance of the study. Next, the researcher will introduce competence-base education and training, the theoretical framework for the study. Next, the research questions and design will be explained. Lastly, foreseeable limitations as well as definitions of relevant terminology in the study will be provided.

Statement of the Problem

As mandated by professional organizations, such as the American Counseling Association *Code of Ethics* (ACA, 2014) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs standards (CACREP, 2015), counselor educators and supervisors are required to engage in gatekeeping to identify and intervene when pre-service counselors are not equipped with proper knowledge, skills, and/or values needed for the counseling profession (DePue & Lambie, 2014; Flynn & Hays, 2015; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). School counseling, one of the specialty areas within counselor education, has its own set of specialty-related courses required beyond the basic core counseling curriculum, in which school counseling-specific knowledge, skills, and competencies are cultivated (CACREP, 2015). The national professional organization representing school counselors, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), provides several documents emphasizing the importance of school counseling competencies and gatekeeping to the profession, including: the ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselors (ASCA, 2016a), ASCA School Counselor Competencies (ASCA, 2019), and ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselor Education (ASCA, 2018a). One of the most salient gatekeeping mechanisms in school counseling programs is clinical

supervision, serving as a final checkpoint prior to graduation. During that time, pre-service school counselors receive feedback and evaluations from university and site supervisors. Over the years, school counseling supervision has aspired to become more consistent, applicable, and evidence-based, in alignment with trends in the school counseling profession. However, no standardized instrument exists to evaluate school counseling interns in a comprehensive way, attending to school counseling competencies, dispositions, roles and responsibilities, and basic skills in accordance with gatekeeping responsibilities.

Purpose of the Study

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to attend to the gap in literature and practice by creating and assessing the psychometric properties an assessment tool to evaluate school counseling interns' competencies. The researcher examined the latent factor structure of close-ended Likert-type items through exploratory factor analysis along with other validity and reliability analyses on data collected from university and site school counseling supervisors. University and site supervisors were asked to evaluate one school counseling intern, as researchers supports that other-efficacy ratings are more representative and more frequently used as compared to self-efficacy ratings in pre-service counselors (Lambie & Ascher, 2016; Lent & Lopez, 2002). The researcher recognizes that internship sites and supervisors vary; however, this study was not designed to look at inconsistencies between settings or supervisors. Demographic information was collected to determine representativeness of the sample; however, it was not used to examine group differences, which was beyond the scope of the study.

Significance of the Study

The potential implications of this dissertation extend to school counselor education programs, school counseling interns, the overall school counseling profession, and diverse PK-12

student populations. Firstly, school counseling graduate programs could greatly benefit from a comprehensive and standardized school counseling internship competency scale. Counselor educators have an ethical responsibility to engage in gatekeeping practices, ensuring the welfare of future clients/students and the profession (ACA, 2014; ASCA, 2018a; CACREP, 2015). Currently, school counseling students are evaluated through informal assessment, unstandardized inventories, measures intended for mental health counseling or teaching and learning internship students, and/or adapted instruments not fully capable of capturing all the roles, responsibilities, competencies, and dispositions expected of school counselors (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Flynn & Hays, 2015; Sutton & Fall, 1995; Swank, Lambie, & Witta, 2012). A standardized instrument would allow for more rigorous and applicable assessment of school counseling internship students, and, in turn, help counselor educators identify students in need of remediation plans or not suited for the profession. This instrument could safeguard the school counseling profession, by evaluating graduates of school counseling programs to determine whether they are well-equipped to meet the needs of diverse students and effectively fulfill all the responsibilities of a school counselor.

This instrument could also impact school counseling interns by providing clarity on evaluation methods and the types of experiences they can anticipate at their internship sites. Firstly, this instrument could decrease ambiguity regarding the way school counseling interns can anticipate being evaluated. This could also lessen their anxiety by demystifying the process of evaluation. Also, by having a clear understanding of their evaluation methods, interns will also have increased understanding about how they will fill their time at their internship sites, aligning their experiences with the competencies listed in the instrument. Lastly, this instrument

could serve as an advocacy tool for interns by assisting interns to self-advocate for opportunities to experience a variety of school counseling responsibilities in alignment with this instrument.

Additionally, school counselors work with students who are diverse in race/ethnicity, nationality, class, cognitive and physical ability, sexual orientation, religion, and family structure (ASCA, n.d.). This evaluation tool could have a distal influence on PK-12 students that practicing school counselors serve. As graduate programs use this evaluation tool to better assess the competencies of their pre-service school counselors and more accurately exercise their gatekeeping responsibilities, the school counseling profession, in turn, could be comprised of more consistently competent school counselors. Ultimately, this could impact the school counseling profession to the extent that every student, regardless of school, receives effective school counseling programming and support from a competent school counselor. This study attends to the gap in the literature, positively impacting school counselor preparation and evaluation, school counseling interns' expectations and experiences, and school counselors' competencies when working with diverse PK-12 student populations.

Beyond these potential implications, the study could also lead to future research regarding the use of this instrument with diverse populations. For example, validity and reliability properties of this instrument could be further examined by level (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school), urbanicity (i.e., rural or urban schools), age, gender, race/ethnicity, nationality, etc. This study could also lead to data-driven school counseling competencies/dispositions, a data-driven school counseling model of supervision, and new supervisory practices, all of which have been studied limitedly.

Overview of Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this research is rooted in competence-based education and training (CBET). CBET aims to assess whether specific benchmarks are met in terms of pre-defined occupation standards (Burke, 1989). This concept dated back to the 1970s and has been held across various disciplines, including vocational education and training (Bohne, Eicker, & Haseloff, 2017), social work (Kelly & Horder, 2001), agriculture (Mulder, 2012), healthcare (Cate & Scheele, 2007), and psychology (Kenkel & Peterson, 2010). The goal of CBET is to verify that training and curricula align with professional standards and that trainees are properly evaluated to assess whether competencies have been adequately met to enter the profession. Within counselor education, the concept of CBET aligns with gatekeeping, to maintain a standard of practice in those entering the profession in order to ensure the welfare of clients (CACREP, 2015; DePue & Lambie, 2014; Flynn & Hays, 2015; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010).

Research Questions

The researcher examined the following research questions in this study:

Research Question One

What are the underlying factors of School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS)?

Research Question Two

What are the validity properties of the SCICS in relation to the Counseling Competencies Scale-Revised (CCS-R) and the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Supervisor Form (SWAI)?

Research Question Three

What are the reliability properties of the SCICS, indicated by Cronbach's alpha for the overall scale and emerging factors, and Spearman-Brown split-half reliability?

Research Design

In the current study, the researcher utilized an exploratory sequential mixed methods approach, which incorporates qualitative and quantitative components of data collection and analysis (Field, 2013). The use of exploratory sequential mixed methods is advantageous when developing and evaluating new instruments by first collecting and analyzing qualitative data, then evaluating the psychometric properties of the instrument through a quantitative approach (Creswell, 2014; Field, 2013). The study itself was divided into 11 phases as adapted from Mvududu and Sink (2013), including: (1) instrument creation using Garner, Freeman, and Lee's (2016) approach, (2), pilot testing and revising, (3) sample size estimation, (4) administering revised instrument to a broader participant pool, (5) screening and checking for parametric assumptions (6) creating correlation matrices and inspecting for factorability, (7) factor extraction using principal axis factor analysis, (8) factor retention, (9) factor rotation using oblique rotation, (10) naming factors, and (11) validity and reliability analyses. To analyze convergent validity, the SCICS was examined in relation overall scores on the CCS-R (Lambie, Mullen, Swank, & Blount, 2018). Additionally, to establish concurrent validity, the researcher compared mean total SCICS scores between first and second semester internship students to establish whether the SCICS can distinguish group differences. Lastly, the researcher examined incremental validity, indicating the unique predictive relationship between the SCICS and the SWAI after controlling for CCS-R scores.

Limitations

This study faces several potential limitations that should be addressed. Firstly, the study only solicited feedback from university and site school counseling supervisors. Therefore, the lack of school counseling interns' perspectives in data collection is a limitation of the study. Additionally, the sample size needed to conduct Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is a limitation, as the minimum sample size was met; however, a larger, more robust sample would produce more rigorous results. A methodological limitation involves the fact that exploratory factor analysis does not serve to test theories or hypotheses since it is exploratory in nature. Lastly, although the study did not involve self-report of school counseling competencies, there may still be a minimal level of social desirability from university and site supervisors who are evaluating their school counseling interns in a way that is positive. Despite these limitations, this research attends to a gap in the literature in a rigorous way, which may produce a valid and reliable instrument used to measure school counseling interns' competencies.

Definition of Terms

ASCA National Model

A specific type of comprehensive school counseling program created by the American School Counselor Association that serves as a framework for school counselors, including foundation, delivery, management, and accountability components along with themes of advocacy, leadership, collaboration, and systemic change (ASCA, 2012).

Clinical Supervision

A process whereby an experienced professional observes and advises a novice professional, to monitor content learned and skills acquired, while also adhering to graduate

gatekeeping practices to ensure that only qualified candidates enter the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014).

Competency

"The quality of being competent; adequacy; possession of required skill, knowledge, qualification or capacity" (ASCA, 2016a).

Competence-based education and training

The concept of training and assessment based upon students/trainees demonstrating adequate knowledge and skills to pass standards or benchmarks associated with their prospective careers (Burke, 1989).

Comprehensive school counseling program

Preventative and data-driven programming coordinated by state-credentialed school counselors and delivered to all students to ensure equitable access to education, support student development, and promote achievement to positively impact students (ASCA, 2017).

Exploratory sequential mixed methods

A research approach that consists of two primary phases in the following order: (1) qualitative data collection and analysis, and (b) quantitative data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2014).

Factor analysis

"A multivariate technique for identifying whether the correlations between a set of observed variables stem from their relationship to one or more latent variables in the data, each of which takes the form of a linear model" (Field, 2013, p. 875).

Gatekeeping

"The ethical responsibility of counselor educators and supervisors to monitor and evaluate an individual's knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions required by competent professional counselors and to remediate or prevent those that are lacking in professional competence from becoming counselors" (CACREP, 2015, p.45).

Internship

"A distinctly defined, post-practicum, supervised clinical experience in which the student refines and enhances basic counseling or student development knowledge and skills, and integrates and authenticates professional knowledge and skills related to program objectives" (CACREP, 2015, p. 46).

School Counseling Intern/Supervisee

Also referred to in this study as a pre-service school counselor. This term refers to any master's-level school counseling student currently enrolled in internship.

School counselor

"School counselors are certified/licensed educators with a minimum of a master's degree in school counseling, making them uniquely qualified to address all students' academic, career and social/emotional development needs by designing, implementing, evaluating and enhancing a comprehensive school counseling program that promotes and enhances student success" (ASCA, n.d., p. 1).

Site Supervisor

A qualified professional school counselor who provides teaching, consultation, and support at a PK-12 site for the professional development of pre-service school counselors completing their internship requirements (ASCA, 2016a).

University Supervisor

      A qualified university school counselor educator (also referred to as school counseling faculty) who provides teaching, consultation, and support at the university level for the professional development of pre-service school counselors completing their internship requirements (ASCA, 2016a).

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, the researcher will outline a theoretical framework and review of the literature, demonstrating the need for a research study on creating a standardized school counseling internship instrument designed to assess for school counseling competencies and assist with counselor education gatekeeping practices. Specifically, the researcher will begin by introducing the theoretical framework of competency-based education and training that will guide the current study. Next, the literature review will provide an overview of counselor education, including the goals and responsibilities of counselor education programs and existing specialty areas, focusing particularly on the school counseling specialty, where the preparation and roles of school counselors will be explained. Next, one of the responsibilities of counselor education programs, gatekeeping, will be introduced, including counselor education program gatekeeping strategies as well as literature on gatekeeping practices. Since clinical supervision exists as a gatekeeping mechanism, supervision will be broadly defined, with an emphasis on school counseling supervision and evaluation. Finally, in discussing existing evaluation measures for gatekeeping in counselor education and synthesizing the theoretical framework with gaps in the literature, the researcher will establish the purpose and rationale of the study.

Competence-Based Education and Training

The concept of competence-based education and training (CBET) operates as the theoretical foundation for this study. CBET is a versatile theory that can be applied to many areas of training, including curriculum models, professional standards, and forms of assessment (Burke, 1989). It refers to the expectation that trainees will adequately demonstrate knowledge and skills at a level of minimal competency required to grant a license, degree, and/or

certification in a particular vocation (Horder, 1996; Kelly & Horder, 2001; O'Hagan, 1996). In CBET assessment, trainees are evaluated to determine whether they meet pre-defined criteria and professional standards (Burke, 1989). The goal of CBET assessment is to identify those who have successfully met the benchmarks needed to perform a job and determine those who do not meet the standards, recognizing that they are either unfit for the job or require remediation.

This theoretical framework is based in the field of teacher performance, serving as a mechanism to train and evaluate pre-service teachers on their knowledge and abilities as it relates to their profession. According to Burke (1989), CBET emerged out of the need for taxpayers to see tangible outcomes from teachers as more federal funds were devoted to teacher education. The theory later expanded in education, as it established curricular competencies for graduating high school students, which are currently used as standards for high school diplomas (Elam, 1971; Houston, 1980). Although this theory traces back to teaching, it has been applied in other fields, including social work (Kelly & Horder, 2001), healthcare (Cate & Scheele, 2007), psychology (Kenkel & Peterson, 2010), agriculture (Mulder, 2012), and more broadly, vocational education and training (Bohne et al., 2017). As professional organizations create national standards, vocational training programs are utilizing CBET to inform their curriculum and assessment practices to verify that standards have been met. Similarly, in the field of counselor education, CBET serves as a foundational theory contributing to professional standards that inform curriculum, ongoing evaluation, and gatekeeping, as a process whereby access to the profession is limited to those achieving minimal competency.

Counselor Education

The concept of CBET supports counselor education by maintaining standards of practice, adherence to strict ethical codes, and evaluation within the overall counseling profession, as well

as in the individual specialty area. The Council for Accreditation for Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) was established as both a process and an accreditation status to determine graduate program guidelines that are required to assure a high standard of training for future counselors and counselor educators (CACREP, 2015). Regularly, CACREP standards are updated to reflect changes in the profession, mirroring the anticipated knowledge and skills required to be successful as a counselor. As supported by CACREP, counselor education graduates should, "demonstrate both knowledge and skill across the curriculum as well as profession dispositions" (CACREP, 2015, p. 4). Furthermore, CACREP asserts that counselor education programs need program objectives that can be evaluated, consistent with CBET theory.

Additionally, the American Counseling Association's (ACA) *Code of Ethics* cites particular standards that practicing counselors should uphold, noting that one of the core professional values includes, "practicing in a competent and ethical manner" (ACA, 2014, p. 3). Professional and personal competencies are particularly defined in terms multiculturalism, termination and referral, consultation, use of assessments, supervision, recognizing boundaries of competence, and maintaining competence through continuing education. Beyond the overarching organizations that represent counselor education programs and professional counselors, such as CACREP and ACA, additional divisions exist to represent specific counselors based upon their specialty.

Counseling Specialty Areas

Within counselor education, a variety of specialty areas exist, including addiction counseling; career counseling; clinical mental health counseling; clinical rehabilitation counseling; college counseling and student affairs; marriage, couple, and family counseling;

school counseling; and rehabilitation counseling, each with a set of knowledge and skill-based expectations aligned with that career (CACREP, 2015). All pre-service counselors from CACREP-accredited programs receive the same core content delivered in eight foundational courses required for entry-level counselors, supporting the mission for a unified counseling professional identity. Each of these professions, while still existing as a branch within counseling, has another distinct identity based upon their specialty, complete with particular skills and knowledge needed to serve clients in a specific capacity. Beyond core courses, individualized standards are set for each of the specialty areas, equipping pre-service counselors with the tools needed to specialize in one or more areas and serve a distinct population (CACREP, 2015). While the counselor education program specialty standards are separate and specific to each specialty area, differentiated competencies and guidelines are also reflected in professional organizations.

As ACA is the largest professional counseling organization, other, smaller organizations support specialty areas by providing specific ethical codes and competencies relevant to each profession. For instance, the American Mental Health Counselor Association (AMHCA) has its own ethics code, specific to mental health counseling professions (AMHCA, 2015) and the International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors (IAMFC) has created a set ethical codes specific to licensed marriage and family therapists (IAMFC, 2017). Relevant to the current study, ASCA represents professional school counselors by providing the ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselors (ASCA, 2016a), ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselor Education (ASCA, 2018a), and ASCA School Counselor Competencies (ASCA, 2019) that align with the specific roles and responsibilities needed for practicing school counselors who are serving PK-12 students.

School counseling. The field of school counseling is vast and complex, as school counselors are often seen as both counselors and educators, charged with attending to diverse needs of PK-12 students while maintaining high levels of professional competence. The training of pre-service school counselors has become more formalized over the years, especially with the recent creation of the ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselor Education (ASCA, 2018a). This document outlines the ethical responsibilities and roles of school counselor educators, emphasizing the necessary self-assessment, program evaluation, and competencies. School counselor educators are charged with training competent pre-service school counselors who accomplish a variety of roles and responsibilities (ASCA, 2018a).

School counselors fulfill many roles while implementing a comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP), such as the ASCA National Model. CSCPs are individualized programs run by school counselors based on school needs and student's academic, career, and social/emotional needs, while using data to both inform programming and evaluate effectiveness (Carey & Dimmitt, 2012; Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Hoffman, 2012; Dimmitt & Wilkerson, 2012; Gysbers & Henderson, 2012). It is important to note that other CSCPs exist beyond the ASCA National Model, as certain states have created their own comprehensive developmental school counseling programs (Martin & Carey, 2012). Certainly, there is some overlap between state CSCPs and the ASCA National Model; however, there is significant variation in the way state models are developed and implemented (Martin, Carey, & DeCoster, 2009).

The most frequently used model, the ASCA National Model includes four major components: foundation, management, delivery, and accountability, as well as four overarching themes: leadership, advocacy, collaboration and systemic change (ASCA, 2012). School counselors spend 80% of their time on direct and indirect services, under the delivery component

of the ASCA National Model. Direct services involve in-person interactions and include school counseling core curriculum (e.g., classroom lessons), individual student planning (e.g. college and career planning), and responsive services (e.g., individual counseling, small-group counseling, crisis response services) (ASCA, 2012b; ASCA, 2016a; ASCA, 2019; Lopez & Mason, 2018; Rose & Steen, 2014; Steen, Bauman, & Smith, 2007). School counselors take part in indirect services while engaging in activities on behalf of students, such as consultation and collaboration with stakeholders (Cholewa, Goodman-Scott, Thomas, & Cook, 2017; Bryan & Henry, 2012; Dinkmeyer, Carlson, & Michel, 2016; Stone & Dahir, 2016), advocating for the removal of barriers to success (ASCA, 2019; Green, 2018; Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnston, 2008; Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007; Ratts & Greenleaf, 2018), and providing referrals (ASCA, 2015a; ASCA, 2016a; CACREP, 2015; Granello & Zyromski, 2018).

Additionally, school counselors spend 20% of their time attending to the foundation, management, and accountability components of the ASCA National Model through establishing school counseling mission statements, creating SMART goals, analyzing data, assessing school and student needs, and cultivating student competencies (ASCA, 2012; ASCA, 2019). By using the CSCPs, school counselors can sew themselves in to the fabric of a school, making themselves and their program integral and impactful for children and adolescents entering and leaving the building each day.

Beyond the aforementioned roles and responsibilities, new and experienced school counselors are also charged with maintaining an adequate level of school counseling competency, as established by the ASCA School Counselor Competencies (ASCA, 2019). This document is aligned with the ASCA National Model and lists the knowledge, abilities, skills, and attitudes required to develop a comprehensive school counseling program. ASCA notes that this

document can be used to self-assess new and experienced school counselors' competencies, support the formation of a professional development plan, assist school administrators in the recruitment and hiring of new school counselors, serve as a practicing school counselor evaluation, and support graduate programs establishing benchmarks aligned with comprehensive school counseling programs (ASCA, 2019).

While this document contains extensive competencies relating to the ASCA National Model, it lacks counseling skill competencies and dispositions essential to the profession that are evaluated in school counseling internship, such as empathy, warmth, open-ended questions, flexibility, professionalism, and timeliness. It is also worth noting that the ASCA National Model is an aspirational framework that may not reflect the actual job responsibilities of practicing school counselors. Beyond the ASCA National Model, other state CSCPs exist. Lapan (2012), and Martin and colleagues, (2009) noted that over the last 20 years, implementation and delivery of the ASCA National Model and state CSCPs varied tremendously. Therefore, the ASCA School Counseling Competencies should not be transformed into a competency evaluation for internship school counseling students to reflect all the skills, abilities, and dispositions that need to be assessed for gatekeeping purposes in alignment with CBET.

School counselor education programs aim to best prepare pre-service school counselors for these multifaceted job roles through adequate training, experiential learning, and evaluation by way of coursework, comprehensive exams, practicum/internship experiences, and supervisory evaluation (CACREP, 2015). Relative to CBET, foundational and specialty-specific CACREP standards, the ACA *Code of Ethics*, the ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselors, ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselor Education, and ASCA School Counselor Competencies all serve as tools to guide counselor education programs to train and evaluate students based on

relevant competencies for successful future school counselors. Since there are CACREP specialty-specific standards for training and specialty-specific professional organizations have their own code of ethics and/or list of competencies, the school counseling specialty area should have an evaluation tool to assess competencies and assist with counselor educators' responsibilities regarding gatekeeping.

Gatekeeping

Counselor educators are charged with developing necessary competencies in pre-service school counselors. The cultivation of counseling competencies is a complex task, requiring learning and experiential practice with ongoing self-awareness through formative and summative evaluations (CACREP, 2015; DePue & Lambie, 2014; Flynn & Hays, 2015; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). Gatekeeping has been defined as the process whereby pre-service counselors who are unprepared with knowledge, skills, and/or values are identified, and counselor educators intervene for the sake of the counseling profession (Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). Gatekeeping exists in the counseling profession as a, "mechanism that aims to ensure the health of the profession by controlling access to it" (Glance, Fanning, Schoepke, Soto, & Williams, 2012, p.2).

Additionally, ACA and CACREP recommend that counselor educators take the lead on gatekeeping to provide remedial assistance to students, including directing them to a different field of study, if necessary (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2015). In cases where students require remediation plans, additional evaluation is needed to verify their growth and fitness for the counseling field (Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). Overwhelmingly, researchers in counselor education supports ongoing formal evaluation of both professional and personal competencies in the counseling field (Flynn & Hays, 2015; Glance et al., 2012; Ziomek-Daigle

& Christensen, 2010). Despite counselor educators recognizing the importance of gatekeeping, research shows that faculty may be reluctant to fulfill this role, as it is difficult to navigate (Schuermann, Avent Harris, & Lloyd-Hazlett, 2018). Over the years, a variety of procedures and frameworks have been developed, focusing on streamlining the process of identifying and evaluating students with deficits; however, much of the literature involves qualitative data on counselor educators' perspectives on gatekeeping (Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010).

In a qualitative study by Ziomek-Daigle and Christensen (2010), researchers used grounded theory to interview eight CACREP program coordinators regarding gatekeeping. Through asking participants to define gatekeeping, describe the purpose and process of gatekeeping, and articulate their role in the process, researchers discovered four phases of gatekeeping practices that exist for counselor educators: preadmission screening, postadmission screening, remediation plan, and remediation outcome. In postadmission screening, students are evaluated, typically through observations in experiential learning (i.e., practicum, internship). While postadmission screening can potentially lead to remediation plans, it is important to note that typical remediation plans consisted of intensified supervision and personal development, both warranting additional evaluation from supervisors (Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). While this study contributes to gatekeeping literature for counselor education programs, as with all qualitative research, the results have limited generalizability, and therefore, may not be reflective of other counselor educators beyond those participating in the study. This study highlights the importance of the gatekeeping process in counselor education, but also the need for standardized evaluations as a part of both the gatekeeping and remediation processes.

More recently, researchers evaluated gatekeeping perceptions of assistant professors, associate/full professors, and adjuncts/lecturers/instructors to determine commonalities and

discrepancies between academic groups (Schuermann et al., 2018). Participants described the need for clear, written gatekeeping expectations to improve the consent of graduate students. Also, this study highlighted the importance of power dynamics in gatekeeping, as researchers recommended explicit assessment of gatekeeping culture in graduate programs to determine reluctance to enact gatekeeping policies. Half of participants noted the need for formal assessments to measure competencies for clinical experiences, which could lead to consistent gatekeeping procedures across programs (Schuermann et al., 2018).

Along the same lines, Homrich, DeLorenzi, Bloom, and Godbee (2014) asserted that, while professional ethical codes exist, there lacks measurable criteria for commonly accepted standards involving professional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal competencies. Consistent with CBET, researchers emphasized that counseling graduate students are expected to surpass adequate standards in a variety of relevant domains. Using Q-sort methodology, researchers contacted CACREP institutions with community counseling and mental health counseling, asking faculty to review a set of previously constructed standards reflecting behaviors expected of graduate students. The item sort resulted in three main categories: professional behaviors, interpersonal behaviors, and intrapersonal behaviors.

The findings indicated that while counselor educators uniformly agreed upon the importance of professionalism and interpersonal competencies, there was variation in their emphasis on intrapersonal competencies (Homrich et al., 2014). They posit that the frequency of discussion in graduate programs regarding ethical codes attribute to the high level of importance on professional and intrapersonal competencies, rather than interpersonal competencies (Homrich et al., 2014). Researchers noted that up until the construction of these standards, it was unfair that trainees were evaluated based upon poorly defined and inconsistent standards that

guide faculty expectations and assessment. This study was an essential step towards the standardization of expectations; however, this study had a relatively small sample size and was limited to mental health counseling standards, missing the mark on school counseling-specific standards. Also, the instrument used for this study was not psychometrically tested, so the results must be cautiously interpreted (Homrich et al., 2014). While these criteria serve as a starting point to establish competencies for graduate training programs, authors note that future research should expand competencies to other CACREP-accredited programs beyond clinical mental health counseling (Homrich et al., 2014).

Researchers highlight the importance of gatekeeping within counselor education (Homrich et al., 2014; Schuermann, et al., 2018; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). However, school counseling-specific gatekeeping is a notable gap in the literature. As mentioned previously, gatekeeping occurs during many phases of graduate training, with clinical supervision during internship as a major milestone regarding student feedback and evaluation.

Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision serves many purposes in counselor education, including as a gatekeeping mechanism to evaluate pre-service counselors and provide feedback on clinical skills and professional dispositions. In the most general sense, clinical supervision is defined as a process whereby an experienced professional observes and advises a novice professional, to monitor content learned and skills acquired, while also adhering to graduate gatekeeping practices to ensure that only qualified candidates enter the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). While supervision is often viewed as an administrative process, it can also be viewed as a social process. Supervisees are typically engaged in a practicum or internship experience, becoming socialized in the field to better learn the critical thinking skills, values, norms,

strategies, and culture of the workplace to further define and internalize their professional identity (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). As in counseling, the strength of the therapeutic relationship has a direct and strong influence on client outcomes (Chang, Scott & Decker, 2013; Lambert & Barley, 2001). Similarly, the quality, applicability, and feedback during supervision can significantly determine a supervisee's feelings of preparedness to enter the profession (Bultsma, 2012).

Supervision plays an integral role for pre-service counselors by contributing to professional identity, promoting strong counseling skills, ensuring the well-being of clients, and serving as a gatekeeping practice (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). As graduate students are immersed in practicum and internship experiences, site and university supervisors are essential contributors as pre-service school counselors grow and refine skills, discover new perspectives, internalize their professional identity, and learn how to handle ethical dilemmas (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2012).

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) Supervision Interest Network created a document of best practices for clinical supervision in 1993 that has since been updated (ACES, 2011). This document provides information about the logistics of supervision, documentation, and evaluation; however, much of the actual supervision session content is not regulated or described, leaving the majority of supervision up to the discretion of the supervisor and/or supervisee. Similarly, evaluation is an important part of this document; however, the information regarding best practices in evaluation are limited. Presently, supervision evaluation methods are highly inconsistent, varying by university, site, and supervisor (Kemer, Eustice, & Luby, 2017; Studer, 2005). The process of supervising and evaluating school counseling interns serves as a final "checkpoint" prior to graduation and entry into the counseling profession.

School Counseling Supervision. Recently, school counseling supervision research has increased, with an emphasis on standardizing school counseling training and supervision to make it practical, applicable, and consistent for pre-service school counselors (Brown, Olivarez, & DeKruyf, 2017; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Page, Pietrzak, & Sutton, 2001; Slaten & Baskin, 2014; Studer, 2005). Additionally, due to considerable differences between post-graduate mental health and school counselors' level of supervision, it is important to make practicum and internship supervision as constructive as possible for pre-service school counselors (Bultsma, 2012).

Beyond graduation, practicing school counselors receive limited supervision compared to their mental health counseling counterparts (Bultsma, 2012). School counseling supervision is minimal in nature, as it only exists within the realm of graduate studies during practicum and internship experiences. Practicing school counselors do not receive any type of formal supervision upon graduating their master's program and securing a school counseling job (Bultsma, 2012). As such, the only prerequisite for school counseling licensure is a graduate degree (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). On the other hand, practicing mental health counselors who are seeking their LPC receive weekly supervision for the duration of their licensure hours. Therefore, it is imperative that pre-service school counseling supervision becomes more evidence-based and consistent as the quality and applicability of their supervision experiences can heavily impact a supervisee's feelings of preparedness to enter the profession (Bultsma, 2012).

Based on state and national surveys, the majority of practicing school counselors desire more supervision beyond their graduate program (Page et al., 2001; Sutton & Page, 1994). Page et al. (2001) noted that practicing school counselors requested additional supervision to further

enhance their effectiveness with students. While Herlihy, Gray, and McCollum (2002) noted that supervision does not necessarily serve to support school counselors with mental health services, many view supervision as a supportive resource to refine counseling skills related to school settings. Ultimately, many school counselors are forced to seek their own support networks, since no formal supervision (e.g., individual or group) is accessible to them after graduation.

While many school counselors request additional supervision, research has shown that practicum and internship supervision experiences built into graduate school are often insufficient. Specifically, research has shown that school counseling site supervision is inadequate and lacks standardization (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Previous research has also determined that internship school counseling supervision by faculty supervisors is highly inconsistent (Akos & Scarborough, 2004). Much of the inconsistency in site and university supervision could stem from the fact that there exists very limited school counseling supervision research by which university and site supervisors can determine best practices.

Researchers note the importance of site supervision training, recommending continuing education courses on supervision for practicing school counselors who aim to supervise interns (Slaten & Baskin, 2014). While many site supervisors are prepared to serve as a school counselor, they are unprepared to fulfill the roles of a supervisor (Studer, 2005). This can become an exceptionally problematic cycle, as Herlihy et al. (2002) explained how interns who receive inadequate site supervision can perpetuate similar site supervision with their own supervisees as they fail to learn best practices themselves. Ultimately, university supervisors rely heavily on site supervisors to address school counseling training and supervision needs of interns outside of the classrooms (Kozlowski & Huss, 2013).

