January 2022

Determining Cross-Cultural Mentorship Readiness in Counselor Education and Supervision Programs

Jody Vernam
Liberty University

Brian Paulson
Liberty University

Bridger D. Falkenstien
Liberty University

Lynn Bohecker
Liberty University

Nivischi Edwards
Liberty University

Recommended Citation

Determining Cross-Cultural Mentorship Readiness in Counselor Education and Supervision Programs

Determining Cross-Cultural Mentorship Readiness in Counselor Education and Supervision Programs

Jody Vernam, Brian Paulson, Bridger D. Falkenstien, Lynn Bohecker, Nivischi Edwards

Abstract: Counselor Education and Supervision (CES) faculty are challenged to include cross-cultural mentorship within CES programs. Successfully implementing cross-cultural mentoring in CES programs requires assessing institutional and CES program readiness and identifying successful strategies. This article outlines a proposed framework to evaluate requisites for cross-cultural mentorship across levels of institutions of higher education and provides strategies to help CES faculty successfully engage and sustain cross-cultural mentorship.

What is the public significance of this article? Society and educational programs continue to grow in cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity. As a result, counselor education programs and the systems within which they function will need to adapt to meet the needs of a diverse population of professional counselors, students, and counselor educators. This article enriches the ongoing dialogue on competent cross-cultural mentorship within counselor education programs across various system levels.

Counselor education and supervision (CES) programs have been challenged to cultivate cross-cultural mentorship to meet the needs of diverse students and faculty in CES programs (Oller & Teeling, 2021). CES faculty and students exist within the current sociopolitical culture, which has reinforced the need for higher education institutions to develop cultural competency (Brown, 2004; Kruse et al., 2018), a necessary component of cross-cultural mentorship (Chung et al., 2007). Cross-cultural mentorship occurs in a socioecological context composed of multidimensional influences across the institutional, community, intrapersonal, interpersonal, and public policy levels (Ratts et al., 2016). Successful development of cultural competency across systemic levels requires factors that indicate readiness for change (McAlearney et al., 2021; Savolainen, 2013; Weiner, 2009). CES faculty would benefit from considering institutional and CES program readiness for change as they

cultivate cross-cultural mentorship. The extant literature has identified benefits and explored guidelines for engagement in cross-cultural mentorship within CES programs (Chung et al., 2007; Oller & Teeling, 2021).

Mentorship is associated with benefits for graduate students (Minor et al., 2013; Tuttle et al., 2019; Waalkes et al., 2021) and counselor educators (Atieno-Okech et al., 2006; Trepal & Stinchfield, 2012; Woo et al., 2019), including counselor educators from minority populations (Borders et al., 2019; Haskins et al., 2016; Solomon & Barden, 2016). The need for successful cross-cultural mentorship applies to both student (Oller & Teeling, 2021) and faculty relationships (Casado Pérez & Carney, 2018). Mentorship guidelines continue to evolve within CES programs (Borders et al., 2012; Borders et al., 2011; Oller & Teeling, 2021), highlighting the need for systematic evaluation of requisites for efficacious cross-cultural mentorship.

Jody Vernam, Brian Paulson, Bridger D. Falkenstien, Lynn Bohecker, Nivischi Edwards, Liberty University. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jody Vernam, jvernam@liberty.edu

A socioecological perspective of the relationship between cultural competency across the levels of the system (Ratts et al., 2016) inherently precipitates a potential evaluation framework to determine CES program readiness to engage and sustain cross-cultural mentorship.

The purpose of this article is to strengthen the existing literature by framing cross-cultural mentorship in a socioecological context that describes the influence of cultural competency across levels of the system. The authors describe cultural competency across levels of higher education, address CES faculty specific issues, and propose an evaluative framework that identifies requisites for cross-cultural mentorship in a CES program. Specific interventions, such as cultural competency inventories (Campinha-Bacote, 2008), courageous conversations (Singleton, 2014), and vignettes (Henderson et al., 2016), are discussed. The article concludes with future research implications. The development of an evaluation framework to engage and sustain cross-cultural mentorship starts with institutional cultural competency readiness.

Existing Cultural Competency Readiness Evaluation Models

Cultural competency includes awareness of the influence and importance of culture, assessment of cross-cultural relationships, evolving practices that support cultural needs (McAlearney et al., 2021), and awareness of self and other cultural identities (Ratts et al., 2016). Organizational readiness is the likelihood that an institution can receive and implement new information toward change (McAlearney et al., 2021). The disciplines of healthcare and business developed the few existing evaluation models for institutional readiness to foster systemic cultural competency (McAlearney et al., 2021; Savolanien 2013; Weiner, 2009).

