

Course Syllabus
Doctoral Internship
SERP 693 2018 1-12 variable credits

Instructor: Linda R. Shaw, Ph.D., LMHC, CRC

Class Times: TBD

Office: Education #412B

Telephone: 520-621-7832

Email: lshaw@email.arizona.edu

Office Hours: Available after class and by appointment. Please contact Sandra Durazo at durazo1@email.arizona.edu for an appointment or if you need to speak with me immediately.

Course/Catalog Description:

The doctoral internship in counselor education and supervision provides a supervised experience in three areas: Research, Supervision and Teaching. The internship provides an opportunity for students to apply the knowledge/skill base acquired through didactic coursework with oversight and mentoring from a faculty supervisor.

Learning Outcomes:

At the conclusion of the internship, students will have demonstrated the ability to achieve the following outcomes:

1. Successfully teach a course, to include preparation, syllabus development, delivery of effective classroom and/or online instruction, and student evaluation
2. Demonstrate proficiency in providing clinical supervision to students completing masters-level counseling practicum and/or internship
3. Apply research concepts and trends in behavioral science and produce a fundable grant or publishable paper

Content Areas:

This course includes content that addresses the following CACREP standards:

- 6.4.d emergent research practices and processes
- 6.4.e models and methods of instrument design
- 6.4.f models and methods of program evaluation

6.C.7 Doctoral students are required to complete internships that total a minimum of 600 clock hours. The 600 hours must include supervised experiences in at least three of the five doctoral core areas (counseling, teaching, supervision, research and scholarship, leadership and advocacy). Doctoral students are covered by individual professional counseling liability insurance policies while enrolled in a counseling or supervision internship.

6.C.8. During internships, the student receives an average of one hour per week of individual and/or triadic supervision, performed by a supervisor with a doctorate in counselor education or an individual with a graduate degree and specialized expertise to advance the student's knowledge and skills.

6.C.9 Group supervision is provided on a regular schedule with other students throughout the internship and must be performed by a counselor education program faculty member.

6.B.3.h. Ethical and culturally relevant strategies used in counselor preparation

Structure of the Internship:

The internship is designed to be completed in (3) 3 credit-hour modules, with each module designed to consist of a minimum of 200 hours spread across a semester. Each module focuses on one of the following three content areas: Teaching, Supervision, and Research. Ordinarily, the internship should be completed toward the end of the student's coursework, however it may in some cases be scheduled earlier in the student's program of study, provided that the student has completed the following coursework:

For the Teaching Module: IA 697A – Learner-Centered Teaching

For the Supervision Module: SERP XXX – Teaching and Supervision

For the Research Module: SERP 556 - Research Methods or similar Methods course; and
EDP 541 - Statistical Methods in Education or similar quantitative course

Method of Instruction/Course Requirements/Grading:

Methods of Instruction, Course Requirements and Grading Criteria are assigned for the internship based upon the criteria listed within each of the module descriptions below. For all modules, students are required to complete an Internship Log that documents a minimum of 600 clock hours (200 per module) devoted to the fulfillment of internship course requirements. Each student will be assigned a faculty supervisor, who will provide one hour of individual or triadic supervision per week. Students are also expected to attend group supervision at regularly scheduled intervals throughout the internship. Supervision sessions will be scheduled by the supervising faculty member, in consultation with the student(s), when possible. Prior to beginning the doctoral internship, students must obtain, and provide proof of professional counseling liability insurance to their faculty supervisor that includes coverage for non-clinical activities, including teaching, supervision, and research. Students are expected to maintain this insurance coverage throughout any period of enrollment in doctoral internship.

Throughout the doctoral internship, doctoral students will comply with ACA, CRCC, AMHCA, and/or ASCA ethical standards and codes, and federal HIPPA and FERPA regulations regarding health and educational information privacy. Failure to comply with the above-named codes and laws may result in a failing grade and/or a plan of remediation that may stipulate additional requirements. For the

internship, students will be assigned one of the following grades, based upon their performance on the criteria provided for each of the modules comprising the internship, provided below.