Focusing on university school counseling supervision, a content analysis of 59 school counseling internship syllabi noted that course objectives and content areas were highly inconsistent for the course, suggesting that school counseling supervision needs to become empirically-based and standardized (Akos & Scarborough, 2004). The syllabi were highly irregular, suggesting that school counseling supervision is remarkably inconsistent across graduate programs. The three most commonly used course objective across the country included: (1) gaining understanding and experience in school counseling interventions, (2) developing professional skills, awareness, and identity; and (3) understanding school culture and organization structure. The most frequent content areas listed in the syllabi were counseling skills and techniques, ethical/professional behavior, and systemic intervention. Looking at this data, several of the most notable themes appear to be school counseling-specific, such as school counseling interventions, understanding school culture and organization structure, and systemic intervention. These results state that the salient components of school counseling supervision involve school counseling-specific topics, implying that pre-service school counselors may benefit most from differentiated supervision in which they are receiving applicable feedback and relevant evaluations specific to their specialty.

As demonstrated, school counseling supervision, while limited in nature, is inconsistent and lacks standardization to maximize effectiveness. Compared to practicing mental health counselors, practicing school counselors have an abbreviated span of time to accumulate the benefits of clinical supervision. Beyond the challenge of time constraints, school counseling supervision itself lacks consistency at the site and university, despite recent research advances that aim to implement standardized practices, new models, and overall best practices of school counseling supervision.

Evaluation. In discussing the importance of gatekeeping and supervision, it is well known that clinical supervisors (i.e., university and site) are the most frequent evaluators of counseling practicum and internship students (Lambie & Ascher, 2016). While supervision primarily involves teaching, counseling, consultation, and feedback; evaluation, or the determination of adequate skills, knowledge, and dispositions, also occurs during supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Borders, 1991). Evaluation methods in graduate training programs vary tremendously; however, many programs use other-efficacy ratings (Lent & Lopez, 2002; Kemer et al., 2017). While self-evaluation in supervision is meaningful, more often, other-efficacy ratings, or the perspectives and beliefs regarding the efficacy of another person's performance are more representative of trainee's strengths and weaknesses (Lambie & Ascher, 2016; Lent & Lopez, 2002). As noted previously, the ACA (2014) *Code of Ethics* and CACREP (2015) standards outline the importance of standards of practice; however, there is a gap in the literature for evaluating and operationally defining the minimum competency level at which trainees can graduate and enter the profession (Lambie & Ascher, 2016).

In a study by Kemer and colleagues (2017), researchers conducted a content analysis on practicum and internship evaluation forms from CACREP-accredited master's programs in clinical mental health counseling. Researchers noted that while feedback and evaluation are critical components of supervision, the way graduate programs define and measure competencies remains unclear. Additionally, evaluation tools are often created through unknown processes by individual graduate programs, creating a high degree of variation in instruments with undetermined reliability and validity. After analyzing 27 evaluation forms with 1,034 items from 20 CACREP-accredited institutions, six common areas were revealed: counseling and process skills, assessment and case conceptualization skills, ethical and professional behavior, self-

awareness and self-reflection skills, supervision behaviors, and multicultural skills (Kemer et al., 2017). While there was some consistency in evaluation areas between graduate programs, there were considerable difference regarding the frequency of evaluation areas (Kemer et al., 2017). For instance, multicultural skills and self-awareness skills were not consistently found in evaluation forms. Additionally, minimal competency levels were not established for practicum and internship developmental levels. This study was influential in terms of highlighting the inconsistencies in pre-service counselor education evaluation, thus drawing attention to a gap in the literature regarding valid and reliable instrumentation needed in practicum and internship.

While this study attends to a gap in the literature on pre-service counselor evaluation forms, these results are only representative of clinical mental health counseling evaluation. Authors recommend increased consistency in evaluation throughout the field to standardize the counselor training process (Kemer et al., 2017). Lastly, authors emphasize the need for more research to creating and evaluating pre-service counselor evaluations to ensure that they are psychometrically sound.

In addition to the previous study, some evaluative methods are not specialty-specific, combining all specialties (e.g., college, mental health, school, etc.) into one instrument (e.g., Flynn & Hays, 2015; Swank et al., 2012). This is problematic, as roles and responsibilities vary tremendously between specialties; therefore, evaluative methods must reflect that. In a study conducted by Flynn and Hays (2015), the Comprehensive Counseling Skills Rubric (CCSR) was created. The CCSR was designed to assess trainee competency, focusing on different phases of a counseling session. While this rubric was intended to be used with all counseling specialties, it was noted that future research should investigate adding or modifying items to better relate the rubric to specialties. With a disproportionate number of school counseling students responding to

the CCSR, the results are not generalizable to the school counseling population. Similarly, none of the items of the rubric speak to specific roles school counselors fulfill in PK-12 settings. Instead, the rubric concentrates heavily on phases of counseling sessions, which may not be practical in school counseling settings, as school counselors often concentrate their energy into their preventative comprehensive school counseling programs, rather than responding reactively to individual students (Goodman-Scott, Betters-Bubon, & Donohue, 2016).

Swank and colleagues (2012), note that the counseling field lacks a comprehensive and psychometrically sound instrument for counseling competencies, resulting in their development of the Counseling Competencies Scale (CCS). Swank et al., (2012) defined foundational competencies as including counseling skills, dispositions, and behaviors without focusing on any particular counseling theory. Five factors emerged, including professional behaviors, counseling relationship, counseling skills, assessment and application, and professional dispositions. While the scale yielded strong internal consistency, the participants were recruited from one of two graduate programs and demographic representation was not consistent with the broader population of counseling graduates (Swank et al., 2012). Similarly, a disproportionately low number of school counseling supervisors were represented in the study, skewing the data to best fit the dominant group, mental health counseling supervisors.

Since the initial exploratory investigation of the CCS, additional research has resulted in revisions to the instrument. Swank and Lambie (2012) established that the CCS aligned with the 2009 CACREP standards (CACREP, 2009) and the 2005 ACA *Code of Ethics* (2005). Researchers also compared faculty supervisor, doctoral supervisor, and supervisee self-ratings for the CCS (Swank, 2014). DePue and Lambie (2014) investigated the correlation between students' empathy and their CCS scores, establishing convergent validity. Lambie and Ascher,

(2016) collected qualitative data from clinical supervisors and supervisees regarding the CCS that contributed to the credibility of the instrument, while also highlighting the need for competent supervisors to complete the instrument to maintain its validity and reliability. Finally, Lambie et al. (2018) conducted exploratory and confirmatory analyses, which resulted in a two-factor model: (1) counseling skills and therapeutic conditions, and (2) counseling dispositions and behaviors. This revision, leading to the CCS-R, resulted in strong reliability, warranting its use in evaluating clinical mental health counseling interns.

Lastly, the Professional School Counseling Internship: Developmental Assessment of Counseling Skills (CIDACS) was created through two phases of participatory action research (Hamlet & Burnes, 2013). This instrument aimed to create a standardized, developmental instrument for school counseling internship students. This inventory was created using the previous versions of CACREP standards from 2009, ASCA National Model from 2007, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) competencies. Firstly, the CIDACS was adapted from the ACSA School Counselor Competencies, as mentioned earlier in this chapter. After gathering feedback from 18 practicing school counselors who served as site supervisors, it was determined that this evaluation instrument was not developmentally appropriate. Additionally, participants noted that several aspects of the instrument were unclear, specifically referring to ASCA National Model elements that were not implemented in their schools. Authors noted that this instrument was not recommended for use (Hamlet & Burnes, 2013).

During phase two of the study, researchers utilized feedback from site supervisors in phase one as well as standards from ASCA, CACREP, and NCATE to alter the instrument, ultimately creating three instruments for the various developmental stages of internship. Then,

researchers implemented the instrument in two graduate programs, requesting site supervisors to use the CIDACS and provide qualitative feedback on the appropriateness of the assessment, ease of use, and recommendations for additional items. (Hamlet & Burnes, 2013). After conducting a content analysis, findings revealed that site supervisions had primarily positive perceptions of the evaluation. Researchers noted that these findings may be attributed to the fact that site supervisors were highly receptive to experiencing a specialty-specific instrument for the first time, as one had not existed prior to implementation of the CIDACS.

Despite the positive perceptions of this instrument by site supervisors, there are several salient limitations of this instrument that warrant additional research to create a school counseling internship instrument (Hamlet & Burnes, 2013). Firstly, although this instrument was based upon professional standards (e.g., ASCA, CACREP, NCATE), all of the standards are currently dated, as updated versions are currently available, and some of the standards are not relevant to the school counseling profession, such as NCATE standards. Next, as mentioned previously, the ASCA School Counseling Competencies, which were used to inform item development, are aspirational competencies that may not adequately reflect the daily roles and responsibilities of school counselors and provide no foundational counseling skills or school counseling dispositions needed in internship evaluations. Also, data from phase two was collected in-person during a group format, which could lead to social desirability in the form of positive responses from site supervisors who participated in the study. Lastly, this instrument, was not evaluated for psychometric properties, such as reliability and validity (Hamlet, & Burnes, 2013).

Despite multiple instruments designed to evaluate counseling competencies, no standardized tool exists for school counseling intern competencies and dispositions. Clearly,

counselor educators need to provide formative and summative evaluations, as mandated by professional organizations and governing bodies; however, nothing exists to evaluate minimum competency levels for school counseling interns (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2015). However, current evaluation instruments are either inapplicable to school counseling interns, are poorly constructed, or have unknown psychometric properties to warrant their use. School counselor education programs need a valid and reliable way to assess student competencies and adequately engage in gatekeeping.

The Current Study

Presently, the counseling profession recognizes the importance of training competent pre-service counselors, with a myriad of professional standards (e.g., ACA, 2014; AMHCA, 2015; ASCA; 2016a; ASCA, 2018; ASCA, 2019; CACREP, 2015; IAMFC, 2017) that emphasize the need to evaluate competencies and engage in gatekeeping procedures to protect access to the profession. However, there are significant gaps in the research regarding school counseling-specific gatekeeping and evaluation. While various counseling competency instruments exist (e.g., Flynn & Hays, 2015; Hamlet & Burnes, 2013; Kemer et al., 2017; Swank et al., 2012), none effectively evaluate pre-service school counselors in a valid and reliable manner. The current study attends to these gaps in the literature, aiming to create the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale, by which university and site supervisors can evaluate school counseling internship students in master's level counseling programs in accordance with their gatekeeping responsibilities. This study also aims to conduct Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to determine the latent structure of the instrument while also examining face, content, convergent, concurrent, and incremental validity in relation to the Counseling Competencies Scale-Revised and Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Supervisor Form. The

psychometric properties of this inventory were examined to determine whether it should be used in school counselor education programs.

Research Questions

The researcher examined the following research questions in this study:

Research Question One

What are the underlying factors of School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS)?

Research Question Two

What are the validity properties of the SCICS in relation to the Counseling Competencies Scale-Revised (CCS-R) and the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Supervisor Form (SWAI)?

Research Question Three

What are the reliability properties of the SCICS, indicated by Cronbach's alpha for the overall scale and emerging factors, and Spearman-Brown split-half reliability?

Conclusion

As demonstrated, despite the essential nature of gatekeeping, limited standardized and comprehensive evaluation tools exist in counseling, particularly school counseling. In an era where school counseling is becoming more data-driven and evidence-based, there is a clear need for graduate training programs to have standardized evaluation tools to better define required school counseling competencies in alignment with CBET. Presently, no instrument exists to evaluate school counseling interns' competencies in a comprehensive way, attending to basic skills, school counseling competencies, school counseling dispositions, and school counseling-specific roles and responsibilities.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the researcher will provide an overview of the research method utilized in the study. First, the researcher will provide an overview of the research questions and corresponding analyses. Then, the researcher will provide a description of the targeted population and sampling frame. As the study utilizes exploratory sequential mixed methods to create and evaluate a new school counseling assessment tool, the researcher will describe the procedures for both components of the study: qualitative inquiry and quantitative analysis. The first component, qualitative inquiry, informed the development of the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS), whereas the second component, quantitative analysis determined the psychometric properties of the inventory using 11 phases of exploratory factor analysis.

Research Questions and Analyses

Research Question One

What are the underlying factors of School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS)? To address the first research question, the researcher used Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) with principal axis factor (PAF) analysis and an oblique rotation to determine the best simple structure of the data.

Research Question Two

What are the validity properties of the SCICS in relation to the Counseling Competencies Scale-Revised (CCS-R) and the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Supervisor Form (SWAI)? To address the second research question, the researcher evaluated multiple types of validity throughout the course of the study, including content, factorial, convergent, concurrent,

and incremental validity. Firstly, content validity was confirmed during the expert review and pilot study. Next, factorial validity was established by conducting EFA. The researcher evaluated convergent validity with the CCS-R. Additionally, the researcher evaluated concurrent validity by establishing that the SCICS can distinguish group differences between first and second semester interns. Lastly, the researcher established incremental validity by conducting a hierarchical regression to determine whether the SCICS predicts supervisory working alliance beyond the CCS-R.

Research Question Three

What are the reliability properties of the SCICS, indicated by Cronbach's alpha for the overall scale and emerging factors, and Spearman-Brown split-half reliability? To address the third and final research question, the researcher evaluated Cronbach's alpha for the overall instrument and individual sub-scales, as well as computed Spearman Brown split-half reliability.

Participants

Participants were recruited to assist in building the item base of the inventory, piloting the inventory, and responding to the revised inventory. The criteria for inclusion in this study include current university and site school counseling supervisors. Specifically, participants included school counseling faculty (i.e., university supervisors) who, (1) graduated from master's level counselor education programs with a school counseling focus, (2) earned their doctorate in counselor education and supervision or a related field, and (3) are currently (or within the past two years) supervising school counseling interns at a university setting. Additionally, participants included professional school counselors (i.e., site supervisors) who, (1) graduated from a master's level counseling program with a school counseling focus, (2) are full-

time professional school counselors, and (3) are currently (or within the past two years) supervising school counseling interns.

Design and Procedures

The research study utilized an exploratory sequential mixed methods approach, which is characterized by qualitative data collection and analysis, followed by quantitative data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2014). According to researchers (e.g., Creswell, 2014; Mertens, 2003), exploratory sequential mixed methods is an advantageous approach when developing and evaluating new instruments or refining and testing theories. Specifically, the American Educational Research Association (AERA), American Psychological Association (APA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME) published *Standards for Education and Psychological Testing* and acknowledged the critical nature of qualitative inquiry to inform instrument creation and validation (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014). Additionally, mixed method approaches have been frequently used in instrument development and validation research (e.g., Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Flynn & Hays, 2015; Garner et al., 2016; Koskey, Sondergeld, Stewart, & Pugh, 2018).

During the first part of the exploratory sequential approach, the researcher collected and analyzed qualitative data to support rigorous instrument creation, as outlined below. Following, the researcher completed the quantitative portion of the study by conducting exploratory factor analysis on the instrument. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is further broken down into multiple phases, as adapted from Mvududu and Sink's (2013), "steps in conducting an EFA." These phases included: (1) instrument creation using Garner and colleagues' (2016) approach, as outlined below, (2), pilot testing and revising, (3) sample size estimation, (4) administering revised instrument to a broader participant pool, (5) screening and checking for parametric

assumptions (6) creating correlation matrices and inspecting for factorability, (7) factor extraction, (8) factor retention, (9) factor rotation, (10) naming factors, and (11) validity and reliability analyses.

Phase 1: Instrument Creation

As adapted by Garner and colleagues (2016), the researcher adhered to the following steps to create the instrument: (1) establishing the blueprint, (2) designing the items, and (3) developing evidence for content validity. For the first step, the researcher established the intended use of the inventory, the blueprint, is as a supervision evaluation of school counselor internship student's counseling competencies and dispositions.

Next, the researcher compiled a list of inventory items, based on literature and theory. Additionally, the researcher received IRB approval to collect qualitative feedback from university and site school counseling supervisors from the previously mentioned targeted population (see Appendix A). Specifically, the researcher asked participants to list as many statements or phrases as possible when considering evaluation criteria for school counseling interns' competencies, abilities, dispositions, and roles/responsibilities. A total of six participants provided qualitative feedback, including school counseling university supervisors ($n = 2$) and site supervisors ($n = 4$), with representation from primary ($n = 2$) and secondary settings ($n = 2$). The researcher organized these items, merged similar items, and verified that each item measured a single operationally defined construct (See Appendix B). The initial item pool for the SCICS has two sections: section one is comprised of basic demographic questions and section two is comprised of 75 school counseling internship competencies.

Demographic items. The SCICS included basic demographic information from supervisors, including gender, age, and race/ethnicity (see Appendix B). Additionally, all

supervisors were asked about their degree(s), professional credentials, setting (i.e., university or site), and supervision training. Site supervisors were asked about their school level (i.e., primary or secondary), school size, caseload, and locale (i.e., rural, urban, or suburban). University supervisors were asked about their academic position within the university (i.e., assistant, associate, professor, instructor, or adjunct). All supervisors were asked to indicate whether the supervisee they were evaluating was in their first or second semester of internship.

School counseling competency items. Initially, the item pool for the SCICS contained 75 items designed to measure school counseling interns' competencies regarding knowledge, skills, and dispositions relevant to the school counseling profession (see Appendix B). Participants scored the instrument using a 5-point Likert-type rating scale adapted from Kemer et al. (2017; *1 = Not Meeting Developmental Expectations, 2 = Emerges to Meet Developmental Expectations, 3 = Meets Minimal Developmental Expectations, 4 = Meets Developmental Expectations, and 5 = Exceeds Developmental Expectations*). Participants also had the opportunity to select *Not Applicable to Setting*.

Phase 2: Pilot Testing and Revising

During the next phase, the researcher conducted expert review and pilot testing to establish content validity. First, the instrument was sent to a panel of four school counseling university ($n = 2$) and site supervisors ($n = 2$) to review the instrument for content validity, providing feedback on whether the instrument measures the entirety of the construct. The researcher made minimal revisions based on supervisor feedback prior to pilot testing the instrument. Supervisors recommended modifying or adding verbs that clarify the items and removing parenthetical qualifiers (i.e., and e.g.) for multiple items to ensure that items are measuring one operationally defined construct. For example, *Demonstration of multicultural*

competency in delivery (e.g., lessons, individual sessions, groups, consultation, etc. was changed to *Demonstrates multicultural competency in delivery of school counseling services*. After making minimal revisions from expert review, the researcher conducted pilot testing.

According to Fowler (2014), pre-survey evaluation is a valuable step in instrument creation, as the researcher can determine comprehension, evaluate content validity, solicit feedback, and gauge how low the instrument takes to complete. Pilot testing should be conducted with a similar population that was used in the main study. Due to ease of access, the researcher pilot tested the instrument with a convenience sample of doctoral supervisors, requesting feedback on comprehension, clarity, formatting, and scaling. Participants in the pilot study were recruited via email and were offered incentives in the form of $10 gift cards. After collecting feedback, the researcher made necessary revisions prior to primary data collection. These revisions included re-wording several items for improved clarity and removing three items that could be collapsed into other existing SCICS items. For example, *Ability to write recommendation* letter was changed to *Demonstrates ability to write a recommendation letter* and *Professional conduct* was changed to *Demonstrates professional conduct*. This resulted in a 72-item instrument.

Phase 3: Sample Size Estimation

To estimate the required sample size to conduct Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), the researcher followed guidelines set by EFA literature. Specifically, the researcher used the subjects-to-variables (STV) ratio, in which the researcher determined the required sample size by calculating the ratio of participants to the number of items on the instrument. The minimum recommended STV ratio is between three to five (Beavers et al., 2013). Additionally, researchers recommend that the sample includes 51 more participants than the number of items, with a

minimum of 200 cases (Beavers et al., 2013). Based on these guidelines and the fact that the SCICS has 72 items, the minimum accepted sample size would be 216, with a recommended sample size of 360 to yield robust analyses.

Phase 4: Administering Revised Instrument to Broader Participant Pool

In the study, the researcher utilized convenience and snowball sampling. After collecting contact information from university websites, the researcher contacted all clinical coordinators of CACREP-accredited programs with school counseling degree programs, requesting them to forward recruitment materials to university and site school counseling supervisors (see Appendix C). The researcher also contacted school counselor educators from CACREP programs directly via email for recruitment. The researcher collected public emails from the leadership board of every state school counselor association, asking them to participate in the survey and forward recruitment materials. The researcher continued recruitment at a national school counseling conference, passing out flyers and collecting contact information from attendees who were eligible to participate in the study. Lastly, the researcher used social media and professional organizations to recruit participants, including school counseling-related Facebook groups, the ASCA Scene, as well as state and regional professional organization websites and listservs. Through these methods of recruitment, the researcher emailed over 2,000 individuals with initial and follow-up emails, offering them the opportunity to complete the survey and forward the recruitment email to any additional eligible colleagues.

Through recruiting university and site supervisors in multiple ways, the researcher aimed to generate a participant base that is both diverse and representative (Creswell, 2014). Similarly, the researcher aimed to recruit participants from diverse backgrounds, multiple geographic regions, and with representation across school levels (i.e., primary and secondary schools) to

enhance generalizability (Creswell, 2014; Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012). The researcher offered

$15 Amazon gift cards as incentives for participants to complete the survey. At the conclusion of

data collection, the researcher randomly selected 150 participants to receive gift cards for

completing the instrument.

Counseling Competencies Scale-Revised (CCS-R). In addition to the revised

instrument, participants completed the CCS-R (Lambie et al., 2018) for validity analyses (see

Appendix D). The CCS-R contains 23 items in a two-factor model that explains 61.5% of

variance. The two sub-scales on the CCS-R are: (1) *Counseling Skills and Therapeutic Condition*

containing 11 items, and (2) *Counseling Dispositions and Behaviors* containing 12 items.

Participants responded to items on the following 5-point Likert-type scale: (*1 = Harmful, 2 =*

Below Expectations/Unacceptable, 3 = Near Expectations/Developing towards Competencies, 4

= Meets Expectations/Demonstrates Competencies, and 5 = Exceeds Expectations/

Demonstrates Competencies). Cronbach's alpha for all items was .96, while α for factor one was

.94 and factor two was .94, which indicates strong internal consistency.

Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Supervisor Form (SWAI). Participants

also completed the SWAI (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990) for validity analyses (see

Appendix E). The SWAI contains 23 items on a 7-point Likert-type scaling ranging from*: 1 =*

Almost Never to *7 = Almost Always*. There are three sub-scales, including (1) *Client Focus*

containing 9 items, (2) *Rapport* containing 7 items, and (3) *Identification* containing 7 items.

Alpha coefficients ranged from .71 to .77, suggesting adequate internal consistency reliability.

Phase 5: Screening and Checking for Parametric Assumptions

All quantitative data was exported into SPSS and the researcher checked the necessary

assumptions to conduct EFA, including sample size, missing values, normality, outliers, inter-

item correlation, and homogeneity of variance. Firstly, the researcher determined whether the sample size was adequate, as three to five participant responses per instrument item are sufficient for data analysis (Mvududu & Sink, 2013). Since the instrument contains 72 competency items, the minimum sample size required for EFA is 216, with a robust sample size at 360. Following, the researcher checked for missing values. If missing values for any participant accounted for less than 5%, expectation maximization (EM) was used to replace missing values; however, if more that 5% of data is missing for any participant, the data for that participant was deleted (Fowler, 2014). EM utilizes a series of regressions to evaluate predicted scores for each missing item (Field, 2013).

The researcher assessed for normality using multiple methods, as recommended by experts in educational research (Field, 2013). First, the researcher computed descriptive statistics and visually inspected the data using QQ plots and box plots to identify outliers for every item. Next, the researcher evaluated univariate outliers by computing Z-scores and removing any scores beyond +/- 3.29, as supported by researchers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). After removing univariate outliers, multivariate outliers were identified and removed using the Mahalanobis Distance Test with significance at $p < .001$ (Field, 2013). Following, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to check for normality. Finally, the researcher evaluated skewness and kurtosis coefficients for each variable, verifying that each were between +/-1.00.

Phase 6: Creating Correlation Matrices and Inspecting for Factorability

After checking for parametric assumptions to conduct EFA, the researcher examined the inter-correlation matrix to determine the factorability of the data. The researcher confirmed which items could be retained and which should be dropped from the instrument. Specifically, the researcher was seeking inter-item correlations between .30 and .85 by visually inspecting the

data (Mvududu & Sink, 2013). This criteria established that similar concepts were being

measured across all items in the instrument; however, multicollinearity would not pose a

problem due to too much overlap between items (Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012; Harman, 1976).

Next, the researcher used Bartlett's test of sphericity to calculate the sum of products and cross-

products from the inter-item correlation matrix to assure factorability, aiming for result close to

zero on a scale that ranges from zero to 1.00. Then, that number was converted to a chi-square

statistic and tested for significance at the $p < .05$ level. Following, the researcher conducted the

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy to determine whether the items were

measuring a common factor. The KMO estimate should reach a minimum of .60 to conduct

factor analysis, while estimates closer to .80 are considered ideal (Field, 2013; Kaiser, 1974;

Mvududu & Sink, 2013). After conducting the aforementioned tests to evaluate adequate

factorability, the researcher conducted factor extraction.

Phase 7: Factor Extraction

After determining the factorability of the data, the researcher used principal axis factor

(PAF) analysis as an extraction method. PAF is the most appropriate to explore the latent factor

structure from a set of instrument items and establishing a good factor solution (Mvududu &

Sink, 2013). Additionally, PAF is reported to have a produce a more stable factor solution if

communalities are low or if there are violations of normality in the data (Kahn, 2006; Mvududu

& Sink, 2013). In the output, factors were extracted, with items' loadings, or beta weights,

varying for each factor. As item loadings moved away from zero, items had greater statistical

power for that particular factor, while item loadings closer to zero had low statistical power for a

factor. Additionally, all items had a communality, or a proportion of variance explained by an

extracted factor. Communalities increased as the factor solution improved, with a good factor

solution explaining between 50-75% of the variance (Mvududu & Sink, 2013). Lastly, each factor had an Eigenvalue (EV), or total variance explained by each factor. This was calculated by adding the squared factor loadings for each factor. As the EV increased for a factor, a greater percentage of variance was explained by the items loaded on that factor. The researcher sought EVs that are at least 1.0, as they are interpreted as being stable (Mvududu & Sink, 2013).

According to the literature, an adequate factor solution contains at least three items with moderate to strong loadings per factor and the overall factor structure should be parsimonious, meaning that items would load strongly on one factor and weakly on all other factors (Mvududu & Sink, 2013). Researchers suggest that it is better to over-extract rather than under-extract factors, as under-extraction can lead to considerable error in the factor solution (Mvududu & Sink, 2013; Reise, Waller, & Comrey, 2000). Ultimately, the researcher conducted the PAF process by extracting factors until the greatest amount of variance was achieved by the least number of factors. After extracting factors and producing the largest amount of variance with the least number of factors, the researcher determined which factors would be retained.

Phase 8: Factor Retention

After extracting initial factors, the researcher used multiple methods to determine which factors would be retained based on recommendations from Beavers et al. (2013). First, the researcher used Kaiser criterion to extract all factors with EVs greater than one. Additionally, the researcher sought factor loadings to be > .35, communalities > .30, and cross loadings < .40 (Beavers et al., 2013). The researcher conducted a parallel analysis, while also evaluating the conceptual appropriateness and meaningful variance accounted for by the model. The researcher also used Cattell's Scree Plot to verify the number of factors to extract. By creating a scree plot, with factors on the x-axis and EVs on the y-axis, the researcher visually inspected the cutoff

point based on where the plotted line bends in an "elbow" shape (Beavers et al., 2013; Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012). On its own, this last method can be subjective; however, the combination of methods provided multiple tests to ensure proper factor extraction. Based on these extraction methods, researchers suggest that at least 50% of the variance should be explained by the factor solution, while other researchers suggest that up to 75-90% of variance can be accounted for (Beavers et al., 2013; Mvududu & Sink, 2013). After the researcher determined which factors were retained, all other factors were discarded, and data analysis continued with factor rotation.

Phase 9: Factor Rotation

After factors were extracted and retained in the solution, the researcher re-ran factor analysis without the removed factors (Beavers et al., 2013). Next, the researcher conducted an oblique rotation of the data to produce the best simple structure of the data. Simple structure refers to manipulating the axes of data (i.e., rotating) to allow for the easiest interpretation of the factor solution by maximizing the factor loadings (Mvududu & Sink, 2013). When factors were extracted previously, the initial factor accounted for the greatest amount of variance. During each subsequent extraction, less and less variance was explained by the factor solution. Therefore, the initial factor solution undoubtedly included factors with high loadings; however, subsequent extracted factors that were retained in the solution had lower variance and potentially higher cross-loadings, which prevented the solution from being easily interpreted. Through rotating the data and, in essence, shifting the "viewing plane" of the factors, items were able to load more precisely on their factors, thus improving the factor solution and interpretation (Mvududu & Sink, 2013).

While orthogonal and oblique rotations can be used in PFA, an oblique rotation was best suited for this data. Oblique rotations shift vectors at less than a 90-degree angle, allowing for

some covariation to occur, whereas orthogonal rotations shift vectors at a 90-degree angle to reduce factor covariation (Mvududu & Sink, 2013). Typically, an oblique rotation assumes that there is a varying degree of overlap between concepts, while orthogonal rotation is used when measuring separate and distinct concepts. In counseling research, oblique rotation is primarily used, as there is much overlap between constructs (Mvududu & Sink, 2013). In this study, the instrument was likely to contain overlapping factors relating to school counseling knowledge, skills, and dispositions; therefore, an oblique rotation was consistent with the data.

Upon rotating the factors, the researcher used guiding frameworks from Beavers et al. (2013) and Mvududu and Sink (2013) to evaluate the rotated factor solution. Firstly, all items should have at least a moderate loading on their factor (i.e., loadings > .30). Next, each factor should have at least three moderate-to-strong loadings. Following, each factor should have between four and 10 items loaded. Lastly, items should not have cross loading on other factors greater than .40. Any items that did not meet these criteria after rotation were discarded.

Phase 10: Naming Factors

The last part of PFA involved naming the factors, which the subjective process of conceptualizing each individual factor by looking for themes within its item loadings. As each factor was measuring a latent dimension, the researcher examined each factor and ascribed a short title to each. Researchers suggest relying on previous research literature relating to the topic in order to determine the factor names (Mvududu & Sink, 2013). As such, the researcher pulled from the ASCA National Model, school counseling literature, and previous counseling competency scales to establish factor names.

Phase 11: Validity and Reliability Analyses

After conducting factor analysis, validity and reliability for the SCICS was evaluated in multiple ways. Firstly, the researcher established content validity through expert review and pilot testing the instrument to determine whether the entirety of the construct was measured through the SCICS. Through conducting EFA, the researcher has established factorial validity, or the extent to which the instrument has an underlying structure. The researcher examined correlations between overall mean scores between the CCS-R (Lambie et al., 2018) and the SCICS to establish convergent validity, or the similarity between the SCICS and an existing competency scale. The researcher evaluated concurrent validity by comparing mean total scores of the SCICS for first and second semester interns to establish whether the SCICS can distinguish between groups that should theoretically be different from one another. The researcher aimed to establish incremental validity by conducting a hierarchical regression to determine whether the SCICS serves as a better predictor for supervisory working alliance beyond the CCS-R. Next, Cronbach's alpha was computed for each factor as well as for the overall instrument to establish internal validity (Cronbach, 1951). Lastly, the researcher conducted Spearman-Brown split-half reliability.