These multidimensional models highlight the necessity to evaluate institutional readiness to change to achieve cultural competency across systems of an institution, recognizing the influence of individuals and collective culture (Weiner, 2009). McAlearney and colleagues (2021) noted the influence of social learning on individual and collective motivation and shared beliefs. Institutional readiness to change depends upon the capability to change, including staff demands and resource availability (Weiner, 2009). Guidance and messaging from leadership influences the readiness for change at each level of the institution (Savolanien, 2013). Evaluating institutional readiness to make the changes necessary to develop cultural competency can guide CES faculty as they implement the structure needed to cultivate cross-cultural mentorship.

Institutional Cultural Competency Considerations for CES Faculty

The current sociopolitical climate and increasingly diverse population demographics have highlighted the importance of institutional cultural competency (Bellon-Harn & Weinbaum, 2017; Kruse et al., 2018), creating a potential focus for advocacy by CES faculty. Institutional cultural competency includes a multisystemic, top-down commitment to diversity among leadership, faculty, staff, and students; the active engagement of all parties of the institution; assessment and delivery of strategies across multiple sites; and adaptation to the needs of a diverse workforce (Brown, 2004; McCalman et al., 2017). Culturally competent institutions elicit and support community involvement and provide support mechanisms to sustain cultural competency training (Brown, 2004; McCalman et al., 2017). Furthermore, culturally competent institutions develop and maintain programs to help members understand the interaction of social and cultural influences on beliefs and behaviors across multiple levels (Betancourt et al., 2003). Finally, culturally competent institutions welcome opportunities to make structural changes to better accommodate diversity (McAlearney et al., 2021; McCalman et al., 2017).

Potential strategies exist in higher education to attain these requisites associated with culturally competent institutions. Administration can require and financially support cultural competency training and programming across departments. Adapting to the needs of a diverse workforce might mean institutions identify and implement strategies to

support publication by faculty for whom English is a second language or support scheduling flexibility to assist faculty in meeting the needs of their families or communities during traditional work hours (Haskins et al., 2016; Trepal & Stinchfield, 2012). Within the intrapersonal and interpersonal contexts, institutions could fund training that improves self and other awareness for all employees. For example, courageous conversations help individuals navigate conversations about race and diversity with those of differing cultural backgrounds to encounter one another with humility and vulnerability, seeking to create a brave space (Brazill, 2020; Singleton, 2014).

Singleton (2014) proposed Four Agreements that make courageous conversations: (1) stay engaged, (2) expect to experience discomfort, (3) speak your truth, and (4) expect and accept a lack of closure. Courageous conversations occurring within the intrapersonal and interpersonal contexts at the administrative level of the institution could create an atmosphere of humility and vulnerability while establishing boundaries and protecting authenticity. This atmosphere could act as a change agent that demonstrates cultural competency in navigating cross-cultural relationships through courageous conversation as an institutional standard for use across departments (Bellon-Harn & Weinbaum, 2017; Osula & Irvin, 2009). From a socioecological perspective, understanding institutional readiness to engage and sustain cultural competency helps CES faculty identify advocacy steps for not only institutional policy changes, but also intrapersonal and interpersonal interventions at the administrative and interdepartmental levels, thereby supporting systemic cultural competency that would influence cross-cultural mentorship.

CES Program Cultural Competency Considerations for CES Faculty

CES programs must demonstrate culturally competent practices in supervision, research, teaching, and counselor self-awareness (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2016; Ratts et al., 2015). Culturally competent CES programs would include similar elements of culturally competent institutions, such as hiring diverse faculty and admitting diverse students, requiring active engagement in cultural competency programming and training, and promoting diverse faculty to leadership roles (Brown 2004; McCalman et al., 2007). Culturally competent CES programs would assess the needs of diverse faculty and students to assist their academic success (McCalman et al., 2017) and value collaboration with other departments to foster cooperation and sharing resources (D'Andrea et al., 1991). Culturally competent CES programs would support cross-cultural mentorship in research, teaching, and wellness mentorship to meet the needs of diverse faculty and students (Atieno Okech et al., 2006; Oller & Teeling, 2021; Waalkes et al., 2021). Specifically, research mentorship includes collaborative dissemination of scholarly work, including presentations and manuscripts (Atieno Okech et al., 2006). CES program curriculum could include courses in which faculty coteach sections (peer mentorship) while collaboratively producing a manuscript for submission to a journal (faculty-to-student mentorship). CES programs will need to consider the intrapersonal and interpersonal needs for collaborative work among diverse teams of students and faculty, necessitating provision of cultural competency training for mentors.