Conclusion

In summary, the researcher used exploratory sequential mixed methods, with qualitative inquiry and exploratory factor analysis to create and validate the instrument. The researcher used supervisor feedback and supplemental literature to create the instrument, following guidelines from Garner et al. (2016), conducted an expert review, and piloted the instrument. Upon making revisions, the researcher collected data from 316 participants, with 230 usable cases. The researcher checked the necessary parametric assumptions, reviewed the inter-item correlation

matrix, conducted factor analysis using principal axis factor analysis with oblique rotation, named the variables, and assessed validity and reliability.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the psychometric properties of The School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS) and determine the validity and reliability to justify its use in evaluating school counseling interns. In this chapter, the researcher presents the results, beginning with a review of the research questions, an overview of the data cleaning and screening, initial assumption checking procedures, and participant descriptive statistics. Next, the researcher reports the inter-item correlation matrix, related assumption checking procedures, and the results of exploratory factor analysis, including the procedures for naming the factors. Lastly, the chapter concludes with the validity and reliability statistics.

Research Questions

The researcher examined the following research questions in this study:

Research Question One

What are the underlying factors of School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS)?

Research Question Two

What are the validity properties of the SCICS in relation to the Counseling Competencies Scale-Revised (CCS-R) and the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Supervisor Form (SWAI)?

Research Question Three

What are the reliability properties of the SCICS, indicated by Cronbach's alpha for the overall scale and emerging factors, and Spearman-Brown split-half reliability?

Data Screening and Missing Data

The researcher evaluated the initial sample of 316 participants to determine the presence of data entry errors, irregular response patterns, and missing information. First, the researcher conducted an SPSS missing values analysis (see table 1), which revealed that between .6% and 48.4% of data were missing across SCICS instrument items, including two types of missing data: *Not Applicable to Setting* missing data and *Non-response* missing data. It was anticipated that participants at varying school levels would utilize the *Not Applicable to Setting* response for items that may not pertain to their setting, as school counselors can have varying roles and responsibilities across levels (Young & Kaffenberger, 2011; Perusse, Goodnough, & Lee, 2009; Scarborough, 2005). The high degree to which participants relied on *Not Applicable to Setting* was surprising, given that the majority of roles and responsibilities are consistent across PK-12 settings; however, it is possible that supervisors may not have been able to evaluate their intern for particular items due to lack of opportunity (CACREP, 2015; Goodman-Scott, 2015).

Researchers support multiple methods for addressing missing or 'not applicable' data, including the removal of items with significantly high frequencies of missing data instead of using imputation methods that could potentially add bias or reduce variability across the dataset (Holman, Glas, Lindenboom, Zwinderman, & de Haan, 2004; Putnam & Rothbart, 2006; Vedsted, Sokolowski, & Heje, 2008). For example, Putnam and Rothbart (2006) excluded all survey items from analyses if more than 20% of respondents selected 'not applicable,' whereas, Vedsted and colleagues (2008) used 10% as their cut-off point. When selecting an adequate cut-off point, researchers suggest that online surveys typically have a between a 30-35% response rate, with recent counseling research indicating average response rates for school counselors (34.2%), university faculty (43.9%), and counseling professional association members (20.1%)

(Nulty, 2008; Poynton, DeFouw, & Morizio, 2019). As the majority of participants in this sample are school counselors, and the researcher elected to use a conservative value for item suppression to maintain as much of the original survey structure; therefore, the researcher removed all SCICS instrument items with more than 34% missing data. As a result, the researcher removed nine items: Q35 ("demonstrates ability to interpret a transcript"), Q36 ("demonstrates ability to enroll a new student"), Q37 ("demonstrates ability to transfer credits"), Q40 ("demonstrates ability to de-escalate parent behavior"), Q47 ("demonstrates ability to help students navigate scholarships"), Q48 ("demonstrates knowledge of financial aid"), Q49 ("demonstrates knowledge of specialty schools/programs (i.e., IB programs, magnet schools, Governor's school, etc."), Q55 ("demonstrates ability to write recommendation letter(s)"), and Q68 ("demonstrates ability to build student schedule").

Second, the missing value analysis by case revealed 63 participants with more than 5% of their data missing; those participants were removed from the sample. Next, the researcher used Expectation Maximization (EM) to replace missing data that accounted for less that 5%. All CCS-R items were re-coded so that all scale items across instruments were scored in a positive manner. Lastly, all items were screened to ensure that all data were within the minimum or maximum range on the Likert-type scale for each instrument.

Table 1

Missing Value Analysis for Likert-Type Scale SCICS Items

	N	*M*	*SD*	Missing	
				Count	%
Q_1	314	3.95	.84	2	.6
Q_2	309	3.86	.91	7	2.2
Q_3	313	4.19	.90	3	.9
Q_4	310	3.99	.88	6	1.9
Q_5	310	4.14	.88	6	1.9
Q_6	312	3.80	.89	4	1.3
Q_7	291	3.41	.99	25	7.9
Q_8	291	3.56	.98	25	7.9
Q_9	307	4.01	.89	9	2.8
Q_10	309	3.74	.97	7	2.2
Q_11	294	3.50	.97	22	7.0
Q_12	267	3.42	1.05	49	15.5
Q_13	300	3.68	.91	16	5.1
Q_14	306	3.92	.86	10	3.2
Q_15	308	3.81	.86	8	2.5
Q_16	312	4.01	.86	4	1.3
Q_17	309	3.68	.96	7	2.2
Q_18	286	3.81	.91	30	9.5
Q_19	311	4.31	.75	5	1.6
Q_20	280	3.57	.95	36	11.4
Q_21	312	3.94	.90	4	1.3
Q_22	302	2.98	1.03	14	4.4
Q_23	312	4.15	.82	4	1.3
Q_24	312	4.24	.87	4	1.3
Q_25	312	4.31	.77	4	1.3
Q_26	305	3.07	1.00	11	3.5
Q_27	235	3.34	.95	81	25.6
Q_28	311	4.28	.79	5	1.6
Q_29	311	3.96	.92	5	1.6
Q_30	308	3.83	.90	8	2.5
Q_31	301	3.85	.90	15	4.7
Q_32	279	3.44	1.00	37	11.7
Q_33	277	3.83	.92	39	12.3
Q_34	236	3.59	1.01	80	25.3
Q_35	221	3.57	1.02	95	30.1
Q_36	187	3.40	1.12	129	40.8
Q_37	172	3.36	1.12	144	45.6
Q_38	312	4.07	1.04	2	1.3
Q_39	311	4.23	.89	5	1.6
Q_40	220	3.33	.98	96	30.4

Q_41	273	3.73	.98	43	13.6
Q_42	239	3.70	.99	77	24.4
Q_43	306	3.84	.93	10	3.2
Q_44	307	3.73	.91	9	2.8
Q_45	297	4.01	.86	19	6.0
Q_46	246	3.72	.89	70	22.2
Q_47	171	3.41	1.03	145	45.9
Q_48	186	3.37	1.03	130	41.1
Q_49	214	3.26	1.04	102	32.3
Q_50	296	3.71	.93	20	6.3
Q_51	287	3.67	.98	29	9.2
Q_52	284	3.58	.96	32	10.1
Q_53	276	3.56	1.02	40	12.7
Q_54	256	3.39	.98	60	19.0
Q_55	163	3.41	1.05	153	48.4
Q_56	298	3.84	.98	18	5.7
Q_57	294	3.82	.96	22	7.0
Q_58	299	4.26	.88	17	5.4
Q_59	298	4.07	1.05	18	5.7
Q_60	298	4.28	.87	18	5.7
Q_61	297	4.14	.89	19	6.0
Q_62	286	3.57	.96	30	9.5
Q_63	278	3.85	.94	38	12.0
Q_64	279	3.90	.96	37	11.7
Q_65	288	3.90	.89	28	8.9
Q_66	278	3.85	.96	38	12.0
Q_67	272	3.23	.97	44	13.9
Q_68	197	3.55	1.03	119	37.7
Q_69	295	3.79	.92	21	6.6
Q_70	279	3.58	.99	37	11.7
Q_71	240	3.56	1.00	76	24.1
Q_72	295	4.06	.88	21	6.6

Initial Assumption Checking

The researcher computed descriptive statistics for all survey items. Multiple methods were used to ensure normality in the data, including visual inspection of QQ plots, boxplots, and histograms; Z scores for univariate outliers; the Mahalanobis Distance Test to evaluate multivariate outliers; the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test; and evaluation of skew and kurtosis

for each item (see table 2). The researcher identified nine cases as univariate outliers and 14 cases as multivariate outliers. Conducted analyses with and without these outliers revealed differences in the results; thus, the researcher removed these 23 cases. As the most statistically conservative test of normality, the KS test was significant; however, skewness (between -.920 and .206) and kurtosis (between -.944 and .445) coefficients were well within acceptable ranges of +/- 2 (Field, 2013). All necessary assumptions were met to conduct EFA.

Table 2

Tests of Normality

	n	Min.	Max.	*M*	*SD*	Skew	Kurtosis	KS Test
Q_1	230	2	5	4.08	.744	-.255	-.769	.236
Q_2	230	2	5	4.01	.807	-.373	-.550	.237
Q_3	230	2	5	4.35	.742	-.919	.294	.301
Q_4	230	2	5	4.13	.771	-.404	-.703	.227
Q_5	230	2	5	4.27	.744	-.612	-.517	.268
Q_6	230	2	5	3.92	.827	-.414	-.359	.259
Q_7	230	1	5	3.55	.923	-.294	-.174	.213
Q_8	230	2	5	3.67	.918	-.105	-.827	.199
Q_9	230	2	5	4.16	.774	-.388	-.864	.231
Q_10	230	2	5	3.90	.876	-.401	-.571	.239
Q_11	230	1	5	3.56	.893	-.085	-.563	.211
Q_12	230	1	5	3.47	.997	-.228	-.528	.198
Q_13	230	2	5	3.79	.840	-.215	-.577	.236
Q_14	230	2	5	4.05	.757	-.209	-.886	.229
Q_15	230	2	5	3.97	.795	-.261	-.656	.237
Q_16	230	2	5	4.13	.756	-.474	-.379	.238
Q_17	230	2	5	3.84	.839	-.196	-.689	.231
Q_18	230	2	5	3.95	.812	-.268	-.660	.220
Q_19	230	2	5	4.37	.717	-.766	-.421	.317
Q_20	230	1	5	3.73	.846	-.359	.252	.207
Q_21	230	2	5	4.09	.779	-.440	-.472	.236
Q_22	230	1	5	3.13	.984	.018	-.463	.201
Q_23	230	2	5	4.26	.725	-.581	-.406	.263
Q_24	230	2	5	4.40	.715	-.835	-.326	.330
Q_25	230	2	5	4.43	.629	-.655	-.532	.324
Q_26	230	1	5	3.21	.950	.206	-.696	.215
Q_27	230	1	5	3.44	.907	-.125	-.357	.181
Q_28	230	2	5	4.41	.659	-.857	.445	.311
Q_29	230	2	5	4.09	.833	-.584	-.355	.230
Q_30	230	2	5	3.96	.806	-.381	-.397	.250

Q_31	230	2	5	3.96	.834	-.209	-.944	.204
Q_32	230	1	5	3.56	.889	-.152	-.538	.211
Q_33	230	2	5	3.97	.843	-.311	-.798	.205
Q_34	230	1	5	3.64	.932	-.165	-.657	.168
Q_38	230	2	5	4.23	.853	-.802	-.289	.286
Q_39	230	2	5	4.37	.705	-.827	.016	.308
Q_41	230	1	5	3.82	.872	-.406	-.122	.222
Q_42	230	1	5	3.76	.928	-.241	-.737	.170
Q_43	230	2	5	4.01	.801	-.329	-.638	.229
Q_44	230	2	5	3.89	.823	-.167	-.766	.224
Q_45	230	2	5	4.17	.719	-.407	-.496	.245
Q_46	230	2	5	3.79	.809	-.060	-.704	.198
Q_50	230	2	5	3.90	.815	-.313	-.482	.251
Q_51	230	1	5	3.82	.905	-.496	-.134	.247
Q_52	230	2	5	3.73	.881	-.082	-.821	.210
Q_53	230	1	5	3.75	.888	-.274	-.469	.221
Q_54	230	1	5	3.52	.903	-.056	-.627	.194
Q_56	230	2	5	4.01	.825	-.441	-.470	.239
Q_57	230	1	5	4.00	.825	-.519	-.025	.243
Q_58	230	2	5	4.35	.754	-.920	.188	.306
Q_59	230	2	5	4.24	.841	-.699	-.628	.296
Q_60	230	3	5	4.43	.701	-.840	-.545	.346
Q_61	230	3	5	4.29	.710	-.487	-.912	.280
Q_62	230	2	5	3.74	.857	-.067	-.765	.211
Q_63	230	2	5	4.00	.815	-.244	-.889	.202
Q_64	230	2	5	4.04	.739	-.263	-.590	.245
Q_65	230	2	5	4.02	.799	-.508	-.181	.257
Q_66	230	2	5	3.98	.825	-.474	-.312	.241
Q_67	230	1	5	3.35	.904	.053	-.657	.212
Q_69	230	2	5	3.92	.832	-.219	-.785	.220
Q_70	230	1	5	3.73	.910	-.315	-.513	.230
Q_71	230	2	5	3.71	.882	-.096	-.784	.195
Q_72	230	2	5	4.23	.724	-.584	-.177	.247

Data and Descriptive Statistics

Data were collected from 316 participants, with 230 usable participants, including 72.6% ($n = 167$) identified as site supervisors and 27.4% ($n = 63$) identified as university supervisors. Descriptive statistics were calculated for gender, with 85.2% ($n = 196$) identified as female and 14.8% ($n = 34$) identified as male (see table 3). For race/ethnicity, 7% ($n = 16$) identified as African American, .4% ($n = 1$) as Asian-American/Pacific Islander, .9% ($n = 2$) as American Indian/Native American, 84.8% ($n = 195$) as Caucasian, 3.5% ($n = 8$) as Hispanic/Latino/a, 3% ($n = 7$) as Biracial/Multi-Racial, and .4% ($n = 1$) as Other. University supervisors reported their academic position, with 33.9% ($n = 21$) as Assistant Professor, 24.2% ($n = 15$) as Associate Professor, 29% ($n = 18$) as Professor, 1.6% ($n = 1$) as Instructor, and 11.3% ($n = 7$) as Adjunct. Site supervisors reported employment across PK-12 settings, including 28.7% ($n = 48$) at elementary, 22.8% ($n = 38$) at middle, 44.3% ($n = 74$) at high, and 4.2% ($n = 7$) at other school settings, such as PK-12. Site supervisors reported caseloads ranging from 6 to 850 ($M = 375.3$, $SD = 167.9$). Participants were able to select multiple professional credentials that applied to them, including 23% ($n = 23$) with NCC, 21.3% ($n = 49$) with LPC credential, 7% ($n = 16$) with Approved Clinical Supervisor (NBCC credential), 85.2% ($n = 196$) with Licensed School Counselor credential, 11.3% ($n = 23$) with National Certified School Counselor (NBCC credential), and 10% ($n = 23$) as Other (see table 4).

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Gender and Race/Ethnicity

	n	*%*	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	34	14.8	14.8	14.8
Female	196	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	230			
African American	16	7.0	7.0	7.0
Asian-American/ Pacific Islander	1	.4	.4	7.4
American Indian/ Native America	2	.9	.9	8.3
Caucasian	195	84.8	84.8	93.0
Hispanic/Latino/a	8	3.5	3.5	96.5
Middle Eastern/Arab	0	0	0	96.5
Biracial/Multi- Racial	7	3.0	3.0	99.6
Other, (please specify)	1	.4	.4	100.0
Total	230			

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Supervisors and Internship Site Characteristics

	n	*%*	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
University Supervisor	63	27.4	27.4	27.4
Site Supervisor	167	72.6	72.6	100.0
Total	230			

Assistant Professor	21	9.1	33.3	33.3
Associate Professor	15	6.5	23.8	57.1
Professor	18	7.8	28.6	85.7
Instructor	1	.4	1.6	87.3
Adjunct	8	3.4	12.7	100.0
Total	63			
Elementary	48	20.9	28.7	28.7
Middle	38	16.5	22.8	51.5
High	74	32.2	44.3	95.8
Other	7	3.0	4.2	100.0
Total	167			
Rural	52	22.6	31.1	31.1
Urban	32	13.9	19.2	50.3
Suburban	83	36.1	49.7	100.0
Total	167			
Professional Credentials				
NCC	53	23		
LPC	49	21.3		
ACS	16	7.0		
LSC	196	85.2		
NCSC	26	11.3		
Other (please specify)	23	10.0		

All supervisors were asked to complete the instruments for one school counseling intern that they supervised within the past two years. Supervisee characteristics included 13% ($n = 30$) male, 85.2% ($n = 196$) female 34.3% ($n = 79$), and 1.7% ($n = 4$) gender fluid or nonbinary with 34.3% (n = 79) in their first semester of internship, 46.5% ($n = 107$) in their second semester of internship, and 3% ($n = 7$) listed as Other, due to supervisors being unsure of what semester of

internship their supervisee was in. The majority of supervisors who selected Other, noted that their supervisee completed their entire internship in one semester (see table 5).

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for School Counseling Interns/Supervisees

	n	*%*	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	30	13.0	13.0	13.0
Female	196	85.2	85.2	98.3
Gender Fluid or Nonbinary	4	1.7	1.7	100.0
Total	230			
1st Semester of Internship	79	34.3	34.3	34.3
2nd Semester of Internship	107	46.5	46.5	80.9
Unsure of Semester	7	3.0	3.0	83.9
Other (please specify)	37	16.1	16.1	100.0
Total	230			

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

The researcher computed an inter-item correlation matrix (see Appendix F) to further investigate whether this dataset met the necessary parametric assumptions for EFA. The matrix and established that each SCICS item met a minimum correlation of .30 with at least half of the other items, suggesting that the items are all measuring a similar construct (Field, 2013). Additionally, visual inspection of the matrix determined that no items had correlations that exceeded .85 with multiple items, which would suggest multicollinearity (Field, 2013: Mvududu

& Sink, 2013). Next, the researcher conducted initial reliability statistics between all items and established a Cronbach's alpha of .98.

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) were also used to determine whether the correlation matrix is factorable (Mvududu & Sink, 2013). Bartlett's Test indicated significance, (χ^2 (1953) = 12629.78, $p < .000$), suggesting homogeneity of variance in the data set. The KMO coefficient was .96, exceeding the benchmark of .80, which suggests that the matrix was ideal for conducting factor analysis (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003). At this point, all assumptions were met in terms of normality, inter-item correlations, and factorability that support the next phase of conducting the EFA.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

In the current analysis, the researcher used principal axis factoring (PAF) as the extraction method, using multiple methods to determine the appropriate number of factors to extract and retain. Firstly, using the Kaiser criterion, factors were extracted with Eigenvalues greater than one. This initial solution yielded an eight-factor model that accounted for 63.7% of the variance. Following, the researcher inspected the Cattell's scree plot, which revealed a three-factor solution. Additionally, the researcher conducted a parallel analysis, which is a more rigorous method to determine that number of factors to rotate. Parallel analysis compares EVs to a randomly generated dataset that has similar characteristics, but no underlying factors (Field, 2013). Parallel analysis revealed a five-factor solution. The researcher also evaluated the meaningful variance and the conceptual appropriateness of the instrument in practice. Based on Kaiser criterion, parallel analysis, visual inspection of the scree plot, meaningful variance, and conceptual appropriateness, the researcher elected to retain and rotate five factors using a direct oblimin rotation.

Post-Rotation Analyses

The researcher selected a direct oblimin rotation (delta = 0) due to the clear interpretation of the model, the least evidence of cross-loadings, and strong conceptual appropriateness. The following retention criteria were used: factor loadings > .35, commonalities >.30, and cross loadings < .32 (Beavers et al., 2013). Due to violations in retention criteria, 15 items (e.g., Q1, Q2, Q9, Q13, Q14, Q15, Q17, Q18, Q20, Q21, Q29, Q45, Q65, Q71 and Q72) were removed from the item pool. The following items were retained in the instrument despite moderate cross loadings due to the conceptual appropriateness of those items in practice: Q12 ("Demonstrates ability to conduct threat assessments"), Q41 ("Demonstrates ability to make a report to Child Protective Services"), and Q63 ("Engages students in classroom lessons"). The results revealed a 48-item instrument that accounted for 65.5% of the variance explained by the five-factor model. The commonalities ranged from .51 to .77 (see table 6). Factor inter-correlations were between .25 and .61 suggesting that low to moderate correlations exist between factors.

Table 6

Principal Factor Analysis Results Using Oblique Rotation (N = 230)

Item	Factor Loadings					
	1	2	3	4	5	h^2
Q64: Demonstrates ability to plan small group curriculum	.644					.76
Q66: Facilitates effective small groups	.488					.68
Q63: Engages students in classroom lessons	.414					.65
Q53: Demonstrates ability to analyze data to evaluate program effectiveness	.368					.69
Q52: Demonstrates ability to utilize data to inform/develop programming	.353					.72
Q34: Demonstrates understanding of course sequencing		.843				.74
Q54: Demonstrates knowledge of standardized testing		.806				.76
Q42: Demonstrates knowledge of graduation/promotion requirements		.742				.73
Q67: Demonstrates understanding of special education referral process		.665				.64
Q22: Demonstrates knowledge of 504 process		.661				.64
Q46: Demonstrates ability to assess students' college/career needs		.635				.69
Q26: Demonstrates knowledge of Individualized Education Program/Plan (IEP) process		.609				.65
Q70: Demonstrates knowledge of FERPA (e.g., parental rights/non-custodial parent rights)		.586				.65
Q33: Effectively assists students with academic planning		.535				.70
Q69: Demonstrates knowledge of proper documentation/record-keeping		.475				.60
Q44: Demonstrates ability to assess students' academic needs		.458				.65
Q31: Demonstrates knowledge of PK-12 school culture		.372				.67

Q10: Conducts successful consultation/collaboration with teachers/staff	.611		.63
Q11: Conducts successful consultation/collaboration with parents	.583		.69
Q8: Effectively facilitates classroom management	.551		.64
Q27: Facilitates effective parent-teacher conferences	.526		.66
Q7: Demonstrates knowledge of Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)	.397		.56
Q56: Demonstrates multicultural awareness of cultural differences		-.803	.77
Q57: Demonstrates multicultural competency in delivery of school counseling services		-.690	.74
Q6: Demonstrates knowledge regarding needs of underserved students		-.632	.63
Q32: Demonstrates understanding of diagnostic criteria for mental health disorders		-.561	.52
Q4: Demonstrates ability to advocate on behalf of students		-.534	.58
Q12: Demonstrates ability to conduct threat assessments (suicidal/homicidal assessment)		-.526	.67
Q62: Demonstrates knowledge of community resources or referrals		-.485	.64
Q41: Demonstrates ability to make a report to Child Protective Services (CPS)		-.452	.64
Q50: Demonstrates knowledge of school interventions for at-risk students		-.433	.73
Q39: Demonstrates willingness to accept feedback		.797	.68
Q60: Demonstrates professional conduct		.766	.74
Q16: Manages emotional reactions		.750	.67
Q61: Demonstrates flexibility/adaptability		.738	.66
Q19: Adheres to ethical standards		.719	.72
Q23: Maintains appropriate boundaries		.715	.66
Q3: Demonstrates emotional stability		.699	.62
Q25: Expresses empathy		.657	.66

Q24: Demonstrates authenticity	.644	.67
Q58: Demonstrates appropriate dress	.619	.51
Q28: Builds rapport/relationships with students	.611	.58
Q59: Timeliness	.592	.56
Q38: Takes initiative	.567	.56
Q5: Demonstrates commitment to ongoing education/professional development	.537	.52
Q43: Demonstrates ability to create school counseling goals	.408	.61
Q51: Demonstrates ability to collect student data	.387	.61
Q30: Builds rapport/relationships with administration	.369	.57

Naming the Factors

The researcher looked for themes in each sub-scale and relied on school counseling literature to inform the naming process for each factor. The following five items loaded on the first factor: Q64, Q66, Q63, Q53, and Q52 (see Appendix B). The researcher named the first factor *Direct Services and Data-Driven Practices,* as each item that loaded on this factor described direct services with students (e.g., small groups and classroom lesson) and using data to inform and evaluate effectiveness. The following 12 items loaded on the second factor: Q34, Q54, Q42, Q67, Q22, Q46, Q26, Q70, Q33, Q69, Q44, and Q31. The researcher named the second factor *Academic Advising and Special Education Process,* as each item that loaded on this factor described responsibilities within the academic realm (e.g., academic planning, course sequencing, knowledge of FERPA, college/career needs, etc.) and closely related to the special education process (e.g., IEPs, special education referral process, and 504 process). The following five items loaded on the third factor: Q10, Q11, Q8, Q27, and Q7. The researcher named this factor *Collaboration and Consultation with Stakeholders,* as all items involved collaborative relationships and integrative responsibilities between school counselors and others (e.g., students, parents, teachers, and staff). The following nine items loaded on the fourth factor: Q56, Q57, Q6, Q32, Q4, Q12, Q62, Q41, and Q50. The researcher named this factor *Cultural Competence and Advocacy*, as all items pertained to awareness of and competency in individual differences (e.g., awareness of cultural differences, multicultural competency in delivery of services, knowledge regarding the needs of underserved students, and knowledge of mental health disorders) and multiple forms of advocacy on behalf of students (e.g., interventions of at-risk students, reports to Child Protective Services, conducting threat assessments, and knowledge of community resources). The following 17 items loaded on the fifth factor: Q39, Q60, Q16,

Q61, Q19, Q23, Q3, Q25, Q24, Q58, Q28, Q59, Q38, Q5, Q43, Q51, and Q30. The researcher named this factor *Professional Dispositions and Behaviors*, as each item pertained to basic school counseling skills (e.g., expresses empathy, builds rapport with students, creates school counseling goals, and demonstrates ability to collect student data) or professional dispositions (e.g., willingness to accept feedback, demonstrates professional conduct, maintains appropriate boundaries, and timeliness).

Validity and Reliability Analyses

The researcher established multiple types of validity and reliability for the SCICS, including face, content, factorial, convergent, concurrent, and incremental validity, as well as internal consistency and split-half reliability. Firstly, face and content validity were established through qualitative inquiry that created the item pool, as well as expert review and piloting of the instrument. Factorial validity was achieved through conducting EFA. In terms of evidence for convergent validity, the researcher found overall SCICS scores to be moderately related to overall CCS-R scores ($r = .54$). To establish concurrent validity, or the notion that the SCICS can distinguish between groups that should theoretically different, the researcher conducted a t-test, comparing total SCICS scores of first semester internship students and second semester students. There was a significant difference between first semester internship students ($M = 182.56$, $SD = 29.89$) and second semester internship students ($M = 193.01$, $SD = 26.92$) using their overall SCICS scores [t (184) =-2.50, p = .013]. In terms of incremental validity, there was no statistically significant predictive relationship between total SCICS scores and supervisory working alliance after controlling for total CCS-R scores. Additionally, there was no significant predictive relationship between the sub-scales of the SCICS on supervisory working alliance after controlling for the overall or sub-scales for the CCS-R; however, one SCICS sub-scale was

statistically significant. Hierarchical regression analysis revealed that after controlling for total CCS-R total scores, the *Academic Advising and Special Education Process* sub-scale had a significant predictive relationship on SWAI score, $F (1, 216) = 4.44$, $p < .05$.

The researcher re-ran the original inter-correlation matrix analyses to determine Cronbach's alpha for the entire instrument as well as all items comprised within each factor. Cronbach's alpha was .98 for the overall instrument, .89 for *Direct Services and Data-Driven Practices*, .95 for *Academic Advising and Special Education Process*, .87 for *Collaboration and Consultation with Stakeholders*, .92 for *Cultural Competence and Advocacy,* and .95 for *Professional Dispositions and Behaviors*. Split-half reliability was also computed, with a Spearman-Brown Coefficient of .96.

Conclusion

This chapter provided a summary of results regarding the current study, including a review of the research questions, overview of data cleaning and screening, initial assumption checking, descriptive statistics, analysis of the inter-item correlation matrix, factor extraction and retention, an oblique factor rotation, and the process of naming factors. Additionally, this chapter discussed the process by which validity and reliability analyses were conducted to justify the practical application of this instrument in counselor education settings.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher will interpret the results of the current study. First, the researcher will summarize the problem, including the gap in the literature. Then, the results of the study will be interpreted for each research question. Next, the researcher will discuss implications for counselor education and the school counseling profession as well as provide recommendations for future research. Lastly, the chapter will conclude with limitations and a summary of the chapter.

Summary of the Problem

The goal of counselor education programs is to train successful graduates who, "demonstrate both knowledge and skill across the curriculum as well as profession dispositions" (CACREP, 2015, p. 4). In accordance with counseling professional organizations, such as ACA and CACREP, counselor educators and supervisors are required to engage in gatekeeping to identify and intervene when pre-service counselors are not equipped with proper knowledge, skills, and/or values needed for the counseling profession (DePue & Lambie, 2014; Flynn & Hays, 2015; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). While counselor education supports gatekeeping, researchers note that faculty and supervisors may be reluctant to fulfill this responsibilities, in part, due to the lack of standardized formal assessments with measurable criteria (Homrich et al., 2014; Schuermann et al., 2018). One of the most salient gatekeeping mechanisms in school counseling programs is clinical supervision, serving as a final evaluative checkpoint prior to graduation.

School counseling, one of the specialty areas within counselor education, has specialty-related courses required beyond the core counseling curriculum, in which school counseling-

specific knowledge and skills are cultivated (CACREP, 2015). Additionally, the American

School Counselor Association (ASCA) provides several documents supporting competencies and

gatekeeping in a way that emphasizes the nuances of the school counseling profession (ASCA,

2016; 2018). The finality of school counseling supervision is especially important, given that

practicing school counselor do not receive additional supervision beyond their counselor

education programs unless they intentionally seek it (Bultsma, 2012; Studer, 2005). Recently,

counselor education programs have aspired to make school counseling supervision more

consistent, applicable, and evidence-based, in alignment with trends in the school counseling

profession. However, no standardized instrument exists to evaluate school counseling interns in a

comprehensive way, attending to the nuances of school counseling, including skills, knowledge,

and dispositions. This study attends to the gap in the literature by creating and examining the

psychometric properties of a novel school counseling internship competency scale. This is the

first assessment of its kind that is not modified from mental health or teaching assessments or

standards. The research questions associated with this study include:

Research Question One

What are the underlying factors of School Counseling Internship Competency Scale

(SCICS)?

Research Question Two

What are the validity properties of the SCICS in relation to the Counseling Competencies

Scale-Revised (CCS-R) and the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Supervisor Form

(SWAI)?

Research Question Three

What are the reliability properties of the SCICS, indicated by Cronbach's alpha for the overall scale and emerging factors, and Spearman-Brown split-half reliability?

RQ #1: The Underlying Factor Structure of the SCICS

To address the first research question, the researcher evaluated all the necessary assumptions to conduct the analyses and ran Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) with a direct oblimin rotation to reveal a five-factor model. While checking the necessary assumptions to conduct EFA, the researcher recognized that the SCICS sample included moderate to high frequencies of two types of missing responses: *Not Applicable to Setting* responses and non-responses. As with all surveys, participants may omit responses to a subset of items; however, rationale behind these missing responses is often unclear (Holman et al., 2004).

'Not applicable to setting' missing data. Participants who responded to items with *Not Applicable to Setting* may be indicating that a specific SCICS item is not relevant to their particular site. For some items, this is understandable, given that roles and responsibilities can vary across school levels (Perusse et al., 2009; Scarborough, 2005; Young & Kaffenberger, 2011). For example, school counselors may be less likely to write letters of recommendation at the elementary school level as opposed to the high school level, whereas school counselors may be less likely to conduct classroom lessons at the high school level as opposed to the elementary school level. Additionally, some items may contain roles and responsibilities are considered aspirational; however, may not regularly occur in practice, due to inconsistencies across PK-12 internship settings (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). In those cases, the *Not Applicable to Setting* response aligns with specific duties that do or do not regularly take place at certain settings.

However, in instances where items represent roles and responsibilities that do exist across the PK-12 continuum, it is surprising that high frequencies of *Not Applicable to Setting* responses were recorded. For example, "demonstrates ability to conduct threat assessments (suicidal/homicidal assessment)," "demonstrates understanding of diagnostic criteria for mental health disorders" and "effectively assists students with academic planning" are considered roles and responsibilities that occur across PK-12 settings (CACREP, 2015); however, between 10.8 and 20.4% of participants listed those items as *Not Applicable to Setting*. More information is needed to determine why these items were considered not relevant to supervisors' particular settings, as these are anticipated experiences that pre-service school counselors should have prior to graduating and entering the school counseling profession.

Non-response missing data. The second type of missing data, non-responses, could indicate error, accidentally ignoring an item, or that the respondent may not have had the opportunity to evaluate that item for their intern. Since the participants did not select *Not Applicable to Setting,* it is clear that this item could be considered applicable; however, evaluating their intern for that item may not have been possible. For example, "facilitates effective parent-teacher conferences," and "conducts effective peer conflict mediation sessions" had between 11.4 % and 25.6% of non-response missing data. These items may be relevant to the school setting; however, the supervisor may not have been able to evaluate their intern for since the intern may not have had an opportunity to perform that duty. If this is the case, counselor education programs may use the SCICS as an advocacy tool to share with their prospective site supervisors to ensure that all experiences included on the instrument will be available for interns. More contextual information is needed to understand the moderate frequencies of non-response missing data.

Despite moderate to high frequencies of missing data, all necessary assumptions were met to conduct EFA with PAF analysis. Using a variety of techniques for factor retention (e.g., Kaiser criterion, Cattell's scree plot, parallel analysis, conceptual appropriateness, and meaningful variance), a five-factor model was rotated using a direct oblimin rotation. The emergent five-factor structure included the following sub-scales *Direct Services and Data-Driven Practices, Academic Advising and Special Education Process, Collaboration and Consultation with Stakeholders, Cultural Competence and Advocacy,* and *Professional Dispositions and Behaviors* The following sections include current literature that support each of these SCICS sub-scales.

Direct services and data-driven practices. The first SCICS sub-scale, *Direct Services and Data-Driven Practices*, includes five items focused on direct services with students (e.g., small groups and classroom lessons) and using data to inform and evaluate the effectiveness of programming within their comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP). Aligned with these items, literature supports that CSCPs have a positive impact on student outcomes (Carey & Dimmitt, 2012; Carey et al., 2012; Dimmitt & Wilkerson, 2012). One facet of CSCPs involves school counselors working directly with students in small-group or large-group formats (ASCA, 2012; ASCA, 2016a; ASCA, 2019; CACREP, 2015; Rose & Steen, 2014; Steen et al., 2007). Research indicates the effectiveness of small group and large group/classroom lessons on students' academic, college/career, and social/emotional concerns (ASCA, 2014; Amatea, Thompson, Rankin-Clemons, & Ettinger, 2010; Berger, 2013; Kayler & Sherman, 2009; Leon, Villares, Brigman, Webb, & Peluso, 2011; Rose & Steen, 2014). Similar to items in this sub-scale, competency in curriculum planning and group leadership are essential to successful small groups and classroom lessons held in PK-12 settings (ASCA, 2019; Lopez & Mason, 2018).

Additionally, data-driven practices, or using data to inform and evaluate programming, provides evidence for the need for student services as well as evidence for how students are different as a result of school counseling programming (ASCA, 2014; ASCA, 2019; Bruce, Getch, & Ziomek-Daigle, 2009; CACREP, 2015; Lopez & Mason, 2018). As such, the items on this sub-scale align with the direct work of school counselors with students as well as the need to utilize data to inform and evaluate these services.

Academic advising and special education process. The second SCICS sub-scale, *Academic Advising and Special Education Process*, includes 12 items focused on PK-12 academics (e.g., assists students with academic planning, understanding of course sequencing, and assesses students' college/career needs) and improving student access to education through the special education (SPED) process (e.g., Individualized Education Program/Plan (IEP) process, 504 process, and special education referral process). Academic-related competencies align with the school counselor's role in promoting academic achievement through college and career readiness interventions in primary and secondary settings (CACREP, 2015; Conley, 2010; Gilfillan, 2018; Knight, 2015; Mariani, Berger, Koerner, & Sandlin, 2017; Villares & Brigman, 2019); knowledge regarding improving graduation/promotion rates (CACREP, 2015; ASCA, 2017), course placement (Davis, Davis, & Mobley, 2013), and standardized tests (ASCA, 2017); and targeted efforts that reduce the achievement gap and improve academic-related skills (CACREP, 2015; Kayler & Sherman, 2009; Leon et al., 2011).

Furthermore, school counselors must support the academic needs of all students, including students with disabilities or special needs, who may require additional supports to access their education and fulfill their potential (ASCA, 2016b; Geddes Hall, 2015; Geltner & Leibforth, 2008). As such, knowledge regarding the IEP, 504, and SPED referral process are

essential to school counselors who, as members of teams, bring a "wealth of knowledge and skills that complements that of other school personnel" (Milsom, Goodnough, & Akos, 2007, p. 23). Therefore, the items on this sub-scale align with the literature supporting school counselors as professionals who support PK-12 students' academic achievement and access to education.

        Collaboration and consultation with stakeholders. The third SCICS sub-scale, *Collaboration and Consultation with Stakeholders,* includes five items focused collaboration/consultation with variety of stakeholders (e.g., parents, teachers, staff, etc.). School counselors exist within a system, working together on multidisciplinary teams to promote collaboration and consultation, therefore maximizing their impact (ASCA, 2012; ASCA, 2016c; ASCA, 2019; Bryan & Henry, 2012; CACREP, 2015; Cholewa et al., 2017). School counselors are able to reach more students by engaging with a variety of stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, school personnel, parents and family members, and representatives from community organizations (ASCA, 2016c; Bryan & Henry, 2012; Cholewa et al., 2017; Dinkmeyer et al., 2016; Stone & Dahir, 2016). By prioritizing relationships and valuing the combined expertise of multidisciplinary groups, collaboration and consultation can be used to define problems and implement corresponding solutions that support student needs (Cholewa et al., 2017). Research has shown that collaboration and consultation can lead to positive school and student outcomes, such as decreasing achievement gaps (Davis et al., 2013; Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy, 2010). Additionally, collaborative systemic frameworks, such as Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), address student academic, college/career, and social/emotional needs through collaborative coordinated services in PK-12 settings (ASCA, 2018c; Ziomek-Daigle, Goodman-Scott, Cavin, & Donohue, 2016). Lastly, collaborating/consulting with others is also considered a competency that supports other services,

such as successful classroom management, by seeking opportunities to engage with students and families as well as consulting with colleagues to increase effectiveness (Runyan, Grothaus, & Michel, 2019). As such, the items on this sub-scale align with research supporting school counselors as professionals who are highly collaborative with a variety of stakeholders involved with PK-12 education to maximize their effectiveness.

      Cultural competence and advocacy. The fourth SCICS sub-scale, *Cultural Competence and Advocacy,* includes nine items focused on multicultural competencies, student individual differences, and advocacy on behalf of students. As PK-12 schools are becoming more diverse, school counselors must be multiculturally competent to successfully meet the needs of diverse student populations, while also addressing equity concerns (ASCA, 2019; CACREP, 2015; Green, 2018; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). School counselors work with students who are diverse in race/ethnicity, nationality, class, cognitive and physical ability, sexual orientation, religion, and family structure; therefore, school counselors must contribute to a safe and inclusive environment that is respectful and nondiscriminatory to support all students' intersecting identities (ASCA, n.d.; ASCA, 2016a). Research supports the notion that school counselors must not only possess multicultural competencies but improve their self-awareness and behave in multicultural competent ways to deliver culturally responsive programming (ASCA, 2019; Greene, 2018). School counselors must be leaders, advocates, and systemic change agents on behalf of marginalized students to identify and remove barriers related to educational and postsecondary access and oppressive educational policies (ASCA, 2012; ASCA, 2015b; ASCA, 2019; Green, 2018; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Ratts et al., 2007; Ratts & Greenleaf, 2018). Research supports the multicultural items on this SCICS sub-scale by

mandating that school counselors possess the necessary knowledge and skills to work with diverse students and meet their needs in a culturally responsive way.

Additionally, this sub-scale includes school counseling competencies that relate to students' individual differences (e.g., mental health disorders, threat assessments, trauma, etc.) and supporting students (e.g., advocating on behalf of students, community resources of referrals). Research indicates that one in five children and adolescents have a mental health disorder and suicide is the third leading cause of death in youth ages 10-24 (National Alliance on Mental Illness, 2017). Similarly, 48% of youth children under the age of 18 experience at least one adverse childhood experience (ACE), including economic hardship; witnessing violence; parental separation or divorce; living with someone who has a substance use disorder or mental health disorder; physical, sexual, or emotional abuse or neglect; parental death; parental incarceration; or unfair treatment due to race/ethnicity (Walker & Walsh, 2015). School counselors need to be equipped to support students with ACEs and mental health disorders, including knowledge of community referrals, proactive interventions, ability to conduct threat assessments for suicidal/homicidal ideation or behaviors, and reporting suspected cases of abuse of neglect to proper authorities (ASCA, 2015a; ASCA, 2016a; CACREP, 2015; Granello & Zyromski, 2018).

Since ACEs are strongly related to a myriad of negative outcomes, including poor academic performance, less engagement in school, more likely to repeat a grade, substance use disorders, high levels of stress, increased internalizing (e.g., anxiety and somatic complaints) and externalizing behaviors (e.g., aggression and attention issues), decrease job opportunities, and developmental delays, it is critical that school counselors identify students with ACEs and be proactive in advocating on their behalf (ASCA, 2016a; Liming & Grube, 2018; Walker & Walsh,

2015). Therefore, the items on this sub-scale align with recent literature supporting the need for

school counselors to competently work with diverse PK-12 students, recognize how mental

health disorders and ACEs impact students in school, and advocate on behalf of students by

amplifying their voices and addressing their specific needs.

Professional dispositions and behaviors. The fifth SCICS sub-scale, *Professional*

Dispositions and Behaviors includes 17 items focused on basic school counseling skills (e.g.,

empathy, authenticity, building rapport, and creating school counseling goals, etc.) and

professional dispositions (e.g., willing to accept feedback, professional conduct, timeliness,

maintains appropriate boundaries, appropriate dress, etc.). Firstly, school counselors must

possess basic counseling microskills to build rapport with their PK-12 students and successfully

implement interventions (ASCA, 2012; ASCA, 2016a; ASCA, 2019; CACREP, 2015; Bayne &

Jangha, 2016). Microskills include using core counseling techniques such as active listening,

empathy, authenticity, and other skills to establish a therapeutic working relationship that

encourages client/student disclosure (Kuntze, van der Molen, & Born, 2009; Ridley, Kelly, &

Mollen, 2011). Additionally, school counseling-specific skills involve collecting student data and

creating SMART goals, or school counseling goals that are specific, measurable, attainable,

realistic, and time-bound goals (ASCA, 2012; ASCA, 2019). Given the importance of data-

driven and evidence-based practices to inform and evaluate CSCPs and their related goals, these

school counseling basic skills are essential in the role of school counselors (ASCA, 2012; ASCA,

2019; Gysbers & Henderson, 2012; Martin & Carey, 2012). In addition to foundational skills,

this sub-scale includes competencies involving professional dispositions.

In accordance with gatekeeping responsibilities, counselor education programs aim to

ensure that who enter the counseling profession possess adequate personal and professional

dispositions. For example, adherence to ethical standards, maintaining appropriate boundaries, flexibility/adaptability, willingness to accept feedback, and demonstrating emotional stability are essential dispositions (ASCA, 2016a; ASCA, 2019). Additionally, school counselors must continuous assess their emotional health and personal behaviors to maintain a high standard of practice (ASCA, 2016a). These dispositions also align with an intensive case study on personal and professional dispositions for counselor education, including: (1) commitment (i.e., investment in learning, professional excellence, interpersonal competence, etc.), (2) openness (i.e., openness to ideas learning, and change; openness to growth; etc.), (3) respect (i.e., perceives and honors diversity, appropriate self-care, etc.) (4) integrity (i.e., personal responsibility, personal and professional maturity, honesty, etc.), and (5) self-awareness (i.e., humility, self-reflection and exploration, and understanding of place in history) (Spurgeon, Gibbons, & Cochran, 2012). As such, the items on this sub-scale align with the literature supporting core counseling skills, ethical standards, best practices in clinical supervision, and professional dispositions. These five sub-scales are widely supported by research and trends in school counseling, contributing to the idea that the SCICS sub-scales comprehensively represent competencies school counseling interns need to enter the school counseling profession. In addition to the underlying structure of the SCICS, the researcher evaluated the validity of the instrument..

RQ #2: The Validity of the SCICS

To address the second research question on the validity of the SCICS, the researcher evaluated multiple types of validity, including content, factorial, convergent, concurrent, and incremental validity. First, the researcher established content validity through the qualitative inquiry to create the instrument, expert review of the instrument, and piloting. The five-factor

solution revealed through EFA support factorial validity of the SCICS. For convergent validity, the moderate correlation between total SCICS scores with total scores of the CCS-R suggests that the SCICS measures similar, but not an identical construct compared to an established counseling competency scale. For concurrent validity, average total SCICS scores were compared between first and second semester school counseling interns. There was a significant difference between the groups, with second semester interns scoring higher on average when compared to their first semester counterparts. Developmentally, it is expected that second semester interns should score higher on competency scales, having have more time and experiences that have contributed to their increased professional development (Smith & Koltz, 2015). This suggests that the SCICS has concurrent validity since the instrument can distinguish between groups that should theoretically have differences.

Lastly, the researcher explored incremental validity by examining the predictive ability of the SCICS beyond the CCS-R in terms of supervisory working alliance. Researchers support the notion that as trainees become more competent, the supervisory relationship may improve and in fact, become more collegial (Johnson, Skinner, & Kaslow, 2014; Thompson & Moffett, 2010; Smith & Koltz, 2015). As such, it is anticipated that competency scales can moderately predict supervisory working alliance. The researcher sought to examine the predictive ability of the SCICS beyond that of the CCS-R, asserting that the school counseling-specific competency scale would have predictive validity beyond the core counseling competency scale on supervisory working alliance, as measured by the SWAI. While the total SCICS did not produce significant incremental validity beyond the total CCS-R, the *Academic Advising and Special Education Process* sub-scale was able to significantly predict SWAI scores beyond total CCS-R scores. As school counselors are in a unique position of being mental health providers within an academic

context, they must balance the roles of counselor and educator within their setting (Perkins, Oescher, & Ballard, 2010). Therefore, the sub-scale devoted to competencies regarding academics and access to education was found to be predictive beyond the CCS-R in terms of supervisory working alliance. Therefore, a distinguishing factor of the SCICS is that it is predictive beyond the CCS-R in terms of the role school counselors fulfill by being both a counselor and an educator, attending to the academic needs of students. Overall, these results support that the SCICS is a valid instrument for school counseling supervisors evaluating their school counseling interns. In addition to validity, the research sought to establish evidence regarding the reliability of the SCICS.

RQ #3: The Reliability of the SCICS

To address the third research question, the researcher evaluated the inter-item correlation matrix, computed Cronbach's alpha for the overall instrument as well as each sub-scale and evaluated split-half reliability. All items on the SCICS met a minimum correlation with at least half of the other items on the instrument and did not exceed maximum correlation with multiple items. This demonstrated that all items are related enough to be measuring the same construct; however, the overlap between items is not too high to suggest multicollinearity (Mvududu & Sink, 2013). Cronbach's alpha for the overall SCICS and each sub-scale were strong, suggesting that the instrument as a whole and each individual sub-scale were reliable. Split-half reliability using the Spearman-Brown Coefficient also indicated strong internal consistency. These results demonstrate that the overall SCICS and individual sub-scales are reliable measures for school counseling supervisors evaluating their school counseling interns. The results of these three research questions have direct implications to counselor education and the school counseling

profession, specifically for counselor educators who serve as university supervisors, school counseling interns, and practicing school counselors who serve as site supervisors.

Implications for Counselor Education

The results of this study contribute to the literature on school counselor preparation, including establishing school counseling internship competencies and supervision evaluation methods in accordance with gatekeeping. In comparison to existing instrumentation, the SCICS accounts for 65.5% of the variance explained by the five-factor model, whereas, the CCS-R accounts for 61.5% variance explained by a two-factor model (Lambie et al., 2018). Additionally, the psychometric properties of the CIDACS, a school counseling instrument, are unknown, as EFA was not conducted on that instrument (Hamlet & Burnes, 2013). As such, the SCICS is the first counseling competency scale that attends to both foundational skills and the nuances of school counseling, while accounting for greater explained variance compared to existing instrumentation. The implications of the current study extend to university supervisors/counseling faculty, school counseling interns, school counseling site supervisors, and most broadly, the school counseling profession.

University supervisors/counseling faculty. Firstly, the SCICS supports the mission of counselor education programs to train competent professionals that meet sufficient standards (CACREP, 2015). This instrument can be used by counselor educators who serve as university supervisors to school counseling interns. As previous counselor education research noted, many faculty and supervisors may be reluctant to fulfill gatekeeping responsibilities due to the lack of formal assessments needed to confidently evaluate students (Schuermann et al., 2018). The SCICS supports the faculty/supervisor role in the gatekeeping process as mandated by professional organizations (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2015). Since gatekeeping exists to "ensure

the health of the profession by controlling access to it" (Glance et al., 2012, p.2), this instrument be used to identify strengths and growing areas of school counseling interns. The SCICS can be used during clinical supervision by university and site supervisors, thus improving the communication between supervisor and intern as well as university and site supervisors by having a standardized and consistent evaluation tool used across settings. Lastly, this research study has implications with non-school counseling faculty. For any non-school counseling faculty who supervise school counseling interns, the SCICS can be an advocacy tool, used to educate non-school counseling faculty regarding the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for school counseling interns to cultivate throughout their internship experiences.

School counseling interns. The implications of this study also extend to school counseling interns. The SCICS provides clarification regarding the expectations counselor education programs have for school counseling internship experiences. This demystifies the internship evaluation experience for interns, providing them a formal evaluation tool with clear standards. Previous research indicated the unfair nature of poorly defined evaluation tools and inconsistent standards across graduate programs or supervisors (Homrich et al., 2014). The SCICS provides clarity and consistency in terms of assessment. While the current study has not investigated the use of the SCICS as a self-assessment tool, the use of this instrument in clinical supervision could increase intern self-reflection and foster communication between interns and supervisors regarding their strengths and growing areas. Lastly, based on the items on the SCICS, interns could use this instrument as an advocacy tool at their internship sites. This could afford interns more well-rounded internship experiences, using the SCICS as a roadmap for the various opportunities they should be experiencing at their sites.

Site supervisors. The SCICS can be used to benefit the evaluative practices of school counselors who serve as site supervisors. Similar to previous research, school counseling site supervision lacks consistency and is often viewed as inadequate (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Due to the high frequencies of *Not Applicable to Setting* responses in the current study, the SCICS can provide clear expectations for site supervisors in terms of what experiences their school counseling interns should be actively engaging in. Based on this instrument, site supervisors can better support their interns to ensure that they have a well-rounded internship experience that meet the criteria for evaluation. Additionally, this instrument can be integrated into site supervisor training, as mandated by professional organizations and recommended by counselor education researchers, to support consistent site supervision expectation, practices, and evaluation (CACREP, 2015; Slaten & Baskin, 2013). Lastly, the SCICS could improve communication between university and site supervisors, with both using the same evaluation tool, thus providing consistency across settings throughout experiential learning.

Implications for the School Counseling Profession

Beyond counselor education, the SCICS has implications that extend into the school counseling profession. By having an evidence-based and standardized instrument used in counselor education programs, the school counseling profession could see an increase in the output of highly competent and well-rounded school counseling in the field within the coming years. Previous instrumentation has not captured the nuances of the school counseling profession, whereas the SCICS supports the development and maintenance of competencies in school counselors that include foundational counseling skills and dispositions, as well as school counseling-specific skills and knowledge. This comprehensive evaluation can serve to promote

necessary school counseling-specific competencies that ultimately support all PK-12 students whom they serve throughout their profession. This instrument supports high benchmarks for competence within the profession, extending to meet the needs of diverse PK-12 students. While the SCICS was originally created to assess for school counseling interns' competencies, this instrument could be used by practicing school counselors as a way to self-evaluate and reflect on areas that could be improved or maintained through professional development. Additionally, school counselors could advocate for administrators to use this instrument to assess their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Limitations of the Current Study

As with all research, there are limitations that need to be addressed when interpreting the results. Firstly, the sample size is a limitation of the study. While a minimum STV ratio of 216 was achieved, a larger and more robust sample would yield stronger results. Similarly, a larger STV ratio would be advantageous in terms of minimizing threats to external validity. Similarly, the sample lacked diversity, with 84.8% of participants identifying as Caucasian and 85.2% identifying as women. Although these demographics are similar to that of ASCA membership (e.g., 81% Caucasian and 85% Female), more representation from diverse groups would be beneficial (ASCA, 2018a). While the sample included representation of supervisors across PK-12 settings, it is important to note that high school counselors accounted for a larger percentage (44.3%) compared to middle school (22.8%) and elementary school (28.7%), which may have impacted the results. Additionally, this sample only included supervisors from CACREP-accredited programs; therefore, it is important to interpret these results as solely representative of evaluation from CACREP-accredited programs. Another limitation of the present study is that no supervisee data was collected. As such, these results are limited to supervisor evaluations of their

supervisees. While other-efficacy ratings tend to be more representative of strengths and weaknesses, it is important to recognize that supervisee self-evaluation was not within the scope of this study (Lambie & Ascher, 2016; Lent & Lopez, 2002). As with all survey research, survey fatigue presents as a limitation; however, the current study had minimal attrition, beginning with 230 participants and ending with 219 participants who took 18 minutes on average to complete the instrument. Lastly, despite anonymity, there may be a minimal level of social desirability from university and site supervisors to evaluate their interns in a way that is positive.

In terms of the methodology, there are several limitations. Firstly, EFA is only used to evaluate latent factor structure and does not test hypotheses or theories. Additionally, the current study did not look at group differences to identify whether response patterns varied based on setting (e.g., primary or secondary settings, university or site supervision), supervisor training experiences, supervision modality (e.g., face-to-face, hybrid, online, etc.), or other pertinent demographics. Another limitation included the high frequency of *Not Applicable to Setting* and missing responses in the sample. While assumptions can be made about these responses, especially regarding the potential lack of opportunity to evaluate interns on those items or district policies that may prevent interns from experiencing those items, additional research is warranted to gain understanding regarding the context. As such, these limitations can serve as a starting point for future research to address these shortcomings.

Future Research

Initial results suggest that the SCICS is a valid and reliable measure to assess for school counseling interns' competencies; however, continued quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research on the SCICS is needed to better understand school counseling competencies in terms of pre-service school counselors. Future research is needed with a larger sample to

investigate group differences (i.e., primary and secondary settings, university and site supervisors, etc.) that could indicate a need for separate instruments based on school level or setting. Additionally, future research is needed that includes the school counseling interns' voice. This research would be beneficial in understanding the use of the SCICS as a self-assessment tool and in triangulating data between the intern, site supervisor, and university supervisor. It is also recommended that future researchers continue to investigate the validity and reliability of the SCICS to justify its use with more diverse populations of supervisors and interns, particularly using Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

In terms of qualitative research, it is recommended that future research incorporates more rich contextual information regarding the way supervisors and interns conduct internship evaluation using the SCICS. For example, Concept Mapping and Consensual Qualitative Research would be advantageous methodologies to use in order to enhance understanding regarding the use of this instrument in school counseling internship. Lastly, more information is needed regarding the high frequencies of *Not Applicable to Setting* and non-response missing data in the sample. While a Latent Class Analysis could be beneficial, more contextual information through interviews or focus groups could provide greater understanding.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the psychometric properties of the SCICS, including validity and reliability. The researcher uncovered the latent structure of the instrument with university and site school counseling supervisors evaluating their interns using EFA with a direct oblimin rotation. Results revealed a five-factor structure, including *Direct Services and Data-Driven Practices*, *Academic Advising and Special Education Process*, *Collaboration and Consultation with Stakeholders*, *Cultural Competence and Advocacy*, and *Professional*

Dispositions and Behaviors. These sub-scales are representative of existing literature, evidence-based practices, and emerging trends in school counseling. The results also support that the SCICS is a valid and reliable measure for assessing school counseling interns. Despite limitations for the current study, the results can be applied to counselor education, including university supervisors/faculty, school counseling interns, and site supervisors, as well as implications for the school counseling profession. Recommendations for future research have also been provided.

CHAPTER SIX

MANUSCRIPT

The Psychometric Properties of the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale

Melanie Burgess, Emily Goodman-Scott, Gülşah Kemer,

Kristy Carlisle, and Robert Carlisle

Old Dominion University

The Psychometric Properties of the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale

As mandated by professional organizations, such as the American Counseling Association *Code of Ethics* (ACA, 2014) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs standards (CACREP, 2015), counselor educators and supervisors are required to engage in gatekeeping to identify and intervene when pre-service counselors are not equipped with proper knowledge, skills, and/or values needed for the counseling profession (DePue & Lambie, 2014; Flynn & Hays, 2015; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). School counseling, one of the specialty areas within counselor education, has its own set of specialty-related courses required beyond the basic core counseling curriculum, in which school counseling specific knowledge, skills, and competencies are cultivated (CACREP, 2015).

Theoretical Framework

The concept of competence-based education and training (CBET) operates as the theoretical foundation for this study. CBET is a versatile theory that can be applied to many areas of training, including curriculum models, professional standards, and forms of assessment (Burke, 1989). It refers to the expectation that trainees will adequately demonstrate knowledge and skills at a level of minimal competency required to grant a license, degree, and/or certification in a particular vocation (Horder, 1996; Kelly & Horder, 2001; O'Hagan, 1996). In CBET assessment, trainees are evaluated to determine whether they meet pre-defined criteria and professional standards (Burke, 1989). The goal of CBET assessment is to identify those who have successfully met the benchmarks needed to perform a job and determine those who do not meet the standards, recognizing that they are either unfit for the job or require remediation.

The concept of CBET supports counselor education by maintaining standards of practice, adherence to strict ethical codes, and evaluation within the overall counseling profession, as well

as in the individual specialty area. As supported by CACREP, counselor education graduates should, "demonstrate both knowledge and skill across the curriculum as well as profession dispositions" (CACREP, 2015, p. 4). Additionally, the American Counseling Association's (ACA) *Code of Ethics* cites particular standards that practicing counselors should uphold, noting that one of the core professional values includes, "practicing in a competent and ethical manner" (ACA, 2014, p. 3).

School Counselor Preparation

The field of school counseling is vast and complex, as school counselors are often seen as both counselors and educators, charged with attending to diverse needs of PK-12 students while maintaining high levels of professional competence. The training of pre-service school counselors has become more formalized over the years, especially with the recent creation of the ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselor Education (ASCA, 2018a). School counselor educators are charged with training competent pre-service school counselors who accomplish a variety of roles and responsibilities (ASCA, 2018a).

School counselors fulfill many roles while implementing a comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP), such as the ASCA National Model. CSCPs are individualized programs run by school counselors based on school needs and student's academic, career, and social/emotional needs, while using data to both inform programming and evaluate effectiveness (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012). School counselor education programs aim to best prepare pre-service school counselors for these multifaceted job roles through adequate training, experiential learning, and evaluation by way of coursework, comprehensive exams, practicum/internship experiences, and supervisory evaluation to support gatekeeping responsibilities (CACREP, 2015).

Gatekeeping

Counselor educators are charged with developing necessary competencies in pre-service school counselors. The cultivation of counseling competencies is a complex task, requiring learning and experiential practice with ongoing self-awareness through formative and summative evaluations (CACREP, 2015; DePue & Lambie, 2014; Flynn & Hays, 2015; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). Gatekeeping has been defined as the process whereby pre-service counselors who are unprepared with knowledge, skills, and/or values are identified, and counselor educators intervene for the sake of the counseling profession (Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). Gatekeeping exists in the counseling profession as a, "mechanism that aims to ensure the health of the profession by controlling access to it" (Glance, Fanning, Schoepke, Soto, & Williams, 2012, p.2). ACA and CACREP recommend that counselor educators take the lead on gatekeeping to provide remedial assistance to students, including directing them to a different field of study, if necessary (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2015).

Over the years, a variety of procedures and frameworks have been developed, focusing on streamlining the process of identifying and evaluating students with deficits; however, much of the literature involves qualitative data on counselor educators' perspectives on gatekeeping (Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). Research highlights the importance of the gatekeeping process in counselor education, but also the need for standardized evaluations as a part of both the gatekeeping and remediation processes (Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). Additionally, research has shown the importance of and need for formal assessments to measure competencies for clinical experiences, which could lead to consistent gatekeeping procedures across programs (Schuermann et al., 2018). Researchers highlight the importance of gatekeeping within counselor education; however, school counseling-specific gatekeeping is a notable gap in the literature

Homrich et al., 2014; Schuermann, et al., 2018; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010). Although gatekeeping occurs during many phases of graduate training, clinical supervision during internship is a major milestone regarding student feedback and evaluation.

Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision serves many purposes in counselor education, including as a gatekeeping mechanism to evaluate pre-service counselors and provide feedback on clinical skills and professional dispositions. In the most general sense, clinical supervision is defined as a process whereby an experienced professional observes and advises a novice professional, to monitor content learned and skills acquired, while also adhering to graduate gatekeeping practices to ensure that only qualified candidates enter the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Supervision plays an integral role for pre-service counselors by contributing to professional identity, promoting strong counseling skills, ensuring the well-being of clients, and serving as a gatekeeping practice (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014).