Training in strengths-based mentoring approaches could benefit diverse students and improve recruitment, matriculation, and graduation rates (Boswell et al., 2015; Butler et al., 2013). CES leadership will need to recruit effective mentors who demonstrate adequate knowledge and skills, engage in ethical behavior, focus on the mentee's development, communicate effectively, explore cultural differences between the mentor and the mentee, and have direct and honest conversations about expectations, including the mentor's available time commitment (Borders et al., 2012). Additionally, a process for mentee feedback encourages improvements for the mentee's experience and training needs for mentors (Bellon-Harn & Weinbaum, 2017). An evaluation process to assess mentor characteristics can create an avenue for helping mentors and mentees communicate each other's needs to strengthen the mentorship relationship (Borders et al., 2012). Vignettes and

role-plays can be useful for training and navigating the cross-cultural mentoring relationship (Henderson et al., 2016).

While existing vignettes describe relationship ruptures between faculty and students due to diversity issues (Henderson et al., 2016), CES faculty could develop vignettes of helpful cross-cultural relationship experiences. The use of vignettes provides platforms to openly discuss and educate often misconstrued topics in the hopes of providing a deeper understanding. The previously described courageous conversations (Singleton, 2014) provides an intrapersonal framework for both cross-cultural faculty-to-faculty and faculty-to-student mentorship.

The socioecological context of cross-cultural mentorship warrants consideration of the intrapersonal and interpersonal, community, and institutional contexts of cultural competency. Given the multidimensional influences on cultural competency, CES programs would benefit from a systematic evaluation framework to determine readiness for cross-cultural mentorship.

Proposed Evaluation Framework for Cross-Cultural Mentorship Within CES Programs

Oller and Teeling (2021) identified the need and recommended guidelines for cross-cultural mentorship within CES programs. Engagement in cross-cultural mentorship requires cultural competency of not only the mentor and the mentee (Chung et al., 2007), but also across the levels of the institution (McAlearney et al., 2021; Savolanien 2013; Weiner, 2009). The proceeding literature review identified requisites for cultural competency and cross-cultural mentorship from a socioecological perspective. Starting at the institutional level, the present work proposes a five-component model to assess readiness to successfully engage and sustain cross-cultural mentorship within a CES program, summarized in Figure 1. Given the multidimensional, socioecological context, a linear approach is not warranted; rather, CES faculty can evaluate the components simultaneously to help identify and attain requisites for cross-cultural mentorship.

Component One: Institutional Evaluation

Component One assesses cultural competency at the institutional level. Higher education can borrow from the healthcare field and utilize the "Organizational Readiness to Change for Cultural Competency Survey" to reveal growth areas for the institution's readiness to adopt culturally competent practices (ORCCCS; McAlearney, et al., 2021). The ORCCCS's two scales assess readiness to improve the quality of provided services and disparities in access to services in healthcare, identifying the institution's stage as preconsideration, consideration, reflection, identification, or implementation. The survey was developed from a review of conceptual frameworks, previous assessment tools, and qualitative research findings pursuant to institutional cultural competence and readiness to change. The ORCCCS demonstrates construct validity and acceptable reliability for both scales with alphas of .85 and .65. While the ORCCCS is specific to the healthcare setting, adapted to higher education, the ORCCCS could provide institutions a designated stage to inform decision making for allocation of resources and stage-appropriate interventions, such as educational trainings at the preconsideration stage.

Assessing readiness gives ownership to administration to understand the challenges CES programs and other departments will face to make necessary changes to support cultural competence. For example, administration and institution leaders could better place individual cultural intelligence to guide a vision of cultural competence. The cultural intelligence scale (CQS; Ang et al., 2006; Ang et al., 2007) assesses an individual's cultural intelligence and measures the ability to understand, act, and successfully navigate culturally diverse settings. CQS can be implemented institution-wide. CES faculty could also mentor administration to engage bravely (Brazill, 2020) in the previously described courageous conversations (Singleton, 2014), creating a top-down support of intrapersonal and interpersonal cultural competency.

The task of engaging administration may seem daunting to taxed CES faculty (Cicco, 2020), who advance systemic cultural competency as an

Figure 1

Proposed Evaluation Framework for CES Faculty to Identify Requisites to Culturally Competent Cross-Cultural Mentorship

Institutional Evaluation

- Institutional Cultural Competency
- Individual Cultural Competency and Holistic Mentorship at Administrative Level
- Adovocacy and Interdepartmental Collaboration

CES Program Evaluation

- CES Program Cultural Competency
- Advocacy
- Individual Cultural Competency and Holistic Mentorship Approach
  - Research, Wellness, and Cross-Cultural Mentorship
  - Mentorship Needs and Identification

Mentor Evaluation for Recruiting and Providing Feedback

- Mentorship Characteristics and Competency Across Holistic Mentorship Areas
- Individual Cultural Competency
- Training, Education, and Feedback Procedure

Plan for Continued Connection Between Mentor and Mentee

- Motivation and Ability to Sustain a Long-Term Commitment
- Maintaining Mentorship Post-Graduation for Faculty and Students
- Quality of Current Mentorship for Newly Hired Faculty