Assessment

In discussing the importance of gatekeeping and supervision, it is well known that clinical supervisors (i.e., university and site) are the most frequent evaluators of counseling practicum and internship students (Lambie & Ascher, 2016). While supervision primarily involves teaching, counseling, consultation, and feedback; evaluation, or the determination of adequate skills, knowledge, and dispositions, also occurs during supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Borders, 1991). Evaluation methods in graduate training programs vary tremendously; however, many programs use other-efficacy ratings (Lent & Lopez, 2002; Kemer, Eustice, and Luby, 2017). While self-evaluation in supervision is meaningful, more often, other-efficacy ratings, or the perspectives and beliefs regarding the efficacy of another person's

performance are more representative of trainee's strengths and weaknesses (Lambie & Ascher, 2016; Lent & Lopez, 2002). As noted previously, the ACA (2014) *Code of Ethics* and CACREP (2015) standards outline the importance of standards of practice; however, there is a gap in the literature for evaluating and operationally defining the minimum competency level at which trainees can graduate and enter the profession (Lambie & Ascher, 2016).

Presently, the counseling profession recognizes the importance of training competent pre-service counselors, with a myriad of professional standards (e.g., ACA, 2014; AMHCA, 2015; ASCA, 2012b; ASCA; 2016; ASCA, 2018a; CACREP, 2015; IAMFC, 2017) that emphasize the need to evaluate competencies and engage in gatekeeping procedures to protect access to the profession. However, there are significant gaps in the research regarding school counseling-specific gatekeeping and evaluation. While various counseling competency instruments exist (e.g., Flynn & Hays, 2015; Hamlet & Burnes, 2013; Kemer et al., 2017; Swank et al., 2013), none effectively evaluate pre-service school counselors in a valid and reliable manner. The current study attends to these gaps in the literature, aiming to create the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale, by which university and site supervisors can evaluate school counseling internship students in master's level counseling programs in accordance with their gatekeeping responsibilities. This study also aims to conduct Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to determine the latent structure of the instrument while also examining convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity as compared to the Counseling Competencies Scale-Revised and Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Supervisor Form. The psychometric properties of this inventory will be examined to determine whether it should be used in school counselor education programs.

Research Questions

The research questions associated with this study include:

Research Question One

What are the underlying factors of School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS)?

Research Question Two

What are the validity properties of the SCICS in relation to the Counseling Competencies Scale-Revised (CCS-R) and the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Supervisor Form (SWAI)?

Research Question Three

What are the reliability properties of the SCICS, indicated by Cronbach's alpha for the overall scale and emerging factors, and Spearman-Brown split-half reliability?

Method

Participants were recruited to assist in building the item base of the inventory, piloting the inventory, and responding to the revised inventory. The criteria for inclusion in this study include current university and site school counseling supervisors. Specifically, participants included school counseling faculty (i.e., university supervisors) who, (1) graduated from master's level counselor education programs with a school counseling focus, (2) earned their doctorate in counselor education and supervision or a related field, and (3) are currently (or within the past two years) supervising school counseling interns at a university setting. Additionally, participants included professional school counselors (i.e., site supervisors) who, (1) graduated from a master's level counseling program with a school counseling focus, (2) are full-time professional school counselors, and (3) are currently (or within the past two years) supervising school counseling interns.

The research study utilized an exploratory sequential mixed methods approach, which is characterized by qualitative data collection and analysis, followed by quantitative data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2014). According to researchers (e.g., Creswell, 2014; Hanson et al., 2005; Mertens, 2003; Punch, 1998), exploratory sequential mixed methods is an advantageous approach when developing and evaluating new instruments or refining and testing theories. Specifically, the American Educational Research Association (AERA), American Psychological Association (APA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME) published *Standards for Education and Psychological Testing* and acknowledged the critical nature of qualitative inquiry to inform instrument creation and validation (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014).

During the first part of the exploratory sequential approach, the researcher collected and analyzed qualitative data to support rigorous instrument creation, as outlined below. Following, the researcher completed the quantitative portion of the study by conducting exploratory factor analysis on the instrument. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is further broken down into multiple phases, as adapted from Mvududu and Sink's (2013), "steps in conducting an EFA." These phases included: (1) instrument creation using Garner, Freeman, and Lee's (2016) approach, as outlined below, (2), pilot testing and revising, (3) sample size estimation, (4) administering revised instrument to a broader participant pool, (5) screening and checking for parametric assumptions (6) creating correlation matrices and inspecting for factorability, (7) factor extraction, (8) factor retention, (9) factor rotation, (10) naming factors, and (11) validity and reliability analyses.

Results

The researcher evaluated the initial sample of 316 participants to determine the presence of data entry errors, irregular response patterns, and missing information. First, the researcher

conducted an SPSS missing values analysis, which revealed that between .6% and 48.4% of data were missing across SCICS instrument items, including two types of missing data: *Not Applicable to Setting* missing data and *Non-response* missing data. It was anticipated that participants at varying school levels would utilize the *Not Applicable to Setting* response for items that did not pertain to their setting, as school counselors can have varying roles and responsibilities across levels (Young & Kaffenberger, 2011; Perusse, Goodnough, & Lee, 2009; Scarborough, 2005). However, the high degree to which participants relied on *Not Applicable to Setting* was surprising, given that the majority of roles and responsibilities are consistent across PK-12 settings (CACREP, 2015; Goodman-Scott, 2015).

Researchers support multiple methods for addressing missing or 'not applicable' data, including the removal of items with significantly high frequencies of missing data (Holman, Glas, Lindenboom, Zwinderman, & de Haan, 2004; Putnam & Rothbart, 2006; Vedsted, Sokolowski, & Heje, 2008). When selecting an adequate cut-off point, researchers suggest that online surveys typically have a between a 30-35% response rate, with recent counseling literature indicating average response rates for school counselors (34.2%), university faculty (43.9%), and counseling professional association members (20.1%) (Nulty, 2008; Poynton, DeFouw, & Morizio, 2019). As the majority of participants in this sample are school counselors, and the researcher elected to use a conservative value for item suppression to maintain as much of the original survey structure; therefore, the researcher removed all SCICS instrument items with more than 34% missing data. As a result, the researcher removed nine items from the instrument. Additionally, 63 participants were removed for having more than 5% of their data missing Next, the researcher used Expectation Maximization (EM) to replace missing data that accounted for less that 5%. Lastly, all items were screened to ensure that all data were within the minimum or

maximum range on the Likert-type scale for each instrument. All necessary assumptions were met to conduct EFA, including normality of the data, Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test, and evaluation of skew and kurtosis for each item. Twenty-three univariate and multivariate outliers were removed from the sample. This resulted in 230 usable participants based on a 63-item SCICS instrument.

Participants included 72.6% ($n = 167$) identified as site supervisors and 27.4% ($n = 63$) identified as university supervisors. Descriptive statistics were calculated for Gender, with 85.2% ($n = 196$) identified as female and 14.8% ($n = 34$) identified as male. For race/ethnicity, 7% ($n = 16$) identified as African American, .4% ($n = 1$) as Asian-American/Pacific Islander, .9% ($n = 2$) as American Indian/Native American, 84.8% ($n = 195$) as Caucasian, 3.5% ($n = 8$) as Hispanic/Latino/a, 3% ($n = 7$) as Biracial/Multi-Racial, and .4% ($n = 1$) as Other. University supervisors reported their academic position, with 33.9% ($n = 21$) as Assistant Professor, 24.2% ($n = 15$) as Associate Professor, 29% ($n = 18$) as Professor, 1.6% ($n = 1$) as Instructor, and 11.3% ($n = 7$) as Adjunct). Site supervisors reported employment across PK-12 settings, including 28.7% ($n = 48$) at elementary, 22.8% ($n = 38$) at middle, 44.3% ($n = 74$) at high, and 4.2% ($n = 7$) at other school settings, such as PK-12. Site supervisors reported caseloads ranging from 6 to 850 ($M = 375.3$, $SD = 167.9$). Participants were able to select multiple professional credentials that applied to them, including 23% ($n = 23$) with NCC, 21.3% ($n = 49$) with LPC credential, 7% ($n = 16$) with Approved Clinical Supervisor (NBCC credential), 85.2% ($n = 196$) with Licensed School Counselor credential, 11.3% ($n = 23$) with National Certified School Counselor (NBCC credential), and 10% ($n = 23$) as Other.

The researcher computed an inter-item correlation matrix to further investigate whether this dataset met the necessary parametric assumptions for EFA. The matrix and established that

each SCICS item met a minimum correlation of .30 with at least half of the other items,

suggesting that the items are all measuring a similar construct (Field, 2013). Additionally, visual

inspection of the matrix determined that no items had correlations that exceeded .85 with

multiple items, which would suggest multicollinearity (Field, 2013: Mvududu & Sink, 2013).

Next, the researcher conducted initial reliability statistics between all items and established a

Cronbach's alpha of .98. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of

Sampling Adequacy (KMO) were also used to determine whether the correlation matrix is

factorable (Mvududu and Sink, 2013). Bartlett's Test indicated significance, (χ^2 (1953) =

12629.78, $p < .000$), suggesting homogeneity of variance in the data set. The KMO coefficient

was .96, exceeding the benchmark of .80, which suggests that the matrix is ideal for conducting

factor analysis (Pett et al., 2003). At this point, all assumptions were met in terms of normality,

inter-item correlations, and factorability that support the next phase of conducting the EFA.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

In the current analysis, the researcher used principal axis factoring (PAF) as the

extraction method, using multiple methods to determine the appropriate number of factors to

extract and retain. Firstly, using the Kaiser criterion, factors were extracted with Eigenvalues

greater than one. This initial solution yielded an eight-factor model that accounted for 63.7% of

the variance. Following, the researcher inspected the Cattell's scree plot, which revealed a three-

factor solution. Additionally, the researcher conducted a parallel analysis, which is a more

rigorous method to determine that number of factors to rotate. Parallel analysis compares EVs to

a randomly generated dataset that has similar characteristics, but no underlying factors (Field,

2013). Parallel analysis revealed a five-factor solution. The researcher also evaluated the

meaningful variance and the conceptual appropriateness of the instrument in practice. Based on

Kaiser criterion, parallel analysis, visual inspection of the scree plot, meaningful variance, and conceptual appropriateness, the researcher elected to retain and rotate five factors using a direct oblimin rotation.

The researcher selected a direct oblimin rotation (delta = 0) due to the clear interpretation of the model, the least evidence of cross-loadings, and strong conceptual appropriateness. The following retention criteria were used: factor loadings > .35, commonalities >.30, and cross loadings < .32 (Beavers et al., 2013). Due to violations in retention criteria, 15 items were removed from the item pool. The following items were retained in the instrument despite moderate cross loadings due to the conceptual appropriateness of those items in practice: Q12 ("Demonstrates ability to conduct threat assessments"), Q41 ("Demonstrates ability to make a report to Child Protective Services"), and Q63 ("Engages students in classroom lessons"). The results revealed a 48-item instrument that accounted for 65.5% of the variance explained by the five-factor model. The commonalities ranged from .51 to .77. Factor inter-correlations were between .25 and .61 suggesting that low to moderate correlations exist between factors.

The researcher looked for themes in each sub-scale and relied on school counseling literature to inform the naming process for each factor. The following five items loaded on the first factor: Q64, Q66, Q63, Q53, and Q52 (see Appendix B). The researcher named the first factor *Direct Services and Data-Driven Practices,* as each item that loaded on this factor described direct services with students (e.g., small groups and classroom lesson) and using data to inform and evaluate effectiveness. The following 12 items loaded on the second factor: Q34, Q54, Q42, Q67, Q22, Q46, Q26, Q70, Q33, Q69, Q44, and Q31. The researcher named the second factor *Academic Advising and Special Education Process,* as each item that loaded on this factor described responsibilities within the academic realm (e.g., academic planning, course

sequencing, knowledge of FERPA, college/career needs, etc.) and closely related to the special education process (e.g., IEPs, special education referral process, and 504 process). The following five items loaded on the third factor: Q10, Q11, Q8, Q27, and Q7. The researcher named this factor *Collaboration and Consultation with Stakeholders,* as all items involved collaborative relationships and integrative responsibilities between school counselors and others (e.g., students, parents, teachers, and staff). The following nine items loaded on the fourth factor: Q56, Q57, Q6, Q32, Q4, Q12, Q62, Q41, and Q50. The researcher named this factor *Cultural Competence and Advocacy*, as all items pertained to awareness of and competency in individual differences (e.g., awareness of cultural differences, multicultural competency in delivery of services, knowledge regarding the needs of underserved students, and knowledge of mental health disorders) and multiple forms of advocacy on behalf of students (e.g., interventions of at-risk students, reports to Child Protective Services, conducting threat assessments, and knowledge of community resources). The following 17 items loaded on the fifth factor: Q39, Q60, Q16, Q61, Q19, Q23, Q3, Q25, Q24, Q58, Q28, Q59, Q38, Q5, Q43, Q51, and Q30. The researcher named this factor *Professional Dispositions and Behaviors*, as each item pertained to basic school counseling skills (e.g., expresses empathy, builds rapport with students, creates school counseling goals, and demonstrates ability to collect student data) or professional dispositions (e.g., willingness to accept feedback, demonstrates professional conduct, maintains appropriate boundaries, and timeliness).

Validity and Reliability Analyses

The researcher established multiple types of validity and reliability for the SCICS, including face, content, factorial, convergent, concurrent, and incremental validity, as well as internal consistency and split-half reliability. Firstly, face and content validity were established

through qualitative inquiry that created the item pool, as well as expert review and piloting of the instrument. Factorial validity was achieved through conducting EFA. In terms of evidence for convergent validity, the researcher found overall SCICS scores to be moderately related to overall CCS-R scores ($r = .54$). To establish concurrent validity, or the notion that the SCICS can distinguish between groups that should theoretically different, the researcher conducted a t-test, comparing total SCICS scores of first semester internship students and second semester students. There was a significant difference between first semester internship students ($M = 182.56$, $SD = 29.89$) and second semester internship students ($M = 193.01$, $SD = 26.92$) in terms of their overall SCICS scores [t (184) =-2.50, p = .013]. Hierarchical regression analysis revealed that after controlling for CCS-R total scores, the *Academic Advising and Special Education Process* sub-scale had a significant predictive relationship on SWAI score, F (1, 216) = 4.44, p < .05.

The researcher re-ran the original inter-correlation matrix analyses to determine Cronbach's alpha for the entire instrument as well as all items comprised within each factor. Cronbach's alpha was .98 for the overall instrument, .89 for *Direct Services and Data-Driven Practices*, .95 for *Academic Advising and Special Education Process*, .87 for *Collaboration and Consultation with Stakeholders*, .92 for *Cultural Competence and Advocacy*, and .95 for *Professional Dispositions and Behaviors*. Split-half reliability was also computed, with a Spearman-Brown Coefficient of .96.

Discussion

RQ #1: The Underlying Factor Structure of the SCICS

To address the first research question, the researcher evaluated all the necessary assumptions to conduct the analyses and ran Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) with a direct oblimin rotation to reveal a five-factor model. Despite moderate to high frequencies of missing

data, all necessary assumptions were met to conduct EFA with PAF analysis. Using a variety of techniques for factor retention (e.g., Kaiser criterion, Cattell's scree plot, parallel analysis, conceptual appropriateness, and meaningful variance), a five-factor model was rotated using a direct oblimin rotation. The emergent five-factor structure included the following sub-scales *Direct Services and Data-Driven Practices, Academic Advising and Special Education Process, Collaboration and Consultation with Stakeholders, Cultural Competence and Advocacy,* and *Professional Dispositions and Behaviors.* The following sections include current literature that support each of these SCICS sub-scales.

      Direct services and data-driven practices. The first SCICS sub-scale, *Direct Services and Data-Driven Practices*, includes five items focused on direct services with students (e.g., small groups and classroom lessons) and using data to inform and evaluate the effectiveness of programming within their comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP). Aligned with these items, literature supports that CSCPs have a positive impact on student outcomes (Carey & Dimmitt, 2012; Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Hoffman, 2012; Dimmitt & Wilkerson, 2012). One facet of CSCPs involves school counselors working directly with students in small-group or large-group formats (ASCA, 2012a; ASCA, 2016a; ASCA, 2019; CACREP, 2015; Rose & Steen, 2014; Steen, Bauman, & Smith, 2007). Research indicates the effectiveness of small group and large group/classroom lessons on students' academic, college/career, and social/emotional concerns (ASCA, 2014; Amatea, Thompson, Rankin-Clemons, & Ettinger, 2010; Berger, 2013; Kayler & Sherman, 2009; Leon, Villares, Brigman, Webb, & Peluso, 2011; Rose & Steen, 2014). Additionally, data-driven practices, or using data to inform and evaluate programming, provides evidence for the need for student services as well as evidence for how students are different as a result of school counseling programming (ASCA, 2014; ASCA, 2019;

Bruce, Getch, & Ziomek-Daigle, 2009; CACREP, 2015; Lopez & Mason, 2018). As such, the items on this sub-scale align with the direct work of school counselors with students as well as the need to utilize data to inform and evaluate these services.

Academic advising and special education process. The second SCICS sub-scale, *Academic Advising and Special Education Process*, includes 12 items focused on PK-12 academics (e.g., assists students with academic planning, understanding of course sequencing, and assesses students' college/career needs) and improving student access to education through the special education (SPED) process (e.g., Individualized Education Program/Plan (IEP) process, 504 process, and special education referral process). Furthermore, school counselors must support the academic needs of all students, including students with disabilities or special needs, who may require additional supports to access their education and fulfill their potential (ASCA, 2016b; Geddes Hall, 2015; Geltner & Leibforth, 2008). As such, knowledge regarding the IEP, 504, and SPED referral process are essential to school counselors who, as members of teams, bring a "wealth of knowledge and skills that complements that of other school personnel" (Milsom, Goodnough, & Akos, 2007, p. 23). Therefore, the items on this sub-scale align with the literature supporting school counselors as professionals who support PK-12 students' academic achievement and access to education.

Collaboration and consultation with stakeholders. The third SCICS sub-scale, *Collaboration and Consultation with Stakeholders,* includes five items focused collaboration/consultation with variety of stakeholders (e.g., parents, teachers, staff, etc.). School counselors exist within a system, working together on multidisciplinary teams to promote collaboration and consultation, therefore maximizing their impact (ASCA, 2012; ASCA, 2016c; ASCA, 2019; CACREP, 2015; Cholewa, Goodman-Scott, Thomas, & Cook, 2017; Bryan &

Henry, 2012). School counselors are able to reach more students by engaging with a variety of stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, school personnel, parents and family members, and representatives from community organizations (ASCA, 2016c; Bryan & Henry, 2012; Cholewa et al., 2017; Dinkmeyer, Carlson, & Michel, 2016; Stone & Dahir, 2016). By prioritizing relationships and valuing the combined expertise of multidisciplinary groups, collaboration and consultation can be used to define problems and implement corresponding solutions that support student needs (Cholewa et al., 2017). Research has shown that collaboration and consultation can lead to positive school and student outcomes, such as decreasing achievement gaps (Davis et al., 2013; Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy, 2010). Additionally, collaborative systemic frameworks, such as Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), address student academic, college/career, and social/emotional needs through collaborative coordinated services in PK-12 settings (ASCA, 2018b; Ziomek-Daigle, Goodman-Scott, Cavin, & Donohue, 2016). As such, the items on this sub-scale align with research supporting school counselors as professionals who are highly collaborative with a variety of stakeholders involved with PK-12 education to maximize their effectiveness.

Cultural competence and advocacy. The fourth SCICS sub-scale, *Cultural Competence and Advocacy,* includes nine items focused on multicultural competencies, student individual differences, and advocacy on behalf of students. As PK-12 schools are becoming more diverse, school counselors must be multiculturally competent to successfully meet the needs of diverse student populations, while also addressing equity concerns (ASCA, 2019; CACREP, 2015; Green, 2018; Holcomb-McCoy, 2008). School counselors work with students who are diverse in race/ethnicity, nationality, class, cognitive and physical ability, sexual orientation, religion, and family structure; therefore, school counselors must contribute to a safe and inclusive

environment that is respectful and nondiscriminatory to support all students' intersecting identities (ASCA, n.d.; ASCA, 2016a). Research supports the notion that school counselors must not only possess multicultural competencies but improve their self-awareness and behave in multicultural competent ways to deliver culturally responsive programming (ASCA, 2019; Greene, 2018). School counselors must be leaders, advocates, and systemic change agents on behalf of marginalized students to identify and remove barriers related to educational and postsecondary access and oppressive educational policies (ASCA, 2012; ASCA, 2015b; ASCA, 2019; Green, 2018; Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnston, 2008; Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007; Ratts & Greenleaf, 2018).

Additionally, this sub-scale includes school counseling competencies that relate to students' individual differences (e.g., mental health disorders, threat assessments, trauma, etc.) and supporting students (e.g., advocating on behalf of students, community resources of referrals). Research indicates that one in five children and adolescents have a mental health disorder suicide is the third leading cause of death in youth ages 10-24 (National Alliance on Mental Illness, 2017). Similarly, 48% of youth children under the age of 18 experience at least one adverse childhood experience (ACE) (Walker & Walsh, 2015). School counselors need to be equipped to support students with ACEs and mental health disorders, including knowledge of community referrals, proactive interventions, ability to conduct threat assessments for suicidal/homicidal ideation or behaviors, and reporting suspected cases of abuse of neglect to proper authorities (ASCA, 2015; ASCA, 2016a; CACREP, 2015; Granello & Zyromski, 2018). Therefore, the items on this sub-scale align with recent literature supporting the need for school counselors to competently work with diverse PK-12 students, recognize how mental health

disorders and ACEs impact students in school, and advocate on behalf of students by amplifying their voices and addressing their specific needs.

Professional dispositions and behaviors. The fifth SCICS sub-scale, *Professional Dispositions and Behaviors* includes 17 items focused on basic school counseling skills (e.g., empathy, authenticity, building rapport, and creating school counseling goals, etc.) and professional dispositions (e.g., willing to accept feedback, professional conduct, timeliness, maintains appropriate boundaries, appropriate dress, etc.). Firstly, school counselors must possess basic counseling microskills to build rapport with their PK-12 students and successfully implement interventions (ASCA, 2012; ASCA, 2016a; ASCA, 2019; CACREP, 2015; Bayne & Awa Jangha, 2016). Microskills include using core counseling techniques such as active listening, empathy, authenticity, and other skills to establish a therapeutic working relationship that encourages client/student disclosure (Kuntze, van der Molen, & Born, 2009; Ridley, Kelly, & Mollen, 2011). Additionally, school counseling-specific skills involve collecting student data and creating SMART goals, or school counseling goals that are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound goals (ASCA, 2012; ASCA, 2019). Given the importance of data-driven and evidence-based practices to inform and evaluate CSCPs and their related goals, these school counseling basic skills are essential in the role of school counselors (ASCA, 2012; ASCA, 2019). In addition to foundational skills, this sub-scale includes competencies involving professional dispositions.

In accordance with gatekeeping responsibilities, counselor education programs aim to ensure that who enter the counseling profession possess adequate personal and professional dispositions. For example, adherence to ethical standards, maintaining appropriate boundaries, flexibility/adaptability, willingness to accept feedback, and demonstrating emotional stability are

essential dispositions (ASCA, 2016a; ASCA, 2019). Additionally, school counselors must

continuous assess their emotional health and personal behaviors to maintain a high standard of

practice (ASCA, 2016a). These dispositions also align with an intensive case study on personal

and professional dispositions for counselor education, including: (1) commitment (i.e.,

investment in learning, professional excellence, interpersonal competence, etc.), (2)openness

(i.e., openness to ideas learning, and change; openness to growth; etc.), (3) respect (i.e.,

perceives and honors diversity, appropriate self-care, etc.) (4) integrity (i.e., personal

responsibility, personal and professional maturity, honesty, etc.), and (5) self-awareness (i.e.,

humility, self-reflection and exploration, and understanding of place in history) (Spurgeon,

Gibbons, & Cochran, 2012). As such, the items on this sub-scale align with the literature

supporting core counseling skills, ethical standards, best practices in clinical supervision, and

professional dispositions. These five sub-scales are widely supported by research and trends in

school counseling, contributing to the idea that the SCICS sub-scales comprehensively represent

competencies school counseling interns need to enter the school counseling profession. In

addition to the underlying structure of the SCICS, the researcher evaluated the validity of the

instrument.

RQ #2: The Validity of the SCICS

To address the second research question on the validity of the SCICS, the researcher

evaluated multiple types of validity, including content, factorial, convergent, concurrent, and

incremental validity. First, the researcher established content validity through the qualitative

inquiry to create the instrument, expert review of the instrument, and piloting. The five-factor

solution revealed through EFA support factorial validity of the SCICS. The researcher compared

total SCICS scores with total scores of the CCS-R to determine convergent validity. A moderate

correlation of $r = .54$ suggests that the SCICS measures similar constructs compared to an established counseling competency scale. For concurrent validity, average total SCICS scores were compared between first and second semester school counseling interns. There was a significant difference between the groups, with second semester interns scoring higher on average when compared to their first semester counterparts. Developmentally, it is expected that second semester interns should score higher on competency scales, having have more time and experiences that have contributed to their professional development (Smith & Koltz, 2015). This suggests that the SCICS has concurrent validity since the instrument can distinguish between groups that should theoretically have differences.

Lastly, the researcher explored incremental validity by examining the predictive ability of the SCICS beyond the CCS-R in terms of supervisory working alliance. Research supports the notion that as trainees become more competent, the supervisory relationship may improve and in fact, become more collegial (Johnson, Skinner, & Kaslow, 2014; Thompson & Moffett, 2010; Smith & Koltz, 2015). As such, it is anticipated that competency scales can moderately predict supervisory working alliance. The researcher sought to examine the predictive ability of the SCICS beyond that of the CCS-R, asserting that the school counseling-specific competency scale would have predictive validity beyond the core counseling competency scale on supervisory working alliance, as measured by the SWAI. While the total SCICS did not produce significant incremental validity beyond the total CCS-R, the *Academic Advising and Special Education Process* sub-scale was able to significant predict SWAI scores beyond the total CCS-R. As school counselors are in a unique position of being mental health providers within an academic context, they must balance the roles of counselor and educator within their setting (Perkins, Oescher, & Ballard, 2010). Therefore, the sub-scale devoted to competencies regarding

academics and access to education was found to be predictive beyond the CCS-R in terms of supervisory working alliance. Therefore, a distinguishing factor in the SCICS that is predictive beyond the CCS-R is the role school counselors fulfill by being both a counselor and an educator, attending to the academic needs of students. Overall, these results support that the SCICS is a valid instrument for school counseling supervisors evaluating their school counseling interns. In addition to validity, the research sought to establish evidence regarding the reliability of the SCICS.

RQ #3: The Reliability of the SCICS

To address the third research question, the researcher evaluated the inter-item correlation matrix, computed Cronbach's alpha for the overall instrument as well as each sub-scale and evaluated split-half reliability. All items on the SCICS met a minimum correlation of .30 with at least half of the other items on the instrument and did not exceed a correlation of .85 with multiple items. This demonstrated that all items are related enough to be measuring the same construct; however, the overlap between items is not too high to suggest multicollinearity (Mvududu & Sink, 2013). Cronbach's alpha for the overall SCICS and each sub-scale were strong, suggesting that the instrument as a whole and each individual sub-scale were reliable. Split-half reliability using the Spearman-Brown Coefficient also indicated strong internal consistency. These results demonstrate that the overall SCICS and individual sub-scales are reliable measures for school counseling supervisors evaluating their school counseling interns.

Implications

University supervisors/counseling faculty. Firstly, the SCICS supports the mission of counselor education programs to train competent professionals that meet sufficient standards (CACREP, 2015). This instrument can be used by counselor educators who serve as university

supervisors to school counseling interns. It supports the faculty/supervisor role in the gatekeeping process as mandated by professional organizations (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2015). Since gatekeeping exists to "ensure the health of the profession by controlling access to it" (Glance et al., 2012, p.2), this instrument be used to identify strengths and growing areas of school counseling interns. The SCICS can be used during clinical supervision by university and site supervisors, thus improving the communication between supervisor and intern as well as university and site supervisors by having a standardized and consistent evaluation tool used across settings. Lastly, this research study has implications with non-school counseling faculty. For any non-school counseling faculty who supervise school counseling interns, the SCICS can be an advocacy tool, used to educate non-school counseling faculty regarding the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for school counseling interns to cultivate throughout their internship experiences.

School counseling interns. The implications of this study also extend to school counseling interns. The SCICS provides clarification regarding the expectations counselor education programs have for internship experiences. This demystifies the internship evaluation experience for interns, providing them a formal evaluation tool with clear standards. Previous research indicated the unfair nature of poorly define evaluation tools and inconsistent standards across graduate programs or supervisors (Homrich et al., 2014). The SCICS provides clarity and consistency in terms of assessment. While the current study has not investigated the use of the SCICS as a self-assessment tool, the use of this instrument in clinical supervision could increase intern self-reflection and foster communication between interns and supervisors regarding their strengths and growing areas. Lastly, based on the items on the SCICS, interns could use this instrument as an advocacy tool at their internship sites. This could afford interns more well-

rounded internship experiences, using the SCICS as a roadmap for the various opportunities they should be experiencing at their sites.

Site supervisors. The SCICS can be used to benefit the evaluative practices of school counselors who serve as site supervisors. Due to the high frequencies of *Not Applicable to Setting* responses in the current study, the SCICS can provide clear expectations for site supervisors in terms of what experiences their school counseling interns should be actively engaging in. Based on this instrument, site supervisors can better support their interns to ensure that they have a well-rounded internship experience that meet the criteria for evaluation. Additionally, this instrument can be integrated into site supervisor training, as mandated by professional organization to support consistent site supervision expectation, practices, and evaluation (CACREP, 2015). Lastly, the SCICS could improve communication between university and site supervisors, with both using the same evaluation tool, thus providing consistency across settings throughout experiential learning.

Implications for the School Counseling Profession

Beyond counselor education, the SCICS has implications that extend into the school counseling profession. By having an evidence-based and standardized instrument used in counselor education, the school counseling profession could see an increase in the output of highly competent and well-rounded school counseling in the field within the coming years. This instrument support high benchmarks for competence within the profession, extending to meet the needs of diverse PK-12 students. While the SCICS was originally created to assess for school counseling interns' competencies, this instrument could be used by practicing school counselors as a way to self-evaluate and reflect on areas that could be improved through professional

development. Additionally, school counselors could advocate for administrators to use this instrument to assess their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Limitations of the Current Study

As with all research, there are limitations that need to be addressed when interpreting the results. Firstly, the sample size is a limitation of the study. While a minimum STV ratio of 216 was achieved, a larger and more robust sample would yield stronger and more representative results. Similarly, a larger STV ratio would be advantageous in terms of minimizing threats to external validity. Similarly, the sample lacked diversity, with 84.8% of participants identifying as Caucasian and 85.2% identifying as women. Although these demographics are similar to that of ASCA membership (e.g., 81% Caucasian and 85% Female), more representation from diverse groups would be beneficial (ASCA, 2018a). Although these demographics are similar to that of ASCA membership (e.g., 85% Female and 81% Caucasian), more representation from diverse groups would be beneficial (ASCA, 2018a). Another limitation of the present study is that no supervisee data was collected. As such, these results are limited to supervisor evaluations of their supervisees. While other-efficacy ratings tend to be more representative of strengths and weaknesses, it is important to recognize that supervisee self-evaluation was not within the scope of this study (Lambie & Ascher, 2016; Lent & Lopez, 2002). Lastly, despite anonymity, there may be a minimal level of social desirability from university and site supervisors to evaluate their interns in a way that is positive.