Ongoing Evaluation of Social Support and Mentoring Effectiveness

- Assess Quaility of and Access to Trainings, Support Networks, and Work Demands to Reduce Burnout for Mentors
- Monitor the Number of Faculty Mentoring Other Faculty and Students
- Advocacy

Note. This figure represents the areas for evaluation by CES faculty and program leadership to assess a program's readiness to improve cultural competency as it relates to a holistic mentorship approach that prioritizes cross-cultural mentorship. The evaluation framework evaluates readiness for cultural competency and cross-cultural mentorship within the institutional, community, intrapersonal, and interpersonal contexts (Ratts et al., 2016). CES faculty can gather assessment data within each component simultaneously and analyze collectively to discern needed requisites for their programs.

advocacy action (Ratts et al., 2015). CES faculty could take a collaborative approach by discussing with colleagues from other departments how each discipline approaches cultural competency, and then collectively approach administration. CES leadership may need to advocate allocation of funds to train faculty in effective strategies for cross-cultural mentorship. CES programs might designate a faculty member to serve on an institution's cultural diversity committee, providing an opportunity to introduce institutional assessment of cultural competency readiness to multiple stakeholders in the institution. CES leaders can mentor and collaborate with administration to utilize assessment strategies and activities that create brave space (Brazill, 2020) for courageous conversations (Singleton, 2014) to discern and model requisites for top-down support of cultural competency to cultivate cross-cultural mentorship.

Component Two: CES Program Evaluation

Even if there is little support or initiation at the institutional level, CES programs can implement component one at the departmental level, the course level, or even the individual faculty level. The framework of the ORCCCS (McAlearney et al., 2021) could provide CES leaders a snapshot of student and faculty perspectives on the program's readiness to improve quality of and access to culturally competent practices. A rating of poor readiness (preconsideration) might warrant starting with education on disparities associated with race and ethnicity in CACREP-accredited programs (Oller & Teeling, 2021). A rating of very good readiness (identification) might suggest faculty and students engage in courageous conversations to determine growth areas for cultural sensitivity (Singleton, 2014) and use vignettes to facilitate exploration of multicultural issues associated with mentorship (Henderson et al., 2016; Wyatt et al., 2019). CES leaders could include an open question that allows students and faculty to provide suggestions for culturally competent practices. For example, students might identify a need to practice broaching behaviors (Chung et al., 2007; Oller & Teeling, 2021), leading faculty to add broaching behavior role-plays as a course assignment. Assessing readiness to improve quality of and

access to culturally competent educational practices could identify appropriate strategies matched to the program developmental level and stimulate ideas to nurture cultural competency within the CES program for cross-cultural mentorship.

Guided by Oller and Teeling's (2021) work, CES faculty leadership could consider cross-cultural mentorship as a requisite to a holistic mentorship program with formal and informal mentorship opportunities, as well as mentorship for specific areas, such as research and wellness. Based on the growing research indicating the need for cross-cultural mentorship and respective guidelines in CES (Boswell et al., 2015; Chung et al., 2007; Oller & Teeling, 2021), careful intention should be given to the selection and pairing of mentors for mentees. Both formal (CQS; Ang et al., 2007; Bellon-Harn & Weinbaum, 2017; Campinha-Bacote, 2008) and informal assessment strategies (Bellon-Harn & Weinbaum, 2017; Black et al., 2004; Brown et al., 2009) can be used to assess mentors in their appropriateness for participation in a cross-cultural mentorship. Additionally, an articulation of cross-cultural mentorship guidelines like those developed for research mentorship (Borders et al., 2012) would be useful in determining effective and ethical cross-cultural mentor characteristics, as well as expectations for mentees. An explicit articulation of these guidelines (Oller & Teeling, 2021) could promote standardized formal assessment and encourage creative informal assessment of both the mentor and the mentee within a holistic mentorship program.

Formally, Bellon-Harn and Weinbaum's (2017) cross-culturally sensitive mentor interview questions and scoring rubric can be used to evaluate a prospective mentor's cross-cultural sensitivity, passion, strengths, weaknesses, role-specific abilities, and openness to feedback. Informally, engagement in courageous conversations (Singleton, 2014) and use of vignettes (Henderson et al., 2016; Wyatt et al., 2019) can help identify potential mentors who are equipped for cross-cultural interactions and committed to further education on promoting cross-cultural mentorship. The use of culturally sensitive formal and informal assessments can cultivate a holistic mentorship

program, including requisites for cross-cultural mentorship. While a holistic mentorship program may not explicitly exist in a CES program, faculty can intervene at the department, course, and individual levels. Minimally, faculty can seek to determine their own cultural competency and readiness to change. Faculty can initiate courageous conversations (Singleton, 2014) with colleagues and provide spaces (Brazill, 2020) to broach courageous topics with students. Faculty can also advocate for needed program changes, such as evaluation, recruitment, and development of mentors through feedback.

Component Three: Mentor Evaluation for Recruiting and Providing Feedback

Evaluation of mentors and an established format for continued feedback are vital to successful mentorship (Black et al., 2004; Boswell et al., 2015; Wyatt et al., 2019). Both formal and informal assessments are necessary in the inspection of a mentoring dyad's appropriateness of fit (Borders et al., 2012; Kuo et al., 2017), particularly within cross-cultural contexts (Bellon-Harn & Weinbaum, 2017; Oller & Teeling, 2021). However, due to the lack of explicit cross-cultural mentorship guidelines (Oller & Teeling, 2021), cross-cultural mentorship appropriateness of fit assessments cannot be standardized and therefore must be adapted from existing mentorship and advisory relationship assessments (Kuo et al., 2017). By incorporating cross-culturally sensitive assessment information specific to the mentorship dyad, such as "my mentor understands my culture and value system," assessing the appropriateness of fit within the cross-cultural mentorship dyad can occur from the mentor's and the mentee's perspectives.

Formally, faculty could utilize the CQS (Ang et al., 2007) individually and discuss in groups to assess individual and program growth areas for cultural competency, collectively identifying advocacy actions at the program level. Informally, faculty can create a guiding set of questions for faculty and students using questions like "What are my diversity related needs?" and "Do I want to commit time and energy to a longer term relationship?" (Black et al., 2004, p. 48). If the CES

student community is at the preconsideration level of readiness to improve cultural competency, CES faculty could assign an article on cross-cultural mentorship, engage class discussion, and adapt these questions to a reflection assignment, thereby introducing the rationale for cultural competency in cross-cultural mentorship, while gathering information to help CES faculty pair students to mentors. While these methods focus on cultural competency and mentor characteristics, a formal assessment specific to cross-cultural mentorship exists.

Mentor cross-cultural competency can be evaluated using The Inventory for Assessing the Process of Cultural Competence in Mentoring (IAPCC-M; Campinha-Bacote, 2008). The IAPCC-M was developed from the conceptual framework of Campinha-Bacote's model of cultural competency (Campinha-Bacote, 2010) and adapted from the Inventory for Assessing the Process of Cultural Competence Revised (IAPCC-R; Transcultural C.A.R.E. Associates, 2020). The IAPCC-M assesses a mentor's cultural competency at one of four levels — cultural proficiency, cultural competence, cultural awareness, or cultural incompetence. The IAPCC-M has demonstrated good Cronbach α's of .78 and .81 (Transcultural C.A.R.E. Associates, 2020) and the IAPCC-R has demonstrated good Cronbach α's ranging from .81 to .86 across three studies (Wilson et al., 2010). The IAPCC-M is as a reliable assessment tool to identify mentor's areas for growth to improve cultural competencies specific to cross-cultural mentorship.

CES faculty can utilize the IAPCC-M (Campinha-Bacote, 2008), informal questionnaires developed from literature (Black et al., 2004), courageous conversations (Singleton, 2014), and crafted vignettes (Henderson et al., 2016) to identify potential growth areas for mentors and mentees. These evaluation methods could also identify if mentors have support and access to culturally sensitive training opportunities to buffer against burnout and isolation for faculty and student mentors (Bellon-Harn & Weinbaum, 2017; Oller & Teeling, 2021; Woo et al., 2019).

Component Four: Plan for Continued Connection Between Mentor and Mentee

Component four assesses plans by the CES program and CES faculty to help mentors and mentees sustain the cross-cultural mentorship relationship across time, as continuing the mentorship relationship can protect mentees from isolation and burnout (Boswell et al., 2015; Wyatt et al., 2019). CES programs may need to equally distribute mentorship responsibilities so mentors can maintain the time commitment. CES faculty could use virtual meetings or an alumnae connection program to stay connected with mentors after graduation. CES programs could assess newly hired faculty needs to help support preexisting mentorship relationships. CES program leaders should also include the quality of current mentoring relationships, especially cross-cultural mentorship, when assessing newly hired faculty needs. Mentors can experience "judgementoring," wherein the mentor chooses to interact with their mentee in a nonconstructive way, utilizing judgment, passive-aggressive confrontation, and critical comparison without explanation or as a pedagogical mechanism (Hobson & Malderez, 2013). "Judgementoring" can be exacerbated by cultural differences between the mentor and the mentee (Wyatt et al., 2019). Assessing plans for continued connection between mentors and mentees would provide vital information needed to sustain cross-cultural mentorship.