In terms of the methodology, there are several limitations. Firstly, EFA is only used to evaluate latent factor structure and does not test hypotheses or theories. Additionally, the current study did not look at group differences to identify whether response patterns varied based on setting (i.e., primary or secondary settings, university or site supervision), supervisor training

experiences, or other pertinent demographics. Another limitation included the high frequency of *Not Applicable to Setting* and missing responses in the sample. While assumptions can be made about these responses, especially regarding the potential lack of opportunity to evaluate interns on those items or district policies that may prevent interns from experiencing those items, additional research is warranted to gain understanding regarding the context. As such, these limitations can serve as a starting point for future research to address these shortcomings.

Future Research

Initial results suggest that the SCICS is a valid and reliable measure to assess for school counseling interns' competencies; however, continued quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research on the SCICS is needed to better understand school counseling competencies in terms of pre-service school counselors. Future research is needed with a larger sample to investigate group differences (i.e., primary and secondary settings, university and site supervisors, etc.) that could indicate a need for separate instruments based on school level or setting. Additionally, future research is needed that includes the school counseling interns' voice. This research would be beneficial in understanding the use of the SCICS as a self-assessment tool and in triangulating data between the intern, site supervisor, and university supervisor. It is also recommended that future researchers continue to investigate the validity and reliability of the SCICS to justify its use with more diverse populations of supervisors and interns, particularly using Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

In terms of qualitative research, it is recommended that future research incorporates more rich contextual information regarding the way supervisors and interns conduct internship evaluation using the SCICS. For example, Concept Mapping and Consensual Qualitative Research would be advantageous methodologies to use in order to enhance understanding

regarding the use of this instrument in school counseling internship. Lastly, more information is needed regarding the high frequencies of *Not Applicable to Setting* or missing responses in the sample. While a Latent Class Analysis could be beneficial, more contextual information through interviews or focus groups could provide greater understanding.

References

Amatea, E. S., Thompson, I. A., Rankin-Clemons, L., & Ettinger, M. L. (2010). Becoming partners: A school-based group intervention for families of young children who are disruptive. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*(36).

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing.* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Akos, P., & Scarborough, J. L. (2004). An examination of the clinical preparation of school counselors. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44,* 96-107.

American Counseling Association. (2005). *Code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

American Counseling Association. (2014). *Code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. (2011). *Best practices in clinical supervision.* Retrieved from https://www.acesonline.net/resources/best-practices-clinical-supervision

American Mental Health Counselors Association. (2015). *AMHCA Code of Ethics.* Retrieved from http://www.amhca.org/learn/ethics

American School Counselor Association. (n.d.). *The role of the school counselor.* Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/home/rolestatement.pdf

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

American School Counselor Association. (2014). *The school counselor and group counseling.* Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/PositionStatements/ PS_Group-Counseling.pdf

American School Counselor Association. (2015a). *The school counselor and child abuse and neglect prevention*. Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/ PositionStatements/PS_ChildAbuse.pdf

American School Counselor Association. (2015b). *The school counselor and cultural diversity.* Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/PositionStatements/ PS_CulturalDiversity.pdf

American School Counselor Association. (2016a). *ASCA ethical standards for school counselors.* Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/Ethics/ EthicalStandards2016.pdf

American School Counselor Association. (2016b). *The school counselor and students with disabilities*. Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/Position Statements/PS_Disabilities.pdf

American School Counselor Association. (2016c). *The school counselor and school-family-community partnerships.* Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/ asca/PositionStatements/PS_Partnerships.pdf

American School Counselor Association. (2017). *The school counselor and high-stakes testing.* Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/PositionStatements /PS_HighStakes.pdf

American School Counselor Association. (2018a). *ASCA ethical standards for school counselor education.* Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/Ethics/SCEEthicalStandards.pdf

American School Counselor Association. (2018b). *The school counselor and multitiered system of supports.* Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/Position Statements/PS_MultitieredSupportSystem.pdf

American School Counselor Association (2019). *ASCA School Counselor Professional Standards & Competencies*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Bayne, H. B., & Jangha, A. (2016). Utilizing improvisation to teach empathy skills in counselor education. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 55*, 250-262. doi:10.1002/ceas.12052

Beavers, A. S., Lounsbury, J. W., Richards, J. K. Huck, S. W., Skolits, G. J., & Esquivel, S. L. (2013). Practical considerations for using exploratory factor analysis in educational research. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 18*(6), 1-13.

Berger, C. (2013). Bringing out the Brilliance: A counseling intervention for underachieving students. *Professional School Counseling, 17* (1), 86-96. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2013-17.80

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2014). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Bodenhorn, N., & Skaggs, G. (2005). Development of the school counselor self-efficacy scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 38*(1), 14-28.

Bohne, C., Eicker, F., & Haseloff, G. (2017). Competence-based vocational education and training (VET): an approach of shaping and networking. *European Journal of Training and Development, 41*(1), 28-38.

Borders, L. D. (1991). Supervision does not equal evaluation. *The School Counselor,38*(4), 253-255.

Brown, C. H., Olivarez, A., & DeKruyf, L. (2017). The impact of the school counselor supervision model on the self-efficacy of school counselor site supervisors. *Professional School Counseling, 21*(1), 152-160.

Bruce, A. M., Getch, Y. Q., & Ziomek-Daigle, J. (2009). Closing the gap: A group counseling approach to improve test performance of African-American students. *Professional School Counseling, 12* (6), 450-457. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2010-12.450

Bryan, J., & Henry, L. (2012). A model for building school-family-community partnerships: Principles and process. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 90*, 408-420.

Bultsma, S. A. (2012). Supervision experiences of new professional school counselors. *Michigan Journal of Counseling: Research, theory, & practice, 39*(1), 4-18.

Burke, J. B. (1989). *Competency based education and training.* Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Carey, J., & Dimmitt, C. (2012). School counseling and student outcomes: Summary of six statewide studies. *Professional School Counseling, 16* (2), 146-153. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2012-16.146

Carey, J., Harrington, K., Marin, I., & Hoffman, D. (2012). A state-wide evaluation of the outcomes of the implementation of ASCA National Model school counseling programs in rural and suburban Nebraska high schools. *Professional School Counseling, 16* (2), 100-107. doi:10.5330/psc.n.2012-16.100

Cate, O. & Scheele, F. (2007). Competency-based postgraduate training: Can we bridge the gap between theory and clinical practice. *Academic Medicine, 82*(6), 542-547.

Conley, D. T. (2010). *College and career ready: Helping all students succeed beyond high school.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Relation Educational Programs (2009). *2009 CACREP Standards.* Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/2009-Standards.pdf

Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Relation Educational Programs (2015). *2016 CACREP Standards.* Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/2016-Standards-with-Glossary-7.2017.pdf

Chang, V. N., Decker, C. L., & Scott, S. T. (2017). *Developing helping skills: A step-by-step approach to competency.* Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Cholewa, B., Goodman-Scott, E., Thomas A., & Cook, J. (2017). Teachers' perceptions and experiences consulting with school counselors: A qualitative study. *Professional School Counseling, 20*(1), 77-88.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334.

Davis, P., Davis, M. P., & Mobley, J. A. (2013). The school counselor's role in addressing the Advanced Placement equity and excellence gap for African American students. *Professional School Counseling, 17* (1), 32-39. doi:10.5330/ PSC.n.2013-17.32

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

DePue, M. K., & Lambie, G. W. (2014). Impact of a university-based practicum experience on counseling students' level of empathy and assessed counseling competencies. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 5*(2), 89-101.

Dimmitt, C., & Wilkerson, B. (2012). Comprehensive school counseling in Rhode Island: Access to services and student outcomes. *Professional School Counseling, 16* (2), 125-135. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2012-16.125

Dinkmeyer, J., Carlson, J., & Michel, R. (2016). *Consultation: Creating school-based interventions* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Dollarhide, C. T., & Miller, G. M. (2006). Supervision for preparation and practice of school counselors: Pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 45*, 242-252.

Efstation, J. F., Patton, M. J., & Kardash, C. M. (1990). Measuring the working alliance in counselor supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *37*(3), 322-329. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.37.3.322

Elam, S. (1971). Performance based teacher education: What is the state of the art? Proceedings from *American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education*. Washington, DC.

Epstein, J. L., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2010). School counselors' roles in developing partnerships with families and communities for student success. *Professional School Counseling, 14,* 1–14.

Fabrigar, L. R., & Wegener, D. T. (2012). *Exploratory factor analysis: Understanding statistics.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Flynn, S. V., & Hays, D. G. (2015). The development and validation of the comprehensive counseling skills rubric. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 6*(2), 87-99.

Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Garner, C. M., Freeman, B. J., & Lee, L. (2016). Assessment of student dispositions: The development of the professional disposition competence assessment (PDCA). *VISTAS Online 2016, 52*, 1-14.

Geddes Hall, J. (2015). The school counselor and special education: Aligning training with practice. *The Professional Counselor*, *5*(2), 217–224. doi:10.15241/jgh.5.2.217

Geltner, J. A., & Leibforth, T. N. (2008). Advocacy in the IEP process: Strengths-based school counseling in action. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(2), 162-165.

Gilfillan, B. H. (2018). School counselors and college readiness counseling. *Professional School Counseling, 21*(1), 1-10. doi:10.1177/2156759X18784297

Glance, D., Fanning, G., Schoepke, A., Soto, W., & Williams, M. A. (2012). Gatekeeping in Counselor Education. *VISTAS Online 2012, 1,* 1-14.

Goodman-Scott, E. (2015). School counselors' perceptions of their academic preparedness and job activities. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 54*, 57-67.

Goodman-Scott, E., Better-Bubon, J., & Donohue, P. (2016). Aligning comprehensive school counseling programs and positive behavioral interventions and supports to maximize school counselors' efforts. *Professional School Counseling, 19*(1), 57-67-. doi:10.5330/1096-2409-19.1.57

Granello, P. F., & Zyromski, B. (2019). Developing a comprehensive school suicide prevention program. *Professional School Counseling, 22*(1), 1-11. doi:10.1177/2156759X18808128

Greene, J. H. (2018). The multicultural school counselor behavior scale: Development, psychometrics, and use. *Professional School Counseling, 22*(1), 1-10. doi:10.1177/2156759X18816687

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

Hamlet, H. S., & Burnes, T. (2013). Professional school counseling internship: Developmental assessment of counseling skills (CIDACS). *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 4*(1), 55-71.

Harman, H. H. (1976). *Modern factor analysis* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

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

Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2010). Involving low-income parents and parents of color in college readiness activities: An exploratory study. *Professional School Counseling, 14*, 115–124.

Holcomb-McCoy, C., Harris, P., Hines, E. M., & Johnston, G. (2008). School counselors' multicultural self-efficacy: A preliminary investigation. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(3), 166-178.

Holman. R., Glas, C. A. W., Lindenboom, R., Zwinderman, A. H., & de Haan, R. J. (2004). Practical methods for dealing with 'not applicable' item responses in the AMC Linear Disability Score project. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes,2*(29), 1-11.

Homrich, A. M., DeLorenzi, L. D., Bloom, Z. D., & Godbee, B. (2014). Making the case for standards of conduct in clinical training. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 53*, 126-144.

Horder, W. (1996). Competence(s) without tears? *Social Work Education, 17*(1), 117-120.

Houston, R. H. (1980). An analysis of the performance-based teacher education movement. Proceedings from *Prospects of Performance-Based Vocational Teacher Education: National Invitational Conference*. Orlando, FL.

International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors (2017). *IAMFC ethical codes.* Retrieved from http://www.iamfconline.org/public/IAMFC-Ethical-Code-Final.pdf

Johnson, W. B., Skinner, C. J., & Kaslow, N. J. (2014). Relational mentoring in clinical supervision: The transformational supervisor. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 70*(!1), 1073-1081. doi:10.1002/jclp.22128

Kahn, J. H. (2006). Factor analysis in counseling psychology research, training, and practice: Principles, advances, and applications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*(5), 684-718.

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika, 39*, 31-36.

Kayler, H., & Sherman, J. (2009). At-risk ninth-grade students: A psychoeducational group approach to increase study skills and grade point averages. *Professional School Counseling, 12* (6), 434- 439. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2010-12.434

Kelly, J. & Horder, W. (2001). The how and the why: Competences and holistic practice. *Social Work Education, 20*(6), 689-699.

Kemer, G., Eustice, K., & Luby, M. (2017). An examination of master's level practicum and internship evaluation forms. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 8*(2), 1-16.

Kenkel, M. B., & Peterson, R. L. (2010). *Competency-based education for professional psychology.* New York, NY: American Psychological Association.

Knight, J. L. (2015). Preparing elementary school counselors to promote career development: Recommendations for school counselor education programs. *Journal of Career Development, 42*(2), 75-85. doi:10.1177/0894845314533745

Koskey, K. L. K., Sondergeld, T. A., Stewart, V. C., & Pugh, K. J. (2018). Applying the mixed methods instrument development construct validation process: The transformative experience questionnaire. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 12*(1), 95-122.

Kozlowski, K. A., & Huss, S. (2013). Training of school counselors. *VISTAS 2013, 53,* 1-17.

Kuntze, J., van der Molen, H. T., & Born, M. P. (2009). Increase in counselling communication after basic and advanced microskills training. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 79,* 175–188. doi:10.1348/000709908X313758

Lambert, M. J., & Barley, D. E. (2001). Research summary on the therapeutic relationship and psychotherapy outcome. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 38*(4), 357-361.

Lambie, G. W., & Ascher, D. L. (2016). A qualitative evaluation of the counseling competencies scale with clinical supervisors and their supervisees. *The Clinical Supervisors, 35*(1), 98-116.

Lambie, G. W., Mullen, P. R., Swank, J. M., & Blount, A. (2018). The counseling competencies scale: Validation and refinement. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development,51,* (1).

Lapan, R. T. (2012). Comprehensive school counseling programs: In some schools for some students but not in all schools for all students. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(2), 84-88.

Lent, R. W., & Lopez, F. G. (2002). Cognitive ties that bind: A tripartite view of efficacy beliefs in growth-promoting relationships. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 21*(3), 256-286.

Leon, A., Villares, E., Brigman, G., Webb, L, & Peluso, P. (2011). Closing the achievement gap of Latina/Latino students: A school counseling response. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 2* (1), 73-86. doi:10.1177/2150137811400731

Liming, K. W., & Grube, W. A. (2018). Wellbeing outcomes for children exposed to multiple adverse experiences in early childhood: A systematic review. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal, 35*, 317-335. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-018-0532-x

Lopez, C. J., & Mason, E. C. M. (2018). School counselors as curricular leaders: A content analysis of ASCA lesson plans. *Professional School Counseling, 21*(1), 1-12. doi:10.1177/2156759X18773277

Mariani, M., Berger, C., Koerner, K., & Sandlin, C. (2017). Operation occupation: A college and career readiness intervention for elementary students. *Professional School Counseling, 20*(1), 65-76. doi:10.5330/1096-2409-20.1.65

Martin, I., & Carey, J. C. (2012). Capacity within state-level school counseling programs: A cross-case analysis. *Professional School Counseling, 15*(3), 132-143.

Martin, I., Carey, J., & DeCoster, K. (2009). A national study of the current status of state school counseling models. *Professional School Counseling ,12*(5), 378-386.

Mertens, D. M. (2003). Mixed methods and the politics of human research: The trans- formative-emancipatory perspective. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 135–164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Milsom, A., Goodnough, G., & Akos, P. (2007). School counselor contributions to the individualized education program (IEP) process. *Preventing School Failure, 52,* 19–24.

Mulder, M. (2012). Competence-based education and training: About frequently asked questions. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension. 18*(4), 319-327.

Mvududu, N. H., & Sink, C. A. (2013). Factor analysis in counseling research and practice. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 4*(2), 75-98.

National Alliance on Mental Illness. (2017). *Mental health facts: Children & teens.* Retrieved from https://www.nami.org/getattachment/learn-more/mental-health-by-the-numbers/childrenmhfacts.pdf

Nulty, D. D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(3), 301-314. doi:10.1080/02602930701293231

O'Hagan, K. (Ed.). (1996). *Competence in social work practice: A practical guide for professionals.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

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

Perera-Diltz D. M., & Mason, K. L. (2012). A national survey of school counselor supervision practices: Administrative, clinical, peer, and technology mediated supervision. *Journal of School counseling, 10*(4).

Perkins, G., Oescher, J., & Ballard, M. B. (2010). The evolving identity of school counselors as defined by the stakeholder. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*(31).

Perusse, R., Goodnough, G., & Lee, V. (2009). Group counseling in the schools. *Psychology in Schools, 46*, 225-231.

Pett, M. A., Lackey, N. R., & Sullivan, J. J. (2003) *Making sense of factor analysis: The use of factor analysis for instrument development in health care research.* SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Poynton, T. A., DeFouw, E. R., & Morizio, L. J. (2019). A systematic review of online response rates in four counseling journals. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 97,* 33-42. doi:10.1002/jcad.12233

Putnam, S. P., & Rothbart, M. K. (2006). Development of short and very short forms of the Children's Behavior Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 87*(1), 102-112.

Ratts, M. J., DeKruyf, L., & Chen-Hayes, S. F. (2007). The ACA advocacy competencies: A social justice advocacy framework for professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(2), 90-97.

Ratts, M. J., & Greenleaf, A. T. (2018). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies: A leadership framework for professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 21*(1), 1-9. doi:10.1177/2156759X18773582

Reise, S. P., Waller, N. G., & Comrey, A. L. (2000). Factor analysis and scale revision. *Psychological Assessment, 12*, 287-297.

Ridley, C. R., Kelly, S. M., & Mollen, D. (2011). Microskills training: Evolution, reexamination, and call for reform. *The Counseling Psychologist, 39,* 800–824. doi:10.1177/0011000010378438

Rose, J., & Steen, S. (2014). The Achieving Success Everyday group counseling model: Fostering resiliency in middle school students. *Professional School Counseling, 18* (1), 28-37.

Runyan, H., Grothaus, T., & Michel, R. E. (2019). Classroom management competencies for school counselors: A Delphi study. *Professional School Counseling, 22*(1), 1-12. doi:10.1177/2156759X19834293

Scarborough, J. L. (2005). The school counselor activity rating scale: An instrument for gathering process data. *Professional School Counseling, 8(3), 274-283.*

Schuermann, H., Avent Harris, J. R., & Lloyd-Hazlett, J. (2018). Academic role and perceptions of gatekeeping in counselor education. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 57*, 51-65.

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.

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).

Spurgeon, S. L., Gibbons, M. M., & Cochran, J. L. (2012). Creating personal dispositions for a professional counseling program. *Counseling and Values, 57*, 96-108.

Steen, S., Bauman, S., & Smith, J. (2007). Professional School Counselors and the practice of group work. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(2)*, 72-80.

Stone, C., & Dahir, C. (2016). *The transformed school counselor.* Boston, MA: Cengage.

Studer, J. R., (2005). Supervising school counselors-in-training: A guide for field supervisors. *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 353-359.

Sutton, J.M., & Fall, M. (1995). The relationship of school climate factors to counselor self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73*, 331-336.

Swank, J. M. (2014). Assessing counseling competencies: A comparison of supervisors' ratings and student supervisees' self-rating. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 5*(1), 17-27.

Swank, J. M., & Lambie, G. W. (2012). The assessment of CACREP core curricular areas and student learning outcomes using the counseling competencies scale. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 3*(2), 116-127.

Swank, J. M., Lambie, G. W., & Witta, E. L. (2012). An exploratory investigation of the counseling competencies scale: A measure of counseling skills, dispositions, and behaviors. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 51*, 189-206.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Thompson, J. M., & Moffett, N. L. (2010). Clinical preparation and supervision of professional school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*(30).

Vedsted, P. Sokolowski, I., & Heje, H. H. (2008). Data quality and confirmatory factor analysis of the Danish EUROPOP questionnaire on patient evaluation of general practice. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 26*, 174-180.

Villares, E., & Brigman, G. (2019). College/career success skills: Helping students experience postsecondary success. *Professional School Counseling, 22*(1), 1-8. doi:10.1177/2156759X19834444

Walker, A. J., & Walsh, E. (2015). Adverse childhood experiences: How schools can help. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing,28*, 68-69.

Young, A., & Kaffenberger, C. (2011). The beliefs and practices of school counselors who use data to implement comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling, 15*, 67-76.

Ziomek-Daigle, J., & Christensen, T. M. (2010). An emergent theory of gatekeeping practices in counselor education. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88*, 407-415.

Ziomek-Daigle, J., Goodman-Scott, E., Cavin, J., & Donohue, P. (2016). Integrating a Multi-Tiered System of Supports with Comprehensive School Counseling Programs. *The Professional Counselor, 6*(3), 220-232.

Appendix A

IRB Approval

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH

Physical Address
4111 Monarch Way, Suite 203
Norfolk, Virginia 23508
Mailing Address
Office of Research
1 Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia 23529
Phone(757) 683-3460
Fax(757) 683-5902

DATE: November 27, 2018

TO: Melanie Burgess
FROM: Old Dominion University Education Human Subjects Review Committee

PROJECT TITLE: [1348742-1] The Psychometric Properties of the School Counseling Internship
                                      Competency Scale
REFERENCE #:
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE: November 27, 2018

REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category # *6.1 and 6.2*

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The Old Dominion University
Education Human Subjects Review Committee has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB
REVIEW according to federal regulations.

We will retain a copy of this correspondence within our records.

If you have any questions, please contact Laura Chezan at (757) 683-7055 or lchezan@odu.edu. Please
include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Old Dominion
University Education Human Subjects Review Committee's records.

Appendix B

Demographic Information:

1. What is your gender?
    a. Female
    b. Male
    c. Other, please specify

2. What is your age?

3. How do you best describe your ethnic background (please check all that apply)?
    a. African American
    b. Asian-American/Pacific Islander
    c. American Indian/Native American
    d. Caucasian
    e. Hispanic/Latino/a
    f. Middle Eastern/Arab
    g. Other, (please specify):

4. Please specify your master's degree:

5. Do you have a PhD?
    a. Yes
    b. No

6. If yes, please specify your PhD degree:

7. How do you best identify?
    a. Professional School Counselor (Site Supervisor)
    b. School Counselor Educator (University Supervisor)

8. If you responded with professional school counselor, what level school are you currently working at?
    a. Elementary
    b. Middle
    c. High
    d. Other (please specify):

9. If you responded with professional school counselor, what is the estimated number of students in the entire school?

10. If you responded with professional school counselor, what is your estimated caseload?

11. If you responded with professional school counselor, how would you best classify your school?
   a. Rural
   b. Urban
   c. Suburban
   d. Other (please specify):

12. If you responded with school counselor educator, how do you best identify your academic position within the university?
   a. Assistant profession
   b. Associate professor
   c. Professor
   d. Instructor
   e. Adjunct
   f. Other (please specify):

13. What are your professional credentials (check all that apply)?
   a. NCC
   b. LPC
   c. Approved Clinical Supervisor (NBCC credential)
   d. Licensed School Counselor
   e. National Certified School Counselor (NBCC credential)
   f. Other (please specify):

14. Please specify which of the following supervision trainings you may have completed

   (Please check all that apply)?

   a. A graduate course in clinical supervision

   b. Workshop training in clinical supervision

      Please describe briefly: _____

   c. Other (please describe briefly) _____

15. Are you **currently (or within the past two years)** providing university or site supervision to one or more **internship** students enrolled in a master's of counseling program with a **school counseling** focus?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Please think about <u>one specific school counseling supervisee</u> when responding to the following questions:

What is the gender of this supervisee?

    a. Female
    b. Male
    c. Other, please specify

What semester of internship are you basing your evaluation of this supervisee on?

    a. First semester of internship
    b. Second semester of internship
    c. Unsure
    d. Other (please specify):

School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS)

1 = Not Meeting Developmental Expectations: Rare and **insufficient** demonstration of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the specified counseling skill(s) and professional disposition(s).

2 = Emerges to Meet Developmental Expectations: Inconsistent and **limited** demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the specified counseling skill(s) and professional disposition(s).

3 = Meets Minimal Developmental Expectations: Consistent demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the specified counseling skill(s) and professional disposition(s).

4 = Meets Developmental Expectations: Consistently strong demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the specified counseling skill(s) and professional disposition(s).

5 = Exceeds Developmental Expectations: Exceedingly strong demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the specified counseling skill(s) and professional disposition(s).

	Rating Scale					Not Applicable to Setting
1. Demonstrates appropriate use of questions	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Engages in collaborative goal setting	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Demonstrates emotional stability	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Demonstrates ability to advocate on behalf of students	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Demonstrates commitment to ongoing education/professional development	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Demonstrates knowledge regarding needs of underserved students	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Demonstrates knowledge of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)	1	2	3	4	5	6

8. Effectively facilitates classroom management	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Conducts successful consultation/collaboration with other counselors	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Conducts successful consultation/collaboration with teachers/staff	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Conducts successful consultation/collaboration with parents	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Demonstrates ability to conduct threat assessments (suicidal/homicidal assessment)	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Demonstrates ability to de-escalate student behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Supports applicable school-wide programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Demonstrates knowledge of ethical/legal dilemmas with minors	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Manages emotional reactions	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Demonstrates ability to assume a leadership role	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Facilitates developmentally appropriate classroom lessons	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Adheres to ethical standards	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Conducts effective peer conflict mediation sessions	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Demonstrates knowledge of comprehensive school counseling programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Demonstrates knowledge of 504 process	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Maintains appropriate boundaries	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Demonstrates authenticity	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. Expresses empathy	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. Demonstrates knowledge of Individualized Education Program/Plan (IEP) process	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. Facilitates effective parent-teacher conferences	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. Builds rapport/relationships with students	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. Builds rapport/relationships with teachers/staff	1	2	3	4	5	6

30. Builds rapport/relationships with administration	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. Demonstrates knowledge of PK-12 school culture	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. Demonstrates understanding of diagnostic criteria for mental health disorders	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Effectively assists students with academic planning	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. Demonstrates understanding of course sequencing	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. Demonstrates ability to interpret a transcript	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. Demonstrates ability to enroll a new student	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. Demonstrates ability to transfer credits	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. Takes initiative	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. Demonstrates willingness to accept feedback	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. Demonstrates ability to de-escalate parent behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6
41. Demonstrates ability to make a report to Child Protective Services (CPS)	1	2	3	4	5	6
42. Demonstrates knowledge of graduation/promotion requirements	1	2	3	4	5	6
43. Demonstrates ability to create school counseling goals	1	2	3	4	5	6
44. Demonstrates ability to assess students' academic needs	1	2	3	4	5	6
45. Demonstrates ability to assess students' social/emotional needs	1	2	3	4	5	6
46. Demonstrates ability to assess students' college/career needs	1	2	3	4	5	6
47. Demonstrates ability to help students navigate scholarships	1	2	3	4	5	6
48. Demonstrates knowledge of financial aid	1	2	3	4	5	6
49. Demonstrates knowledge of specialty schools/programs (i.e., IB programs, magnet schools, Governor's school, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6
50. Demonstrates knowledge of school interventions for at-risk students	1	2	3	4	5	6

51. Demonstrates ability to collect student data	1	2	3	4	5	6
52. Demonstrates ability to utilize data to inform/develop programming	1	2	3	4	5	6
53. Demonstrates ability to analyze data to evaluate program effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5	6
54. Demonstrates knowledge of standardized testing	1	2	3	4	5	6
55. Demonstrates ability to write recommendation letter(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6
56. Demonstrates multicultural awareness of cultural differences	1	2	3	4	5	6
57. Demonstrates multicultural competency in delivery of school counseling services	1	2	3	4	5	6
58. Demonstrates appropriate dress	1	2	3	4	5	6
59. Timeliness	1	2	3	4	5	6
60. Demonstrates professional conduct	1	2	3	4	5	6
61. Demonstrates flexibility/adaptability	1	2	3	4	5	6
62. Demonstrates knowledge of community resources or referrals	1	2	3	4	5	6
63. Engages students in classroom lessons	1	2	3	4	5	6
64. Demonstrates ability to plan small group curriculum	1	2	3	4	5	6
65. Demonstrates ability to integrate technology into school counseling	1	2	3	4	5	6
66. Facilitates effective small groups	1	2	3	4	5	6
67. Demonstrates understanding of special education referral process	1	2	3	4	5	6
68. Demonstrates ability to build student schedule	1	2	3	4	5	6
69. Demonstrates knowledge of proper documentation/record-keeping	1	2	3	4	5	6
70. Demonstrates knowledge of FERPA (e.g., parental rights/non-custodial parent rights)	1	2	3	4	5	6
71. Demonstrates ability to use career assessments	1	2	3	4	5	6
72. Facilitates effective individual sessions with students	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C

Study Background and Consent

Title: Pilot Testing of the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale

Principal Investigator: Melanie Burgess, M.S.Ed.
Faculty Advisors: Emily Goodman-Scott, Ph.D., Gülşah Kemer, Ph.D., and Kristy Carlisle, Ph.D.

Purpose of Study
The purpose of this study is to attend to the gap in literature and practice by validating a standardized assessment to evaluate school counseling interns' competencies. The goal is to use exploratory factor analysis to determine the latent factor structure of the instrument with university and site school counseling supervisors while also assessing the psychometric properties of this instrument to justify its use in evaluating school counseling interns.

Description of the Study
Counselor education programs aim to adequately train competent pre-service counselors to fulfill a myriad of roles and responsibilities associated with their specialty area. In accordance with professional organizations, gatekeeping is an ethical responsibility of counselor educators and supervisors to protect the welfare of clients and the health of the counseling profession through ongoing evaluation of pre-service counselors. Presently, no standardized evaluation tool exists to assess school counseling interns comprehensively, attending to school counseling competencies, dispositions, roles, and responsibilities.

During this phase of the study, participants will be asked to review the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS) and provide feedback in a focus group format to contribute to the revision and improvement of the instrument.

Participants
The criteria for inclusion in the pilot testing phase of the study includes a minimum of 10 ODU doctoral students who are doctoral supervisors and are currently (or within the past two years) supervising school counseling master's level practicum and internship students. Participation in this study is voluntary and as far as can be anticipated, there will be no or minimal mental, social, legal, emotional, or physical risk from participating in the study. There is not penalty for withdrawing participation in this study at any time. Participants also have the right to avoid answering any questions they choose.

Confidentiality
Researchers will take steps to protect participants' confidentiality. During the focus group, the researcher cannot guarantee confidentiality due to the nature of focus groups. The feedback collected from pilot testing will be used to revise and improve the instrument, while no personal or identifying information will be collected.

Benefits

At the conclusion of the focus group, all participants will be offered incentives in the form of $10 gift cards.

Contact information

To inquire about this study via email, please contact both Ms. Melanie Burgess (mevan032@odu.edu) and Dr. Emily Goodman-Scott, (egscott@odu.edu), Counseling and Human Services Program in the Old Dominion University Darden College of Education. For questions about the protection of human research participants in this study, please contact Dr. Laura Chezan, the current chair of the Old Dominion Darden College of Education & Professional Studies Human Subjects Committee (757-683-7055; lchezan@email.com).

Study Background and Consent

Title: The Psychometric Properties of the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale

Principal Investigator: Melanie Burgess, M.S.Ed.
Faculty Advisors: Emily Goodman-Scott, Ph.D., Gülşah Kemer, Ph.D., and Kristy Carlisle, Ph.D.