Component Five: Ongoing Evaluation of Social Support and Mentoring Effectiveness

Component five further evaluates intrapersonal and interpersonal contexts by assessing the CES program's ability to support mentor engagement in cross-cultural mentorship over time. Mentors in CES programs balance their personal life, academic responsibilities, professional responsibilities, and relationship with mentees (Black et al., 2004; Oller & Teeling, 2021). Ignoring the weight of this balancing act, mentors are at greater risk of burnout, affecting both the mentor and the mentee (Boswell et al., 2015). Self-compassion strategies have been suggested to help address stress associated with the mentor role intersectionality (Solomon & Barden,

2016). CES programs need to assess if cross-cultural mentors have access to necessary social support. Cross-cultural mentorship using self-compassion strategies (Solomon & Barden, 2016) can provide further support for diverse mentoring relationships in their stress tolerance and overall well-being. These constructs have been linked to mentor effectiveness and their desire to continue mentoring (Bellon-Harn & Weinbaum, 2017; Black et al., 2004; Minor et al., 2013). While initially developed to meet the needs of counselor educator mothers, Solomon and Barden's (2016) self-compassion mentorship framework can be used to help support diverse mentors in their stress tolerance and overall health, which has been shown to increase their effectiveness and desire to continue mentoring (Bellon-Harn & Weinbaum, 2017; Black et al., 2004; Minor et al., 2013). The proposed evaluation framework highlights numerous needs for developing cultural competency within an institution and cultivating cross-cultural mentorship within a CES Program.

Framework Summary and Implications for CES Programs

Leadership organizations within professional counseling and counselor education emphasize the imperative of mentorship between peers, faculty, and their students (CACREP, 2016; CSI, 1999; Kaplan & Gladding, 2011). While the benefits of mentorship have been empirically supported (Borders et al., 2011), these relationships are contraindicated if culturally insensitive and disconnected from ongoing evaluation and supportive resources (Bellon-Harn & Weinbaum, 2017; Oller & Teeling, 2021). Oller and Teeling (2021) proposed a holistic approach to mentorship that included cross-cultural mentorship relationships within counselor education programs, resulting in an affirming mentorship atmosphere that recognizes, invites, and celebrates diversity. Consideration of a socioecological perspective of cultural competency needed for cross-cultural mentorship precipitated an evaluative framework and strategies to help CES faculty identify and enact requisites to cross-cultural mentorship.

Implications of the proposed framework for CES programs are far-reaching. Extensively, the evaluative framework could guide creation of a holistic mentorship program from a cross-cultural perspective to meet the needs of an ever-diversifying population (Oller & Teeling, 2021). Utilizing formal and informal assessment strategies, CES faculty can assess institutional, CES program, and individual cultural competency, identify requisites for cross-cultural mentorship, including appropriateness of the mentorship dyad, ongoing evaluation of the cross-cultural mentorship process, the identification of plans for continued mentor–mentee connection, and creation of mentor supports.

Recommendations for Future Research

Mentorship is associated with benefits to graduate students and faculty (Atieno Okech et al., 2006; Minor et al., 2013; Waalkes et al., 2018; Woo et al., 2019), especially minoritized faculty who face barriers to success (Haskins et al., 2016; Solomon & Barden, 2016; Trepal & Stinchfield, 2012). Cross-cultural mentorship is a necessary component of CES programs requiring explicit guidelines (Oller & Teeling, 2021) and identification of requisites for cross-cultural mentorship with consideration of institutional and CES program cultural competency. Providing an evaluation framework at the institutional and CES program levels, emphasizing cross-cultural mentorship, identifies implications for future research.

First, taxed CES faculty (Borders et al., 2011) face the daunting task of assembling requisites for cross-cultural mentorship while managing the demands on time and resources initiated by the pandemic (Cicco, 2020) and sociopolitical climate (Kruse et al., 2018). Future research needs to identify how CES faculty can navigate institutional politics to successfully meet these needs at the institutional and CES program level. Second, existing readiness evaluation assessments are not specific to institutions of higher education or CES programs (Campinha-Bacote, 2008; McAlearney et al., 2021; Savolainen, 2013; Weiner, 2009). Exploring theoretically and empirically validated assessment tools within higher education and CES

programs would provide reliable and valid tools to guide resource allocation decisions and advocacy actions. Finally, early work explored the role of peer mentorship among graduate students (Bowman et al., 1990), while recent work has focused on faculty-to-faculty mentorship (Haskins et al., 2016; Solomon & Barden, 2016). Cross-cultural mentorship exists within all relationships of the CES program. Future research on cross-cultural peer mentoring among graduate students is needed. CES programs will benefit from considering institutional and program readiness to successfully engage in cross-cultural mentorship and to engage in future research in this critical area.

References

American Counseling Association. (2014). 2014 *ACA code of ethics.* https://www.counseling.org/knowledge-center

Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, S. K. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group and Organization Management*, *31*(1), 100–123. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275267

Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C. Yee Ng, K. Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, *33*(3), 335–371. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x

Atieno Okech, J. E. A., Astramovich, R. L., Johnson, M. M., Hoskins, W. J., & Rubel, D. J. (2006). Doctoral research training of counselor education faculty. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *46*(2), 131–145. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00018.x

Bellon-Harn, M. L., & Weinbaum, R. K. (2017). Cross-cultural peer-mentoring: Mentor outcomes and perspectives. *Teaching and Learning in Communication Sciences & Disorders*, *1*(2), 3. https://doi.org/10.30707/TLCSD1.2Bellon-Harn

Betancourt, J. R., Green, A. R., Carrillo, J. E., & Ananeh-Firempong, O. (2003). Defining cultural competence: A practical framework for addressing racial/ethnic disparities in health and health care. *Public Health Report*s, *118*(4), 293–302. https://doi.org/10.1093/phr/118.4.293

Black, L. L., Suarez, E. C., & Medina, S. (2004). Helping students help themselves: Strategies for successful mentoring relationships. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *44*(1), 44–55. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2004.tb01859.x

Borders, L. D., Gonzalez, L. M., Umstead, L. K., & Wester, K. L. (2019). New counselor educators' scholarly productivity: Supportive and discouraging environments. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *58*(4), 293–308. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12158

Borders, L. D., Wester, K. L., Granello, D. H., Chang, C. Y., Hays, D. G., Pepperell, J., & Spurgeon, S. L. (2012). Association for counselor education and supervision guidelines for research mentorship: Development and implementation. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *51*(3), 162–175. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2012.00012.x

Borders, L. D., Young, J. S., Wester, K. L., Murray, C. E., Villalba, J. A., Lewis, T. F., & Mobley, A. K. (2011). Mentoring promotion/tenure-seeking faculty: Principles of good practice within a counselor education program. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *50*(3), 171–188. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb00118.x

Boswell, J. N., Wilson, A. D., Stark, M. D., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2015). The role of mentoring relationships in counseling programs. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education 4*(3), 168–183. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-03-2015-0007

Bowman, R. L., Bowman, V. E., & Delucia, J. L. (1990). Mentoring in a graduate counseling program: Students helping students. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *30*(1), 58–65. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1990.tb01179.x

Brazill, S. C. (2020). Pedagogical strategies for teaching a multicultural education course: From safe space to brave space for a community of learners. *Educational Research: Theory and Practice*, *31*(2), 56–71. https://scholarworks.montana.edu/xmlui/handle/1/16090

Brown, L. I. (2004). Diversity: The challenge for higher education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 7*(1), 21–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332042000187289

Butler, S. K., Evans, M. P., Brooks, M., Williams, C. R., & Bailey, D. F. (2013). Mentoring African American men during their postsecondary and graduate school experiences: Implications for the counseling profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 91*(4), 419–427. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2013.00113.x

Campinha-Bacote, J. (2008). Assessing the process of cultural competence in mentoring. *Transcultural C.A.R.E. Associates.*

Campinha-Bacote, J. (2010). A culturally conscious model of mentoring. *Nurse Educator, 35*(3), 130–135. https://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0b013e3181d950bf

Casado Pérez, J. F., & Carney, J. V. (2018). Telling of institutional oppression: Voices of minoritized counselor educators. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *57*(3), 162–177. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12108

Chi Sigma Iota Academy of Leaders. (1999). *Principles and practices of leadership excellence*. Greensboro, NC: Author. http://www.csi-net.org/?Leadership_Practices

Chung, R. C., Bemak, F., & Talleyrand, R. M. (2007). Mentoring within the field of counseling: A preliminary study of multicultural perspectives. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *29*(1), 21–32. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-006-9025-2

Cicco, G. (2020). Online instruction during a pandemic: Faculty collaboration and self-care. *I-Manager's Journal of Educational Technology*, *17*(3), 1. https://doi.org/10.26634/jet.17.3.17545

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2016). *2016 CACREP standards*. http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/2016-Standards-with-citations.pdf

D'Andrea, M., & Daniels, J. (1991). Exploring the different levels of multicultural counseling training in counselor education. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *70*(1), 78–85. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1991.tb01565.x

Haskins, N. H., Ziomek-Diagle, J., Sewell, C., Crumb, L., Appling, B., & Trepal, H. (2016). The intersectionality of African American mothers in counselor education: A phenomenological examination. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *55*(1), 60–75. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12033

Henderson, S. J., Horton, R. A., Saito, P. K., & Shorter-Gooden, K. (2016). Validation of assessment vignettes and scoring rubric of multicultural and international competency in faculty teaching. *Multicultural Learning and Teaching*, *11*(1), 53–81. https://doi.org/10.1515/mlt-2014-0002