School counselor educators are invited to take part in a research study on assessing the validity and reliability of a school counseling internship competency scale designed to measure pre-service school counselors' competencies (knowledge, skills, abilities, and dispositions).

Purpose of Study
The purpose of this study is to attend to the gap in literature and practice by validating a standardized assessment to evaluate school counseling interns' competencies. The goal is to use exploratory factor analysis to determine the latent factor structure of the instrument with university and site school counseling supervisors while also assessing the psychometric properties of this instrument to justify its use in evaluating school counseling interns.

Description of the Study
Participants will complete the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale (SCICS), the Counseling Competency Scale-Revised (CCS-R), and the Supervisory Working Alliance-Supervisor Version (SWAI) for one specific school counseling supervisee they have provided university or site supervision for within the past two years. Participation in this study is voluntary and as far as can be anticipated, there will be no or minimal mental, social, legal, emotional, or physical risk from participating in the study. There is not penalty for withdrawing participation in this study at any time. Participants also have the right to avoid answering any questions they choose.

Participants
The criteria for inclusion in this study include current university and site school counseling supervisors. Specifically, participants will include school counseling faculty (i.e., university supervisors) who, (1) graduated from master's level counselor education programs with a school counseling focus, (2) earned their doctorate in counselor education and supervision or a related field, and (3) are currently (or within the past two years) supervising school counseling interns at a university setting. Additionally, participants will include professional school counselors (i.e., site supervisors) who, (1) graduated from a master's level counseling program with a school counseling focus, (2) are full-time professional school counselors, and (3) are currently (or within the past two years) supervising school counseling interns.

Confidentiality
The researchers are taking steps to ensure participant responses are anonymous. All information obtained about participants is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. The anonymous data will be kept on researchers' password protected computers. The anonymous results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, and publications.

Benefits
At the conclusion of the survey, participants will have the optional opportunity to submit their contact information another survey, completely separate from their submitted responses. Of those participants who submit contact information, 150 randomly selected participants will receive one $15 gift card.

Contact information
To inquire about this study via email, please contact both Ms. Melanie Burgess (mevan032@odu.edu) and Dr. Emily Goodman-Scott, (egscott@odu.edu), Counseling and Human Services Program in the Old Dominion University Darden College of Education. For questions about the protection of human research participants in this study, please contact Dr. Laura Chezan, the current chair of the Old Dominion Darden College of Education & Professional Studies Human Subjects Committee (757-683-7055; lchezan@email.com).

Appendix D

Counseling Competency Scale-Revised (CCS-R)

Part 1: Counseling Skills & Therapeutic Conditions (12 items)

	Primary Counseling Skill(s)	Specific Counseling Skills and Therapeutic Conditions Descriptors	Exceeds Expectations/ Demonstrates Competencies (5)	Meets Expectations/ Demonstrates Competencies (4)	Near Expectations/ Developing towards Competencies (3)	Below Expectations/ Unacceptable (2)	Harmful (1)
1	Nonverbal Skills	Includes Body Position, Eye Contact, Posture, Distance from Client, Voice Tone, Rate of Speech, Use of silence, etc. (*attuned to the emotional state and cultural norms of the clients*)	Demonstrates effective nonverbal communication skills, conveying connectedness & empathy (85%).	Demonstrates effective nonverbal communication skills for the majority of counseling sessions (70%)	Demonstrates inconsistency in his or her nonverbal communication skills.	Demonstrates limited nonverbal communication skills.	Demonstrates poor nonverbal communication skills, such as ignores client &/or gives judgmental looks.
2	Encouragers	Includes minimal encouragers & door openers such as "Tell me more about…", "Hmm"	Demonstrates appropriate use of encouragers, which supports development of a therapeutic relationship (85%).	Demonstrates appropriate use of encouragers for the majority of counseling sessions, which supports development of a therapeutic relationship (70%)	Demonstrates inconsistency in his or her use of appropriate encouragers.	Demonstrates limited ability to use appropriate encouragers.	Demonstrates poor ability to use appropriate encouragers, such as using skills in a judgmental manner.
3	Questions	Use of Appropriate Open & Closed Questioning (*e.g., avoidance of double questions*)	Demonstrates appropriate use of open & closed-ended questions, with an emphasis	Demonstrates appropriate use of open & closed-ended questions for the majority of	Demonstrates inconsistency in using open-ended questions & may use closed questions	Demonstrates limited ability to use open-ended questions with restricted effectiveness.	Demonstrates poor ability to use open-ended questions, such as questions tend to confuse

			on open-ended question (85%).	counseling sessions (70%).	for prolonged periods.		clients or restrict the counseling process.
4	Reflecting *Paraphrasing*	Basic Reflection of Content – Paraphrasing (With couples and families, paraphrasing the different clients' multiple perspectives)	Demonstrates appropriate use of paraphrasing as a primary therapeutic approach (85%).	Demonstrates appropriate use of paraphrasing (majority of counseling sessions; 70%).	Demonstrates paraphrasing inconsistently & inaccurately or mechanical or parroted responses.	Demonstrates limited proficiency in paraphrasing or is often inaccurate.	Demonstrates poor ability to paraphrase, such as being judgmental &/or dismissive.
5	Reflecting *Reflection of Feelings*	Reflection of Feelings (With couples and families, reflection of each clients' feelings)	Demonstrates appropriate use of reflection of feelings as a primary approach (85%).	Demonstrates appropriate use of reflection of feelings (majority of counseling sessions; 70%).	Demonstrates reflection of feelings inconsistently & is *not* matching the client.	Demonstrates limited proficiency in reflecting feelings &/or is often inaccurate.	Demonstrates poor ability to reflect feelings, such as being judgmental &/or dismissive.
6	Reflecting *Summarizing*	Summarizing content, feelings, behaviors, & future plans (With couples and families, summarizing relational patterns of interaction)	Demonstrates consistent ability to use summarization to include content, feelings, behaviors, and future plans (85%).	Demonstrates ability to appropriately use summarization to include content, feelings, behaviors, and future plans (majority of counseling sessions; 70%).	Demonstrates inconsistent & inaccurate ability to use summarization.	Demonstrates limited ability to use summarization (e.g., summary suggests counselor did *not* understand client or is overly focused on content rather than process).	Demonstrates poor ability to summarize, such as being judgmental &/or dismissive.
7	Advanced Reflection *(Meaning)*	Advanced Reflection of Meaning, including Values and Core Beliefs (taking counseling to a deeper level)	Demonstrates consistent use of advanced reflection & promotes discussions of greater depth during counseling sessions (85%).	Demonstrates ability to appropriately use advanced reflection, supporting increased exploration in session (majority of counseling sessions; 70%).	Demonstrates inconsistent & inaccurate ability to use advanced reflection. Counseling sessions appear superficial.	Demonstrates limited ability to use advanced reflection &/or switches topics in counseling often.	Demonstrates poor ability to use advanced reflection, such as being judgmental &/or dismissive.

8	Confrontation	Counselor challenges clients to recognize & evaluate inconsistencies.	Demonstrates the ability to challenge clients through verbalizing inconsistencies & discrepancies in the clients' words &/or actions in a supportive fashion. Balance of challenge & support (85%).	Demonstrates the ability to challenge clients through verbalizing inconsistencies & discrepancies in the clients' words &/or actions in a supportive fashion (can confront, but hesitant) or was *not* needed; therefore, appropriately *not* used (majority of counseling sessions; 70%).	Demonstrates inconsistent ability to challenge clients through verbalizing inconsistencies & discrepancies in clients' words &/or actions in a supportive fashion. Used minimally/missed opportunity.	Demonstrates limited ability to challenge clients through verbalizing discrepancies in the client's words &/or actions in a supportive & caring fashion, &/or skill is lacking.	Demonstrates poor ability to use confrontation, such as degrading client, harsh, judgmental, &/or aggressive.
9	Goal Setting	Counselor collaborates with clients to establish realistic, appropriate, & attainable therapeutic goals (With couples and families, goal setting supports clients in establishing common therapeutic goals)	Demonstrates consistent ability to establish collaborative & appropriate therapeutic goals with clients (85%).	Demonstrates ability to establish collaborative & appropriate therapeutic goals with client (majority of counseling sessions; 70%).	Demonstrates inconsistent ability to establish collaborative & appropriate therapeutic goals with clients.	Demonstrates limited ability to establish collaborative, appropriate therapeutic goals with clients.	Demonstrates poor ability to develop collaborative therapeutic goal, such as identifying unattainable goals, and agreeing with goals that may be harmful to the clients.
10	Focus of Counseling	Counselor focuses (or refocuses) clients on their therapeutic goals (i.e., purposeful counseling)	Demonstrates consistent ability to focus &/or refocus counseling on clients' goal attainment (85%).	Demonstrates ability to focus &/or refocus counseling on clients' goal attainment (majority of counseling sessions; 70%).	Demonstrates inconsistent ability to focus &/or refocus counseling on clients' therapeutic goal attainment.	Demonstrates limited ability to focus &/or refocus counseling on clients' therapeutic goal attainment.	Demonstrates poor ability to maintain focus in counseling, such as counseling moves focus away from clients' goals
11	Facilitate Therapeutic Environment	Expresses accurate empathy & care. Counselor is	Demonstrates consistent ability to be empathic &	Demonstrates ability to be empathic & uses appropriate responses	Demonstrates inconsistent ability to be	Demonstrates limited ability to be empathic &/or	Demonstrates poor ability to be empathic & caring,

	Empathy & Caring	"present" and open to clients. (includes immediacy and concreteness)	uses appropriate responses (85%).	(majority of counseling sessions; 70%).	empathic &/or use appropriate responses.	uses appropriate responses.	such as creating an unsafe space for clients.
12	Facilitate Therapeutic Environment *Respect & Compassion*	Counselor expresses appropriate respect & compassion for clients	Demonstrates consistent ability to be respectful, accepting, & compassionate with clients (85%).	Demonstrates ability to be respectful, accepting, & compassionate with clients (majority of counseling sessions; 70%).	Demonstrates inconsistent ability to be respectful, accepting, & compassionate with clients.	Demonstrates limited ability to be respectful, accepting, &/or compassionate with clients.	Demonstrates poor ability to be respectful & compassionate with clients, such as having conditional respect.

Part 2: Counseling Dispositions & Behaviors (11 items)

	Primary Counseling Dispositions & Behaviors	Specific Counseling Disposition & Behavior Descriptions	Exceeds Expectations/ Demonstrates Competencies (5)	Meets Expectations/ Demonstrates Competencies (4)	Near Expectations/ Developing towards Competencies (3)	Below Expectations/ Unacceptable (2)	Harmful (1)
1	Professional Ethics	Adheres to the ethical guidelines of the ACA, ASCA, IAMFC, APA, & NBCC; including practices within competencies.	Demonstrates consistent & advanced (*i.e., exploration & deliberation*) ethical behavior & judgments.	Demonstrates consistent ethical behavior & judgments.	Demonstrates ethical behavior & judgments, but on a concrete level with a basic ethical decision-making process.	Demonstrates limited ethical behavior & judgment, and a limited ethical decision-making process.	Demonstrates poor ethical behavior & judgment, such as violating the ethical codes &/or makes poor decisions
2	Professional Behavior	Behaves in a professional manner towards supervisors, peers, & clients (e.g., emotional regulation). Is respectful and appreciative to the culture of colleagues and is	Demonstrates consistent & advanced respectfulness and thoughtfulness, & appropriate within *all* professional interactions.	Demonstrates consistent respectfulness and thoughtfulness, & appropriate within *all* professional interactions.	Demonstrates inconsistent respectfulness and thoughtfulness, & appropriate within professional interactions.	Demonstrates limited respectfulness and thoughtfulness & acts inappropriately within some professional interactions.	Demonstrates poor professional behavior, such as repeatedly being disrespectful of others &/or impedes the professional atmosphere of the counseling setting / course.

		able to effectively collaborate with others.				
3	Professional & Personal Boundaries	Maintains appropriate boundaries with supervisors, peers, & clients.	Demonstrates consistent & strong appropriate boundaries with supervisors, peers, & clients.	Demonstrates consistent appropriate boundaries with supervisors, peers, & clients.	Demonstrates appropriate boundaries inconsistently with supervisors, peers, & clients.	Demonstrates inappropriate boundaries with supervisors, peers, & clients.	Demonstrates poor boundaries with supervisors, peers, & clients; such as engaging in dual relationships.
4	Knowledge & Adherence to Site and Course Policies	Demonstrates an understanding & appreciation for *all* counseling site and course policies & procedures.	Demonstrates consistent adherence to *all* counseling site and course policies & procedures, including strong attendance and engagement.	Demonstrates adherence to most counseling site and course policies & procedures, including strong attendance and engagement.	Demonstrates inconsistent adherence to counseling site and course policies & procedures, including attendance and engagement.	Demonstrates limited adherence to counseling site and course policies & procedures, including attendance and engagement.	Demonstrates poor adherence to counseling site and course policies, such as failing to adhere to policies after discussing with supervisor / instructor.
5	Record Keeping & Task Completion	Completes *all* weekly record keeping & tasks correctly & promptly (e.g., case notes, psychosocial reports, treatment plans, supervisory report).	Completes *all* required record keeping, documentation, and assigned tasks in a thorough, timely, & comprehensive fashion.	Completes *all* required record keeping, documentation, and tasks in a competent & timely fashion.	Completes *all* required record keeping, documentation, and tasks, but in an inconsistent & questionable fashion.	Completes required record keeping, documentation, and tasks inconsistently & in a poor fashion.	Failure to complete paperwork &/or tasks by specified deadline.
6	Multicultural Competence in Counseling Relationship	Demonstrates respect for culture (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, spirituality, religion, sexual orientation,	Demonstrates consistent & advanced multicultural competencies (knowledge, self-awareness,	Demonstrates multicultural competencies (knowledge, self-awareness, appreciation, & skills) in	Demonstrates inconsistent multicultural competencies (knowledge, self-awareness, appreciation, &	Demonstrates limited multicultural competencies (knowledge, self-awareness, appreciation, &	Demonstrates poor multicultural competencies, such as being disrespectful, dismissive, and defensive regarding the significance of culture

		disability, social class, etc.) and awareness of and responsiveness to ways in which culture interacts with the therapeutic relationship.	appreciation, & skills) in interactions with clients.	interactions with clients.	skills) in interactions with clients.	skills) in interactions with clients.	in the therapeutic relationship.
7	Emotional Stability & Self-Control	Demonstrates self-awareness and emotional stability (i.e., congruence between mood & affect) & self-control (i.e., impulse control) in relationships with clients.	Demonstrates consistent emotional stability & appropriateness in interpersonal interactions with clients.	Demonstrates emotional stability & appropriateness in interpersonal interactions with clients.	Demonstrates inconsistent emotional stability & appropriateness in interpersonal interactions with clients.	Demonstrates limited emotional stability & appropriateness in interpersonal interactions with clients.	Demonstrates poor emotional stability & appropriateness in interpersonal interactions with client, such as having high levels of emotional reactants with clients
8	Motivated to Learn & Grown/Initiative	Demonstrates engagement in learning & development of therapeutic competencies.	Demonstrates consistent and strong engagement in promoting professional and personal growth & development.	Demonstrates consistent engagement in promoting professional and personal growth & development.	Demonstrates inconsistent engagement in promoting professional and personal growth & development.	Demonstrates limited engagement in promoting professional and personal growth & development.	Demonstrates poor engagement in promoting professional and personal growth & development, such as expressing lack of appreciation for profession &/or apathy to learning.
9	Openness to Feedback	Responds non-defensively & alters behavior in accordance with supervisory &/or instructor feedback.	Demonstrates consistent and strong openness to supervisory &/or instructor feedback & implements	Demonstrates consistent openness to supervisory &/or instructor feedback & implements suggested changes.	Demonstrates openness to supervisory &/or instructor feedback; however, does *not* implement	Demonstrates a lack of openness to supervisory &/or instructor feedback & does *not* implement suggested changes.	Demonstrates *no* openness to supervisory &/or instructor feedback & is defensive &/or dismissive when given feedback.

			suggested changes.		suggested changes.	
10	Flexibility & Adaptability	Demonstrates ability to adapt to changing circumstance, unexpected events, & new situations.	Demonstrates consistent and strong ability to adapt & "reads-&-flexes" appropriately.	Demonstrates consistent ability to adapt & "reads-&-flexes" appropriately.	Demonstrates an inconsistent ability to adapt & flex to clients' diverse changing needs.	Demonstrates a limited ability to adapt & flex to clients' diverse changing needs.	Demonstrates a poor ability to adapt to clients' diverse changing needs, such as being rigid in work with clients.
11	Congruence & Genuineness	Demonstrates ability to be present and "be true to oneself"	Demonstrates consistent and strong ability to be genuine & accepting of self & others.	Demonstrates consistent ability to be genuine & accepting of self & others.	Demonstrates inconsistent ability to be genuine & accepting of self & others.	Demonstrates a limited ability to be genuine & accepting of self & others (incongruent).	Demonstrates a poor ability to be genuine & accepting of self & others, such as being disingenuous.

Appendix E

Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Supervisor Form (SWAI)

(Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990)

Instructions: Please indicate the frequency with which the behavior described in each of the following items seems characteristic of your work with your supervisee. After each item, circle the number corresponding to the appropriate point of the following seven-point scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost Never						Almost Always

1. I help my trainee work within a specific treatment plan with his/her trainee.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I help my trainee stay on track during our meetings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. My style is to carefully and systematically consider the material that my trainee brings to supervision.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. My trainee works with me on specific goals in the supervisory session.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. In supervision, I expect my trainee to think about or reflect on my comments to him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I teach my trainee through direct suggestion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. In supervision, I place a high priority on our understanding the client's perspective.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I encourage my trainee to take time to understand what the client is saying and doing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. When correcting my trainee's errors with a client, I offer alternative ways of intervening with that client.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I encourage my trainee to formulate his/her own interventions with his/her clients.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I encourage my trainee to talk about the work in ways that are comfortable for him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I welcome my trainee's explanations about his/her client's behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. During supervision, my trainee talks more than I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I make an effort to understand my trainee.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I am tactful when commenting about my trainee's performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I facilitate my trainee's talking in our sessions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. In supervision, my trainee is more curious than anxious when discussing his/her difficulties with clients.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. My trainee appears to be comfortable working with me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. My trainee understands client behavior and treatment technique similar to the way I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. During supervision, my trainee seems able to stand back and reflect on what I am saying to him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I stay in tune with my trainee during supervision.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. My trainee identifies with me in the way he/she thinks and talks about his/her clients.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. My trainee consistently implements suggestions made in supervision.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix F
Inter-Item Correlations

	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	Q_4	Q_5	Q_6	Q_7	Q_8	Q_9	Q_10	Q_11	Q_12	Q_13	Q_14	Q_15	Q_16	Q_17	Q_18	Q_19	Q_20	Q_21	Q_22	Q_23	Q_24	Q_25	Q_26	Q_27	Q_28	Q_29	Q_30	Q_31	Q_32
Q_1	1	0.57	0.50	0.44	0.51	0.46	0.51	0.40	0.47	0.55	0.49	0.43	0.51	0.49	0.54	0.46	0.45	0.40	0.57	0.53	0.40	0.22	0.51	0.48	0.51	0.38	0.47	0.55	0.55	0.46	0.51	0.36
Q_2	0.57	1	0.47	0.46	0.49	0.48	0.58	0.44	0.57	0.59	0.52	0.48	0.52	0.53	0.43	0.48	0.49	0.47	0.49	0.50	0.47	0.34	0.50	0.48	0.45	0.38	0.50	0.40	0.51	0.53	0.51	0.34
Q_3	0.50	0.47	1	0.39	0.51	0.40	0.45	0.36	0.49	0.43	0.44	0.33	0.48	0.43	0.50	0.70	0.50	0.34	0.58	0.42	0.41	0.27	0.62	0.65	0.53	0.34	0.38	0.50	0.47	0.46	0.42	0.36
Q_4	0.44	0.46	0.39	1	0.39	0.57	0.43	0.39	0.37	0.52	0.54	0.57	0.61	0.47	0.49	0.39	0.49	0.37	0.42	0.42	0.37	0.38	0.36	0.46	0.45	0.40	0.46	0.43	0.39	0.46	0.51	0.43
Q_5	0.51	0.49	0.51	0.39	1	0.44	0.46	0.40	0.51	0.44	0.38	0.37	0.47	0.46	0.51	0.49	0.50	0.44	0.59	0.42	0.49	0.32	0.60	0.57	0.54	0.30	0.39	0.51	0.48	0.47	0.53	0.38
Q_6	0.46	0.48	0.40	0.57	0.44	1	0.48	0.41	0.41	0.42	0.46	0.56	0.53	0.42	0.52	0.39	0.51	0.40	0.52	0.48	0.40	0.36	0.40	0.50	0.50	0.43	0.42	0.48	0.38	0.41	0.48	0.48
Q_7	0.51	0.58	0.45	0.43	0.46	0.48	1	0.49	0.47	0.57	0.51	0.57	0.51	0.54	0.46	0.41	0.49	0.53	0.47	0.45	0.50	0.46	0.48	0.42	0.42	0.51	0.50	0.38	0.47	0.51	0.55	0.47
Q_8	0.40	0.44	0.36	0.39	0.40	0.41	0.49	1	0.42	0.59	0.51	0.53	0.55	0.40	0.44	0.36	0.54	0.69	0.40	0.39	0.45	0.48	0.37	0.45	0.33	0.55	0.57	0.46	0.46	0.51	0.57	0.37
Q_9	0.47	0.57	0.49	0.37	0.51	0.41	0.47	0.42	1	0.54	0.53	0.42	0.51	0.49	0.47	0.45	0.45	0.46	0.53	0.50	0.48	0.34	0.52	0.52	0.45	0.44	0.43	0.52	0.50	0.49	0.45	0.30
Q_10	0.55	0.59	0.43	0.52	0.44	0.42	0.57	0.59	0.54	1	0.58	0.48	0.55	0.53	0.48	0.42	0.54	0.55	0.47	0.43	0.51	0.38	0.42	0.45	0.39	0.45	0.58	0.51	0.62	0.55	0.61	0.35
Q_11	0.49	0.52	0.44	0.54	0.38	0.46	0.51	0.51	0.53	0.58	1	0.57	0.62	0.45	0.45	0.39	0.50	0.42	0.38	0.47	0.43	0.49	0.35	0.42	0.42	0.53	0.68	0.41	0.48	0.53	0.46	0.39
Q_12	0.43	0.48	0.33	0.57	0.37	0.56	0.57	0.53	0.42	0.48	0.57	1	0.60	0.39	0.51	0.37	0.47	0.44	0.40	0.46	0.47	0.47	0.37	0.44	0.41	0.50	0.60	0.40	0.39	0.47	0.56	0.58
Q_13	0.51	0.52	0.48	0.61	0.47	0.53	0.51	0.55	0.51	0.55	0.62	0.60	1	0.49	0.54	0.45	0.50	0.50	0.46	0.51	0.40	0.45	0.43	0.51	0.52	0.54	0.49	0.46	0.56	0.58	0.58	0.45
Q_14	0.49	0.53	0.43	0.47	0.46	0.42	0.54	0.40	0.49	0.53	0.45	0.39	0.49	1	0.47	0.45	0.45	0.42	0.55	0.44	0.51	0.35	0.48	0.48	0.46	0.37	0.42	0.46	0.53	0.49	0.52	0.36
Q_15	0.54	0.43	0.50	0.49	0.51	0.52	0.46	0.44	0.47	0.48	0.45	0.51	0.54	0.47	1	0.53	0.51	0.48	0.63	0.48	0.50	0.41	0.59	0.57	0.52	0.50	0.48	0.51	0.47	0.52	0.58	0.54
Q_16	0.46	0.48	0.70	0.39	0.49	0.39	0.41	0.36	0.45	0.42	0.39	0.37	0.45	0.45	0.53	1	0.50	0.38	0.66	0.48	0.45	0.34	0.64	0.62	0.59	0.35	0.39	0.56	0.48	0.55	0.51	0.38
Q_17	0.45	0.49	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.51	0.49	0.54	0.45	0.54	0.50	0.47	0.50	0.45	0.51	0.50	1	0.54	0.54	0.55	0.54	0.41	0.47	0.55	0.49	0.45	0.56	0.50	0.57	0.58	0.57	0.42
Q_18	0.40	0.47	0.34	0.37	0.44	0.40	0.53	0.69	0.46	0.55	0.42	0.44	0.50	0.42	0.48	0.38	0.54	1	0.46	0.38	0.49	0.39	0.40	0.42	0.30	0.45	0.56	0.45	0.50	0.48	0.50	0.32
Q_19	0.57	0.49	0.58	0.42	0.59	0.52	0.47	0.40	0.53	0.47	0.38	0.40	0.46	0.55	0.63	0.66	0.54	0.46	1	0.45	0.55	0.37	0.69	0.69	0.67	0.39	0.37	0.64	0.59	0.56	0.55	0.41
Q_20	0.53	0.50	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.48	0.45	0.39	0.50	0.43	0.47	0.46	0.51	0.44	0.48	0.48	0.55	0.38	0.45	1	0.50	0.35	0.42	0.46	0.39	0.48	0.46	0.44	0.47	0.53	0.42	
Q_21	0.40	0.47	0.41	0.37	0.49	0.40	0.50	0.45	0.48	0.51	0.43	0.47	0.40	0.51	0.50	0.45	0.54	0.49	0.55	0.50	1	0.46	0.58	0.51	0.49	0.44	0.47	0.49	0.50	0.53	0.66	0.45
Q_22	0.22	0.34	0.27	0.38	0.32	0.36	0.46	0.48	0.34	0.38	0.49	0.47	0.45	0.35	0.41	0.34	0.41	0.39	0.37	0.35	0.46	1	0.38	0.39	0.35	0.67	0.55	0.36	0.35	0.47	0.52	0.32
Q_23	0.51	0.50	0.62	0.36	0.60	0.40	0.48	0.37	0.52	0.42	0.35	0.37	0.43	0.48	0.59	0.64	0.47	0.40	0.69	0.42	0.58	0.38	1	0.62	0.58	0.40	0.34	0.53	0.50	0.52	0.53	0.34
Q_24	0.48	0.48	0.65	0.46	0.57	0.50	0.42	0.45	0.52	0.45	0.42	0.44	0.51	0.48	0.57	0.62	0.55	0.42	0.69	0.46	0.51	0.39	0.62	1	0.68	0.39	0.42	0.70	0.55	0.52	0.55	0.37
Q_25	0.51	0.45	0.53	0.45	0.54	0.50	0.42	0.33	0.45	0.39	0.42	0.41	0.52	0.46	0.52	0.59	0.49	0.30	0.67	0.46	0.49	0.35	0.58	0.68	1	0.36	0.41	0.69	0.53	0.54	0.52	0.44
Q_26	0.38	0.38	0.34	0.40	0.30	0.43	0.51	0.55	0.44	0.45	0.53	0.50	0.54	0.37	0.50	0.35	0.45	0.45	0.39	0.39	0.44	0.67	0.40	0.39	0.36	1	0.50	0.37	0.50	0.52	0.39	
Q_27	0.47	0.50	0.38	0.46	0.39	0.42	0.50	0.57	0.43	0.58	0.68	0.60	0.50	0.42	0.48	0.39	0.56	0.56	0.37	0.48	0.47	0.55	0.34	0.42	0.41	0.50	1	0.40	0.55	0.52	0.57	0.44
Q_28	0.55	0.40	0.50	0.43	0.51	0.48	0.38	0.46	0.52	0.51	0.41	0.40	0.49	0.46	0.51	0.56	0.50	0.45	0.64	0.46	0.49	0.36	0.53	0.70	0.69	0.37	0.40	1	0.62	0.53	0.53	0.31
Q_29	0.55	0.51	0.47	0.39	0.48	0.38	0.47	0.46	0.50	0.62	0.48	0.39	0.46	0.53	0.47	0.48	0.57	0.50	0.59	0.44	0.50	0.35	0.50	0.55	0.53	0.37	0.55	0.62	1	0.62	0.53	0.29
Q_30	0.46	0.53	0.46	0.46	0.47	0.41	0.51	0.51	0.49	0.55	0.53	0.47	0.56	0.49	0.52	0.55	0.58	0.48	0.56	0.47	0.53	0.47	0.52	0.52	0.54	0.50	0.52	0.53	0.62	1	0.64	0.39
Q_31	0.51	0.51	0.42	0.51	0.53	0.48	0.55	0.57	0.45	0.61	0.46	0.56	0.58	0.52	0.58	0.51	0.57	0.50	0.55	0.53	0.66	0.52	0.53	0.55	0.52	0.52	0.57	0.53	0.53	0.64	1	0.48
Q_32	0.36	0.34	0.36	0.43	0.38	0.48	0.47	0.37	0.30	0.35	0.39	0.58	0.45	0.36	0.54	0.38	0.42	0.32	0.41	0.44	0.45	0.32	0.34	0.37	0.44	0.39	0.44	0.31	0.29	0.39	0.48	1
Q_33	0.49	0.51	0.34	0.52	0.53	0.49	0.47	0.49	0.45	0.54	0.42	0.47	0.51	0.45	0.55	0.45	0.52	0.41	0.53	0.44	0.47	0.45	0.44	0.52	0.55	0.48	0.51	0.54	0.53	0.67		
Q_34	0.42	0.41	0.30	0.46	0.35	0.42	0.51	0.52	0.40	0.43	0.40	0.49	0.46	0.43	0.46	0.39	0.49	0.44	0.47	0.39	0.47	0.55	0.39	0.41	0.38	0.55	0.51	0.43	0.50	0.56	0.59	0.41
Q_38	0.47	0.50	0.51	0.43	0.55	0.45	0.46	0.37	0.50	0.46	0.41	0.43	0.43	0.45	0.41	0.53	0.63	0.42	0.59	0.49	0.55	0.36	0.50	0.52	0.58	0.35	0.44	0.53	0.51	0.57	0.58	0.31
Q_39	0.48	0.48	0.58	0.41	0.56	0.44	0.41	0.36	0.46	0.38	0.33	0.35	0.40	0.47	0.47	0.62	0.47	0.40	0.66	0.43	0.50	0.30	0.63	0.59	0.62	0.27	0.38	0.59	0.60	0.51	0.53	0.33
Q_41	0.42	0.37	0.29	0.45	0.43	0.54	0.46	0.49	0.47	0.54	0.54	0.61	0.52	0.39	0.55	0.31	0.51	0.45	0.40	0.49	0.48	0.46	0.37	0.40	0.42	0.56	0.53	0.41	0.46	0.51	0.61	0.49
Q_42	0.45	0.40	0.35	0.50	0.42	0.47	0.47	0.50	0.44	0.42	0.49	0.50	0.52	0.45	0.54	0.36	0.53	0.44	0.45	0.50	0.54	0.43	0.49	0.42	0.51	0.47	0.48	0.52	0.64	0.48		
Q_43	0.53	0.56	0.48	0.46	0.56	0.47	0.53	0.46	0.47	0.47	0.46	0.49	0.51	0.50	0.57	0.52	0.58	0.48	0.61	0.49	0.57	0.43	0.61	0.60	0.57	0.42	0.45	0.55	0.57	0.62	0.64	0.43
Q_44	0.56	0.52	0.45	0.49	0.54	0.51	0.59	0.52	0.47	0.52	0.49	0.58	0.56	0.46	0.58	0.50	0.56	0.45	0.61	0.50	0.53	0.49	0.56	0.52	0.53	0.50	0.49	0.46	0.52	0.57	0.69	0.50
Q_45	0.45	0.46	0.45	0.53	0.53	0.52	0.46	0.38	0.44	0.44	0.42	0.53	0.51	0.50	0.55	0.53	0.52	0.41	0.64	0.50	0.50	0.43	0.54	0.52	0.60	0.39	0.41	0.59	0.54	0.52	0.59	0.45
Q_46	0.42	0.45	0.37	0.45	0.50	0.49	0.49	0.44	0.47	0.44	0.42	0.53	0.50	0.44	0.60	0.41	0.45	0.45	0.55	0.44	0.51	0.48	0.46	0.49	0.48	0.54	0.47	0.46	0.49	0.55	0.60	0.50
Q_50	0.48	0.52	0.44	0.55	0.50	0.60	0.58	0.52	0.43	0.54	0.48	0.61	0.56	0.48	0.65	0.48	0.60	0.53	0.53	0.55	0.57	0.53	0.50	0.55	0.49	0.55	0.53	0.51	0.52	0.57	0.68	0.50
Q_51	0.48	0.55	0.46	0.44	0.57	0.45	0.53	0.42	0.48	0.46	0.38	0.46	0.46	0.52	0.53	0.50	0.53	0.50	0.63	0.51	0.59	0.41	0.58	0.52	0.55	0.41	0.41	0.51	0.55	0.58	0.58	0.39
Q_52	0.54	0.54	0.44	0.43	0.55	0.48	0.54	0.42	0.46	0.47	0.42	0.45	0.43	0.54	0.58	0.54	0.54	0.44	0.60	0.52	0.62	0.42	0.59	0.50	0.52	0.48	0.48	0.49	0.56	0.58	0.65	0.48
Q_53	0.49	0.49	0.44	0.42	0.51	0.49	0.56	0.45	0.47	0.47	0.43	0.48	0.45	0.50	0.58	0.46	0.55	0.47	0.58	0.53	0.61	0.44	0.56	0.47	0.48	0.49	0.45	0.43	0.50	0.54	0.60	0.48
Q_54	0.37	0.32	0.25	0.44	0.36	0.44	0.46	0.48	0.33	0.41	0.42	0.53	0.45	0.38	0.54	0.29	0.45	0.41	0.46	0.41	0.52	0.58	0.39	0.41	0.38	0.65	0.50	0.38	0.43	0.50	0.62	0.36
Q_56	0.41	0.38	0.41	0.54	0.51	0.62	0.39	0.40	0.41	0.43	0.39	0.53	0.46	0.40	0.59	0.50	0.54	0.37	0.53	0.51	0.47	0.31	0.47	0.55	0.55	0.41	0.48	0.52	0.44	0.51	0.57	0.54
Q_57	0.41	0.42	0.40	0.52	0.51	0.61	0.41	0.40	0.42	0.48	0.41	0.50	0.50	0.43	0.57	0.50	0.53	0.41	0.57	0.50	0.52	0.36	0.48	0.56	0.57	0.42	0.47	0.54	0.46	0.57	0.58	0.49
Q_58	0.40	0.39	0.42	0.28	0.47	0.31	0.34	0.30	0.43	0.43	0.34	0.29	0.19	0.36	0.48	0.40	0.41	0.50	0.41	0.33	0.52	0.38	0.38	0.25	0.49	0.44	0.43	0.27	0.31	0.43	0.44	0.42
Q_59	0.49	0.48	0.49	0.33	0.59	0.44	0.44	0.37	0.47	0.47	0.40	0.36	0.29	0.36	0.48	0.46	0.46	0.43	0.36	0.58	0.58	0.47	0.35	0.59	0.46	0.46	0.40	0.49	0.43	0.50	0.50	0.32
Q_60	0.53	0.53	0.56	0.38	0.58	0.43	0.44	0.41	0.48	0.47	0.30	0.38	0.41	0.52	0.48	0.66	0.52	0.45	0.73	0.48	0.53	0.30	0.65	0.58	0.58	0.27	0.34	0.58	0.53	0.53	0.54	0.38
Q_61	0.49	0.43	0.54	0.33	0.50	0.39	0.41	0.38	0.48	0.40	0.35	0.39	0.36	0.45	0.46	0.62	0.47	0.36	0.64	0.40	0.50	0.30	0.60	0.61	0.57	0.34	0.35	0.60	0.55	0.51	0.49	0.35
Q_62	0.39	0.37	0.32	0.51	0.44	0.55	0.50	0.44	0.38	0.48	0.49	0.57	0.48	0.42	0.58	0.33	0.55	0.41	0.40	0.42	0.43	0.47	0.37	0.40	0.39	0.47	0.46	0.42	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.54
Q_63	0.48	0.43	0.37	0.39	0.47	0.40	0.46	0.59	0.44	0.50	0.41	0.44	0.44	0.37	0.48	0.41	0.51	0.58	0.51	0.42	0.45	0.34	0.46	0.48	0.49	0.40	0.45	0.52	0.51	0.47	0.52	0.34
Q_64	0.48	0.49	0.44	0.42	0.46	0.48	0.50	0.48	0.53	0.46	0.42	0.47	0.44	0.51	0.55	0.46	0.50	0.55	0.60	0.50	0.57	0.35	0.54	0.51	0.47	0.41	0.37	0.50	0.53	0.47	0.56	0.45
Q_65	0.43	0.38	0.41	0.37	0.45	0.39	0.48	0.37	0.36	0.36	0.34	0.39	0.42	0.45	0.52	0.53	0.44	0.38	0.50	0.53	0.44	0.38	0.47	0.37	0.37	0.46	0.47	0.41	0.48	0.54		
Q_66	0.49	0.49	0.37	0.42	0.48	0.43	0.45	0.51	0.54	0.48	0.40	0.45	0.48	0.52	0.45	0.53	0.51	0.57	0.51	0.58	0.34	0.49	0.50	0.49	0.44	0.40	0.52	0.49	0.51	0.59	0.48	
Q_67	0.34	0.37	0.32	0.38	0.33	0.42	0.51	0.47	0.35	0.41	0.47	0.40	0.42	0.36	0.47	0.34	0.43	0.44	0.40	0.41	0.50	0.60	0.39	0.35	0.32	0.70	0.48	0.31	0.37	0.50	0.55	0.43
Q_69	0.49	0.41	0.39	0.38	0.38	0.42	0.43	0.40	0.41	0.41	0.37	0.47	0.38	0.35	0.54	0.44	0.41	0.38	0.54	0.44	0.46	0.38	0.48	0.44	0.45	0.44	0.41	0.46	0.51	0.46	0.53	0.39
Q_70	0.38	0.43	0.32	0.37	0.43	0.47	0.54	0.42	0.41	0.43	0.40	0.49	0.36	0.38	0.57	0.38	0.43	0.47	0.53	0.40	0.51	0.53	0.43	0.43	0.36	0.53	0.44	0.37	0.41	0.46	0.49	0.59
Q_71	0.43	0.42	0.33	0.39	0.40	0.48	0.44	0.44	0.41	0.38	0.39	0.43	0.41	0.40	0.52	0.37	0.42	0.47	0.53	0.51	0.48	0.42	0.45	0.44	0.39	0.48	0.35	0.41	0.41	0.45	0.54	0.45
Q_72	0.52	0.52	0.48	0.53	0.57	0.56	0.47	0.44	0.44	0.52	0.43	0.49	0.53	0.47	0.55	0.55	0.57	0.50	0.63	0.51	0.53	0.39	0.52	0.55	0.59	0.42	0.45	0.59	0.54	0.52	0.55	0.43