Hobson, A. J., & Malderez, A. (2013). Judgmentoring and other threats to realizing the potential of school-based mentoring in teacher education. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, *2*(2), 89–108. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-03-2013-0019

Kaplan, D. M., & Gladding, S. T. (2011). A vision for the future of counseling: The 20/20 principles for unifying and strengthening the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *89*(3), 367–372. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00101.x

Kruse, S. D., Rakha, S., & Calderone, S. (2018). Developing cultural competency in higher education: An agenda for practice. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *23*(6), 733–750. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2017.1414790

Kuo, P. B., Woo, J., & Bang, N. M. (2017). Advisory relationship as a moderator between research self-efficacy, motivation, and productivity among counselor education doctoral students. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *56*(2), 130–144. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12067

McAlearney, A. S., Gregory, M., Walker, D. M., & Edwards, M. (2021). Development and validation of an organizational readiness to change instrument focused on cultural competency. *Health Services Research*, *56*(1), 145–153. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.13563

McCalman, J., Jongen, C., & Bainbridge, R. (2017). Organisational systems' approaches to improving cultural competence in healthcare: A systematic scoping review of the literature. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, *16*(1), 78. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-017-0571-5

Minor, A. J., Pimpleton, A., Stinchfield, T., Stevens, H., & Othman, N. A. (2013). Peer support in negotiating multiple relationships within supervision among counselor education doctoral students. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *35*(1), 33–45. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-012-9161-9

Oller, M. L., & Teeling, S. S. (2021). Cross-cultural mentoring in counselor education: A call to action. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*, *3*(1), 5. https://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1080&context=tsc

Osula, B., & Irvin, S. M. (2009). Cultural awareness in intercultural mentoring: A model for enhancing mentoring relationships. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *5*(1), 37–50. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Cultural-Awareness-in-Intercultural-Mentoring-%3A-A-Osula/fe3fcce5833c033ac606c827fb941fba9f3d2795

Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nasser-McMillan, S., Butler, S. K., & Rafferty McCullough, J. (2015). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies. *Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development.* https://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/competencies/multicultural-and-social-justice-counseling-competencies.pdf?sfvrsn=8573422c_20

Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nassar-McMillan, S., Butler, S. K., & Rafferty McCullough, J. (2016). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies: Guidelines for the counseling profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *44*(1), 28–48. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12035

Savolainen, T. (2013). Change implementation in intercultural context: A case study of creating readiness to change. *Journal of Global Business Issues*, *7*(2), 51. https://www.academia.edu/5179064/Change_Implementation_in_Intercultural_Context_A_Case_Study_of_Creating_Readiness_to_Change

Singleton, G. E. (2014). Courageous conversations about race: A field guide for achieving equity in school (2nd ed.). SAGE.

Solomon, C., & Barden, S. M. (2016). Self-compassion: A mentorship framework for counselor educator mothers. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *55*(2), 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12038

Transcultural C.A.R.E. Associates. (2020). Psychometric properties of the IAPCC-M. http://transculturalcare.net/iapcc-m/

Trepal, H. C., & Stinchfield, T. A. (2012). Experiences of motherhood in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *51*(2), 112–126. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2012.00008.x

Tuttle, M., Grimes, L. E., & Lopez-Perry, C. (2019). Career-decision making: School counselors in counselor education doctoral programs. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*, *1*(1), 7. https://doi.org/10.7290/tsc010107

Waalkes, P. L., Benshoff, J. M., Stickl, J., Swindle, P. J., & Umstead, L. K. (2018). Structure, impact, and deficiencies of beginning counselor educators' doctoral teaching preparation. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *57*(1), 66–80. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12094

Waalkes, P. L., Hall, D., Swindle, P. J., & Stickl Haugen, J. E. (2021). Beginning counselor educators' experiences of teaching mentorship. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*, *3*(1), 8. https://trace.tennessee.edu/tsc/vol3/iss1/

Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science*, *4*(1), 67–67. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-67

Wilson, A. H., Sanner, S., & McAllister, L. E. (2010). A longitudinal study of cultural competence among health science faculty. *Journal of Cultural Diversity*, *17*(2), 68–72.

Woo, H., Kim, H., & Park, S. (2019). Burnout and turnover intentions among junior counseling faculty: Moderating role of mentoring. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, *56*(2), 85–94. https://doi.org/10.1002/joec.12114

Wyatt, G. E., Chin, D., Milburn, N., Hamilton, A., Lopez, S., Kim, A., Stone, J. D., & Belcher, H. M. E. (2019). Mentoring the mentors of students from diverse backgrounds for research. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 89(3), 321–328. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ort0000414