	Q_33	Q_34	Q_38	Q_39	Q_41	Q_42	Q_43	Q_44	Q_45	Q_46	Q_50	Q_51	Q_52	Q_53	Q_54	Q_56	Q_57	Q_58	Q_59	Q_60	Q_61	Q_62	Q_63	Q_64	Q_65	Q_66	Q_67	Q_69	Q_70	Q_71	Q_72
Q_1	0.49	0.42	0.47	0.48	0.42	0.45	0.53	0.56	0.45	0.42	0.48	0.48	0.54	0.49	0.37	0.41	0.41	0.40	0.49	0.53	0.49	0.39	0.48	0.48	0.43	0.49	0.34	0.49	0.38	0.43	0.52
Q_2	0.51	0.41	0.50	0.48	0.37	0.40	0.56	0.52	0.46	0.45	0.52	0.55	0.54	0.49	0.32	0.38	0.42	0.39	0.48	0.53	0.43	0.37	0.43	0.49	0.38	0.49	0.37	0.41	0.43	0.42	0.52
Q_3	0.34	0.30	0.51	0.58	0.29	0.35	0.48	0.45	0.45	0.37	0.44	0.46	0.44	0.44	0.25	0.41	0.40	0.42	0.49	0.56	0.54	0.32	0.37	0.44	0.41	0.37	0.32	0.39	0.32	0.33	0.48
Q_4	0.52	0.46	0.43	0.41	0.45	0.50	0.46	0.49	0.53	0.45	0.55	0.44	0.43	0.42	0.44	0.54	0.52	0.28	0.34	0.38	0.33	0.51	0.39	0.42	0.37	0.42	0.38	0.38	0.37	0.39	0.53
Q_5	0.53	0.35	0.55	0.56	0.43	0.42	0.56	0.54	0.53	0.50	0.50	0.57	0.55	0.51	0.36	0.51	0.51	0.47	0.59	0.58	0.50	0.44	0.47	0.46	0.45	0.48	0.33	0.38	0.43	0.40	0.57
Q_6	0.49	0.42	0.45	0.44	0.54	0.47	0.47	0.51	0.52	0.49	0.60	0.45	0.48	0.49	0.44	0.62	0.61	0.31	0.44	0.43	0.39	0.55	0.40	0.48	0.39	0.43	0.42	0.42	0.47	0.48	0.56
Q_7	0.47	0.51	0.46	0.41	0.46	0.47	0.53	0.59	0.46	0.49	0.58	0.53	0.54	0.56	0.46	0.39	0.41	0.34	0.44	0.44	0.41	0.50	0.46	0.50	0.48	0.45	0.51	0.43	0.54	0.44	0.47
Q_8	0.49	0.52	0.37	0.36	0.49	0.50	0.46	0.52	0.38	0.44	0.52	0.42	0.42	0.45	0.48	0.40	0.40	0.30	0.37	0.41	0.38	0.44	0.59	0.48	0.37	0.51	0.47	0.40	0.42	0.44	0.44
Q_9	0.45	0.40	0.50	0.46	0.47	0.44	0.47	0.47	0.44	0.47	0.43	0.48	0.46	0.47	0.33	0.41	0.42	0.43	0.47	0.48	0.48	0.38	0.44	0.53	0.36	0.54	0.35	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.44
Q_10	0.54	0.43	0.46	0.38	0.54	0.42	0.47	0.52	0.44	0.44	0.54	0.46	0.47	0.47	0.41	0.43	0.48	0.34	0.40	0.47	0.40	0.48	0.50	0.46	0.36	0.48	0.41	0.41	0.43	0.48	0.52
Q_11	0.42	0.40	0.41	0.33	0.54	0.49	0.46	0.49	0.42	0.42	0.48	0.38	0.42	0.43	0.42	0.39	0.41	0.29	0.36	0.30	0.35	0.49	0.41	0.42	0.34	0.40	0.47	0.37	0.40	0.39	0.43
Q_12	0.47	0.49	0.43	0.35	0.61	0.50	0.49	0.58	0.53	0.53	0.61	0.46	0.45	0.48	0.53	0.53	0.50	0.19	0.29	0.38	0.39	0.57	0.44	0.47	0.39	0.45	0.40	0.47	0.49	0.43	0.49
Q_13	0.51	0.46	0.43	0.40	0.52	0.52	0.51	0.56	0.51	0.50	0.56	0.46	0.43	0.45	0.45	0.46	0.50	0.36	0.36	0.41	0.36	0.48	0.44	0.44	0.42	0.45	0.42	0.38	0.36	0.41	0.53
Q_14	0.45	0.43	0.45	0.47	0.39	0.44	0.50	0.46	0.50	0.44	0.48	0.52	0.54	0.50	0.38	0.40	0.43	0.40	0.48	0.52	0.45	0.42	0.37	0.51	0.46	0.52	0.36	0.35	0.38	0.40	0.47
Q_15	0.55	0.46	0.41	0.47	0.55	0.54	0.57	0.58	0.55	0.60	0.65	0.53	0.59	0.58	0.54	0.59	0.57	0.41	0.46	0.48	0.46	0.58	0.48	0.55	0.52	0.53	0.47	0.54	0.57	0.52	0.55
Q_16	0.45	0.39	0.53	0.62	0.31	0.36	0.52	0.50	0.53	0.41	0.48	0.50	0.53	0.46	0.29	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.66	0.62	0.33	0.41	0.46	0.39	0.45	0.34	0.44	0.38	0.37	0.55
Q_17	0.52	0.49	0.63	0.47	0.51	0.53	0.58	0.56	0.52	0.45	0.60	0.53	0.54	0.55	0.45	0.54	0.53	0.41	0.43	0.52	0.47	0.55	0.51	0.50	0.44	0.53	0.43	0.41	0.43	0.42	0.57
Q_18	0.41	0.44	0.42	0.40	0.45	0.42	0.48	0.45	0.41	0.45	0.53	0.46	0.44	0.47	0.41	0.37	0.41	0.33	0.36	0.45	0.36	0.41	0.58	0.55	0.43	0.51	0.44	0.38	0.47	0.47	0.50
Q_19	0.53	0.47	0.59	0.66	0.40	0.45	0.61	0.61	0.64	0.55	0.53	0.63	0.60	0.58	0.46	0.53	0.57	0.52	0.58	0.73	0.64	0.40	0.51	0.60	0.50	0.57	0.40	0.54	0.53	0.53	0.63
Q_20	0.44	0.39	0.49	0.43	0.49	0.45	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.44	0.55	0.51	0.52	0.53	0.41	0.51	0.50	0.38	0.38	0.48	0.40	0.42	0.42	0.50	0.33	0.51	0.41	0.44	0.40	0.51	0.51
Q_21	0.47	0.47	0.55	0.50	0.48	0.50	0.57	0.53	0.50	0.51	0.57	0.59	0.62	0.61	0.52	0.47	0.52	0.38	0.47	0.53	0.50	0.43	0.45	0.57	0.44	0.58	0.50	0.46	0.51	0.48	0.53
Q_22	0.45	0.55	0.36	0.30	0.46	0.54	0.43	0.49	0.43	0.48	0.53	0.41	0.42	0.44	0.58	0.31	0.36	0.25	0.35	0.30	0.30	0.47	0.34	0.35	0.38	0.34	0.60	0.38	0.53	0.42	0.39
Q_23	0.44	0.39	0.50	0.63	0.37	0.43	0.61	0.56	0.54	0.46	0.50	0.58	0.59	0.56	0.39	0.47	0.48	0.49	0.59	0.65	0.60	0.37	0.46	0.54	0.47	0.49	0.39	0.48	0.43	0.45	0.52
Q_24	0.52	0.41	0.52	0.59	0.40	0.49	0.60	0.52	0.52	0.49	0.55	0.52	0.50	0.47	0.41	0.55	0.56	0.44	0.46	0.58	0.61	0.40	0.48	0.51	0.42	0.50	0.35	0.44	0.43	0.44	0.55
Q_25	0.55	0.38	0.58	0.62	0.42	0.42	0.57	0.53	0.60	0.48	0.49	0.55	0.52	0.48	0.38	0.55	0.57	0.43	0.46	0.58	0.57	0.39	0.49	0.47	0.47	0.49	0.32	0.45	0.36	0.39	0.59
Q_26	0.48	0.55	0.35	0.27	0.56	0.56	0.42	0.50	0.39	0.54	0.55	0.41	0.48	0.49	0.65	0.41	0.42	0.27	0.36	0.27	0.34	0.47	0.40	0.41	0.37	0.44	0.70	0.44	0.53	0.48	0.42
Q_27	0.51	0.51	0.44	0.38	0.53	0.51	0.45	0.49	0.41	0.47	0.53	0.41	0.48	0.45	0.50	0.48	0.47	0.31	0.31	0.34	0.35	0.46	0.45	0.37	0.37	0.40	0.48	0.41	0.44	0.35	0.45
Q_28	0.54	0.43	0.53	0.59	0.41	0.47	0.55	0.46	0.59	0.47	0.51	0.51	0.49	0.43	0.38	0.52	0.54	0.43	0.49	0.58	0.60	0.42	0.52	0.50	0.46	0.52	0.31	0.46	0.37	0.41	0.59
Q_29	0.54	0.50	0.51	0.60	0.46	0.48	0.57	0.52	0.54	0.47	0.52	0.55	0.56	0.50	0.43	0.44	0.46	0.44	0.43	0.53	0.55	0.43	0.51	0.53	0.49	0.49	0.37	0.51	0.41	0.41	0.54
Q_30	0.53	0.56	0.57	0.51	0.51	0.52	0.62	0.57	0.52	0.47	0.57	0.55	0.58	0.54	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.57	0.42	0.50	0.53	0.51	0.47	0.47	0.41	0.51	0.50	0.46	0.49	0.45	0.52
Q_31	0.67	0.59	0.58	0.53	0.61	0.64	0.64	0.69	0.59	0.47	0.68	0.58	0.65	0.60	0.62	0.57	0.58	0.40	0.50	0.54	0.49	0.60	0.52	0.56	0.48	0.59	0.55	0.53	0.59	0.54	0.55
Q_32	0.38	0.41	0.31	0.33	0.49	0.48	0.43	0.50	0.45	0.47	0.50	0.39	0.45	0.48	0.36	0.54	0.49	0.28	0.32	0.38	0.35	0.54	0.34	0.45	0.34	0.48	0.43	0.39	0.43	0.45	0.43
Q_33	1	0.68	0.52	0.50	0.60	0.71	0.54	0.70	0.54	0.47	0.63	0.54	0.55	0.49	0.60	0.55	0.53	0.44	0.45	0.48	0.44	0.54	0.48	0.46	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.57	0.56	0.55	0.56
Q_34	0.68	1	0.41	0.47	0.51	0.80	0.53	0.63	0.44	0.47	0.58	0.50	0.56	0.51	0.69	0.40	0.46	0.35	0.38	0.42	0.33	0.57	0.39	0.46	0.50	0.47	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.63	0.46
Q_38	0.52	0.41	1	0.61	0.47	0.40	0.59	0.55	0.53	0.47	0.54	0.61	0.57	0.53	0.40	0.49	0.50	0.51	0.64	0.70	0.60	0.45	0.46	0.48	0.39	0.51	0.36	0.45	0.41	0.40	0.57
Q_39	0.50	0.47	0.61	1	0.37	0.48	0.57	0.51	0.62	0.47	0.44	0.54	0.51	0.48	0.36	0.48	0.50	0.52	0.56	0.67	0.67	0.40	0.39	0.50	0.45	0.46	0.36	0.47	0.35	0.43	0.58
Q_41	0.60	0.51	0.47	0.37	1	0.58	0.52	0.56	0.53	0.47	0.70	0.45	0.46	0.51	0.57	0.54	0.51	0.33	0.41	0.37	0.38	0.68	0.43	0.52	0.42	0.50	0.55	0.51	0.54	0.50	0.54
Q_42	0.71	0.80	0.40	0.48	0.58	1	0.51	0.66	0.48	0.47	0.61	0.47	0.53	0.52	0.66	0.46	0.47	0.34	0.38	0.36	0.34	0.64	0.42	0.50	0.49	0.48	0.59	0.57	0.57	0.58	0.50
Q_43	0.54	0.53	0.59	0.57	0.52	0.51	1	0.59	0.60	0.47	0.60	0.63	0.64	0.61	0.48	0.54	0.54	0.50	0.56	0.62	0.54	0.56	0.50	0.62	0.43	0.60	0.46	0.51	0.45	0.53	0.65
Q_44	0.70	0.63	0.55	0.51	0.56	0.66	0.59	1	0.56	0.47	0.63	0.60	0.57	0.59	0.57	0.52	0.50	0.43	0.49	0.53	0.49	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.45	0.55	0.55	0.56	0.59	0.54	0.55
Q_45	0.54	0.44	0.53	0.62	0.53	0.48	0.60	0.56	1	0.47	0.64	0.62	0.60	0.59	0.49	0.49	0.57	0.47	0.52	0.54	0.50	0.49	0.61	0.53	0.54	0.45	0.55	0.50	0.60	0.68	0.68
Q_46	0.68	0.64	0.51	0.47	0.55	0.66	0.51	0.69	0.58	1	0.47	0.62	0.59	0.63	0.61	0.66	0.50	0.52	0.40	0.51	0.45	0.45	0.52	0.45	0.50	0.56	0.64	0.62	0.68	0.62	0.54
Q_50	0.63	0.58	0.54	0.44	0.70	0.61	0.60	0.63	0.64	0.47	1	0.65	0.67	0.68	0.65	0.62	0.64	0.43	0.52	0.50	0.48	0.67	0.53	0.64	0.52	0.60	0.63	0.56	0.60	0.58	0.65
Q_51	0.54	0.50	0.61	0.54	0.45	0.47	0.63	0.60	0.62	0.47	0.65	1	0.75	0.76	0.52	0.52	0.55	0.49	0.54	0.58	0.48	0.45	0.50	0.58	0.50	0.58	0.46	0.50	0.50	0.54	0.57
Q_52	0.55	0.56	0.57	0.51	0.46	0.53	0.64	0.57	0.60	0.47	0.67	0.75	1	0.83	0.61	0.55	0.57	0.47	0.58	0.55	0.49	0.55	0.54	0.63	0.50	0.58	0.51	0.57	0.60	0.63	0.58
Q_53	0.49	0.51	0.53	0.48	0.51	0.52	0.61	0.59	0.59	0.47	0.68	0.76	0.83	1	0.59	0.53	0.58	0.42	0.54	0.50	0.60	0.47	0.57	0.55	0.57	0.60	0.58	0.60	0.60	0.56	0.60
Q_54	0.60	0.69	0.40	0.36	0.57	0.66	0.48	0.57	0.49	0.47	0.65	0.52	0.61	0.59	1	0.48	0.52	0.35	0.41	0.33	0.36	0.56	0.42	0.49	0.47	0.57	0.67	0.61	0.68	0.60	0.49
Q_56	0.55	0.40	0.49	0.48	0.54	0.46	0.54	0.52	0.59	0.47	0.62	0.52	0.55	0.53	0.48	1	0.85	0.47	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.53	0.44	0.50	0.41	0.55	0.46	0.41	0.42	0.42	0.56
Q_57	0.53	0.46	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.47	0.54	0.50	0.57	0.47	0.64	0.55	0.57	0.58	0.52	0.85	1	0.49	0.45	0.51	0.46	0.53	0.40	0.46	0.43	0.52	0.49	0.39	0.47	0.43	0.62
Q_58	0.44	0.35	0.51	0.52	0.33	0.34	0.50	0.43	0.47	0.47	0.43	0.49	0.47	0.42	0.35	0.47	0.49	1	0.65	0.63	0.58	0.31	0.35	0.38	0.36	0.41	0.36	0.31	0.35	0.36	0.53
Q_59	0.45	0.38	0.64	0.56	0.41	0.38	0.56	0.49	0.52	0.47	0.52	0.54	0.58	0.54	0.41	0.48	0.45	0.65	1	0.64	0.64	0.43	0.45	0.48	0.40	0.49	0.40	0.49	0.50	0.47	0.56
Q_60	0.48	0.42	0.70	0.67	0.37	0.36	0.62	0.53	0.57	0.47	0.50	0.58	0.55	0.50	0.33	0.48	0.51	0.63	0.64	1	0.70	0.40	0.50	0.61	0.47	0.55	0.35	0.49	0.43	0.51	0.65
Q_61	0.44	0.33	0.60	0.67	0.38	0.34	0.54	0.49	0.54	0.47	0.48	0.48	0.49	0.42	0.36	0.48	0.46	0.58	0.64	0.70	1	0.38	0.51	0.53	0.40	0.51	0.32	0.48	0.43	0.42	0.60
Q_62	0.54	0.57	0.45	0.40	0.68	0.64	0.56	0.51	0.50	0.47	0.67	0.45	0.55	0.54	0.56	0.53	0.53	0.31	0.43	0.40	0.38	1	0.47	0.58	0.43	0.53	0.52	0.50	0.54	0.59	0.56
Q_63	0.48	0.39	0.46	0.39	0.43	0.42	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.47	0.53	0.50	0.54	0.50	0.42	0.44	0.40	0.35	0.45	0.50	0.51	0.47	1	0.65	0.41	0.61	0.38	0.54	0.50	0.54	0.54
Q_64	0.46	0.46	0.48	0.50	0.52	0.50	0.62	0.50	0.61	0.47	0.64	0.58	0.63	0.60	0.49	0.50	0.46	0.38	0.48	0.61	0.53	0.58	0.65	1	0.46	0.75	0.48	0.60	0.58	0.71	0.65
Q_65	0.49	0.50	0.39	0.45	0.42	0.49	0.43	0.45	0.53	0.47	0.52	0.50	0.50	0.47	0.47	0.41	0.43	0.36	0.40	0.47	0.40	0.43	0.41	0.46	1	0.40	0.41	0.49	0.51	0.49	0.45
Q_66	0.49	0.47	0.51	0.46	0.50	0.48	0.60	0.55	0.54	0.47	0.60	0.58	0.58	0.57	0.57	0.55	0.52	0.41	0.49	0.55	0.51	0.53	0.61	0.75	0.40	1	0.46	0.56	0.49	0.58	0.62
Q_67	0.49	0.59	0.36	0.36	0.55	0.59	0.46	0.55	0.45	0.47	0.63	0.46	0.51	0.55	0.67	0.46	0.49	0.36	0.40	0.35	0.32	0.52	0.38	0.48	0.41	0.46	1	0.50	0.58	0.59	0.49
Q_69	0.57	0.59	0.45	0.47	0.51	0.57	0.51	0.56	0.55	0.47	0.56	0.50	0.57	0.57	0.61	0.41	0.39	0.31	0.49	0.49	0.48	0.50	0.54	0.60	0.49	0.56	0.50	1	0.64	0.61	0.54
Q_70	0.56	0.59	0.41	0.35	0.54	0.57	0.45	0.59	0.50	0.47	0.60	0.50	0.60	0.60	0.68	0.42	0.47	0.35	0.50	0.43	0.43	0.54	0.50	0.58	0.51	0.49	0.58	0.64	1	0.62	0.51
Q_71	0.55	0.63	0.40	0.43	0.50	0.58	0.53	0.54	0.60	0.47	0.58	0.54	0.63	0.56	0.60	0.42	0.43	0.36	0.47	0.51	0.42	0.59	0.54	0.71	0.44	0.58	0.59	0.61	0.62	1	0.54
Q_72	0.56	0.46	0.57	0.58	0.54	0.50	0.65	0.55	0.68	0.47	0.65	0.57	0.58	0.60	0.49	0.56	0.62	0.53	0.56	0.65	0.60	0.56	0.54	0.65	0.45	0.62	0.49	0.54	0.51	0.54	1

VITA

Melanie A. Burgess, Ph.D.
CURRICULUM VITAE

2100 New Education Building
4301 Hampton Blvd., Norfolk, VA 23529

EDUCATION
Doctor of Philosophy, Counselor Education & Supervision   *May 2019*
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia
CACREP accredited program

Master of Science in Education, School Counseling   *May 2016*
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia
CACREP accredited program

Bachelor of Science, Psychology   *December 2013*
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

SCHOLARSHIP

Selected Publications

Goodman-Scott, E., Sink, C., Cholewa, B., & **Burgess, M.** (2018). An ecological view of school counselor ratios and student academic outcomes: A national investigation. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 96*, 388-398. doi:10.1002/jcad.12221

Kemer, G., Sunal, Z., Li, C., & **Burgess, M.** (2018). Beginning and expert supervisors' descriptions of effective and less effective supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor.*

Goodman-Scott, E., **Burgess, M.,** & Carlisle, R. (2018). How school counselors implement social stories: Results of a qualitative study. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Counseling, 4*(1).

Goodman-Scott, E., Carlisle, R., Clark, M**.**, & **Burgess, M.** (2018). "A powerful tool": A phenomenological study of school counselors' experiences with social stories. *Professional School Counseling, 20*(1), 25-35. doi:10.5330/1096-2409-20.1.25

Goodman-Scott, E., Cholewa, B., Burkhardt, C. K. & **Burgess, M.** (2017). Counseling children and adolescents in school settings. In J. Daigle (Ed.), *Counseling children and adolescents: Working in school and clinical mental health settings* (1st ed., p. 145-196.). New York City: Routledge.

Goodman-Scott, E., Bobzien, J., **Burgess, M.**, Melton, R., & Lambert, S. F. (2016). Counseling children and adolescents with Sensory Processing Disorder: Results of an exploratory

national study. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Counseling.*
doi:10.1080/23727810.2016.1172300

Grants

Burgess, M. (2018, September). *The psychometric properties of a school counseling internship competency scale.* Grant proposal submitted to the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision ($1,974).

Burgess, M. (2018, September). *The psychometric properties of a school counseling internship competency scale.* Grant proposal submitted to the Southern Association of Counselor Education and Supervision ($500).

Burgess, M. (2017, February). *Novice school counselor's experiences transitioning into the profession.* Grant received from the Virginia Counselors Association Foundation. ($500).

Selected Presentations

Burgess, M. (2019, March). *The Psychometric Properties of the School Counseling Internship Competency Scale.* Presentation at the Evidence-Based School Counseling Conference, Columbus, OH.

Burgess, M. & Smith-Durkin, S. (2018, October). *Infusing the ASCA Model and Data-Driven Practices into School Counseling Internship Supervision.* Presentation at the Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, Myrtle Beach, SC.

Burgess, M., Goodman-Scott, E., Carlisle, R., & Smith-Durkin, S. (2018, September). *Using single subject design to strengthen pre-service counselors*. Presentation at the Association for Assessment and Research in Counseling National Conference, Richmond, VA.

Cholewa, B., Goodman-Scott, E., Sink, C., & **Burgess, M.** (2018, September). *Demystifying national datasets: Research strategies for counselor educators.* Presentation at the Association for Assessment and Research in Counseling National Conference, Richmond, VA.

Burgess, M., Boulden, R., Smith-Durkin, S., & Wilson, G. (2018, March). *An empirical state of mind: Evidence–based practices in the supervision of future school counselors.* Presented at the Evidence-Based School Counseling conference, New York, NY.

Burgess, M., Sunal, Z., Li, C., Giresunlu, Y., Killen, R., Kalafsky, S., & Kemer, G. (2017, October). *Beginning counselors and supervisors: First supervision experiences*. Panel presentation at the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Conference, Chicago, IL.

Burgess, M., Wilson, G., & Smith-Durkin, S. (2017, October). *Transitioning from graduate student to school counselor: Strategies for school counselor educators*. Poster session at the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Conference, Chicago, IL.