Course Grades:

- S=Superior: The student has completed all course requirements, including submission of all assignments and forms; the average student score on quantitative assessments is equal to or exceeds 90%; and overall performance is outstanding4- for a doctoral student
- P= Pass: The student has completed all course requirements, including submission of all assignments and forms; the average student score on quantitative assessments is equal to or exceeds 80% and overall performance is acceptable for a doctoral student
- F=Fail: The average student score on quantitative assessments is equal to or lower than 79% and overall performance falls below acceptable levels for a doctoral student

Module-specific Methods of Instruction, Course Requirements and Grading Criteria are specified below:

Teaching:

Method of Instruction in Teaching Content Area:

Each student will be assigned an undergraduate course for which he/she will be responsible. In some cases, the student may be assigned to co-teach a class with a faculty instructor, who will also serve as the supervising faculty member. Courses may be on-line, in person or hybrid, depending on student preferences and availability of courses offered during the semester in which the student elects to complete the teaching module. Students will be responsible for updating the syllabus; designing the D2L course website; preparing course materials, lectures, discussions and other course components; meeting with students during office hours and responding to student concerns; developing, administering and grading assessment rubrics and instruments. All activities involved in the Teaching component of the internship will be performed under the supervision of a faculty member who will meet regularly with the student, including one hour per week of individual/triadic supervision and at least three group meetings, scheduled at regular intervals throughout the semester, to review course materials, observations and evaluations with the student.

Course Requirements in Teaching Content Area:

1. Prior to the semester in which you intend to complete the teaching component of the internship, attend the "New Teacher Orientation" provided by the College of Education, offered in the week preceding the Fall semester.
2. During the midpoint of the semester preceding the semester in which student intends to complete the teaching component of the internship, meet with assigned supervisor to discuss the requirements for this component and obtain instructions for accessing the D2L site.
3. Review and thoroughly familiarize yourself with the previous syllabus, previous D2L site, textbook, and all existing course materials.
4. Review and thoroughly familiarize yourself with Section F (Supervision, Training and Teaching) of the ACA Code of Ethics. Come to your initial group supervision session prepared to discuss Section F and ethical issues related to counselor education, including boundary issues,

remediation, gatekeeping responsibilities, and multicultural considerations in teaching diverse students

5. In consultation with your supervisor, update and modify syllabus and materials to reflect: Changes in the field since course was last taught; innovations in teaching approaches; recently published research or reports pertinent to the course content; previous evaluations of the course; other changes recommended or required by your supervisor.
6. Schedule individual/triadic and group meetings with supervisor for ongoing monitoring and supervision. The faculty supervisor will observe the student in class at regular intervals and provide feedback during supervision, using the Classroom Observation Form.
7. Teach (or co-teach) course, seeking regular input and feedback from supervisor and others as directed.
8. Develop and prior to the last week of class, submit a Teaching Portfolio that includes the following components:
 - a. Course Syllabus
 - b. Examples of Instructional methods, e.g. Powerpoints, Exercises, Discussion groups, etc.
 - c. Examples of tools used for course assessment, e.g. exams, projects, grading rubrics
 - d. Final Reflection Paper – 3-5 page paper reflecting on your teaching philosophy and style; your strengths and areas for future growth as a teacher, with examples from your teaching experience during the semester; your reactions to your student and supervisor evaluations; and general “take-away” from the experience.

Grading for Teaching Content Area:

The grade for the Teaching Content Area will be determined by the Supervising Faculty Member and will be based upon:

1. Student Internship Supervisor Evaluation form (www.coe.arizona.edu/dps/forms)
2. Assessment of Teaching Form (www.coe.arizona.edu/dps/forms)
3. Teaching Portfolio

Rubric for Evaluation of Teaching Portfolio:

1=Strongly Disagree

2=Somewhat Disagree

3=Neither Agree or Disagree

4=Somewhat Agree

5=Strongly Agree

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
1. The syllabus includes all required template information, clearly specifies measurable outcomes, course requirements, grading criteria and assignments.					
2. The instructional methods and materials promote student mastery of course material and are likely to engage students in active learning					

3. The reflection paper is thoughtful and reflects student's willingness to self-evaluate, learn from experience and use the internship as an opportunity for developing his/her personal philosophy and professional identity as a teacher.					
Total Points =					

Supervision:

Method of Instruction in Supervision Content Area:

Each doctoral student supervisor (DSS) will be assigned 4-6 masters-level practicum or internship students to supervise. The doctoral student will fulfill all of the responsibilities of the supervisor outlined in the Clinical Services Manual (https://www.coe.arizona.edu/sites/coe/files/2015-2016_student_fac_clin_prac_man_updated_2.1.16.pdf), including meeting individually with each student for 1 hour per week for supervision, as well as joining a supervising faculty member (SFM) to provide group supervision for 1 ½ hours per week. The student will be responsible for all supervision activity including development of supervisees' counseling skills, addressing counseling relationship issues, reviewing and approving logs, forms, and other required paperwork, interacting with practicum site supervisors, safeguarding client welfare, providing ongoing assessment and evaluation and providing a mid-term and final summative evaluation. The DSS must meet with a SFM for supervision an average of one hour per week for individual and/or triadic supervision. DSS's should document a minimum of 200 clock hours in supervision-related activities.

Course Requirements in Supervision Content Area:

1. Read and thoroughly familiarize yourself with the *Counseling Program Clinical Practice Manual* located at https://www.coe.arizona.edu/sites/coe/files/2015-2016_student_fac_clin_prac_man_updated_2.1.16.pdf. You are responsible for ensuring that your supervisees are apprised of their rights and responsibilities and monitoring supervisee compliance with the manual and with ethical guidelines for the profession and specialization.
2. Prior to meeting with students, produce proof of professional liability insurance that includes coverage for teaching, research and supervision.
3. Meet with assigned students each week for an average of 1 hour for individual supervision and 1 ½ hour of group supervision.
4. Visit practicum/internship site a minimum of once per semester and engage in ongoing interactions with site supervisors throughout the semester, intervening where needed to problem-solve or provide support.
5. Meet with supervising faculty member (SFM) for 1 hour per week for supervision
6. Attend DSS group supervision, schedule TBD. At least once during your supervision semester you will prepare and formally present a supervision challenge for discussion and input from the group, and provide periodic updates to the group thereafter. Opportunities for Informal

discussion of supervision issues will also be available at each group supervision session. The formal presentation should include: a) description of supervisee (background, counseling style, etc.); b) challenges in supervision; c) examples of challenges and attempts to address; and d) plans for future supervision. Presenters are cautioned to prepare and present case examples in a manner consistent with Section F.7.f of the ACA Code of Ethics.

7. Contact SFM immediately if you become aware of problems on the practicum/internship site that might imperil the master's student, the practicum/internship placement, or the welfare of clients. If the SFM is unavailable, contact another Counseling faculty member or the DPS Department Head.
8. Final Reflection Paper (10 points). Write a 3-5 page reflection paper that addresses each of the following questions:
 - a. How would you describe your personal style of clinical supervision? In responding to this question, please describe 1) the model(s) of counseling you draw from in your work with your clients and 2) the theoretical framework(s) you use in your supervision. Provide examples.
 - b. Reflect on and evaluate your performance in various aspects of your role as a supervisor as well as your effectiveness in developing an effective supervisory alliance with your supervisees. What aspects of your supervisor-supervisee relationship did you find challenging and/or conducive to supervision?
 - c. Overall, how would you evaluate your skill level at the beginning of your supervision experience compared to your skill level as you near the end of your experience. What skill areas need further development?

Grading for Supervision Content Area:

The grade for the Supervision Content Area will be determined by the Supervising Faculty Member and will be based upon student's performance as reflected in:

1. Student Evaluation of Doctoral Student Supervisor Form (www.coe.arizona.edu/dps/forms)
2. Supervising Faculty Member Evaluation of Doctoral Student Supervisor Form (www.coe.arizona.edu/dps/forms)
3. Group Supervision Challenge Presentation
4. Supervision Reflection Paper

Rubric for Evaluation of Supervision Reflection Paper:

1=Strongly Disagree

2=Somewhat Disagree

3=Neither Agree or Disagree

4=Somewhat Agree

5=Strongly Agree

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
----------	---	---	---	---	---

1. Model(s) and Theoretical Framework(s) are accurately described and are consistent with observed supervisor style/behavior					
2. Student demonstrates an understanding of supervisory alliance and supervisor role in creating a strong alliance					
3. Reflection paper includes honest self-appraisal and accurately evaluates supervisory strengths and weaknesses					
Total Points =					

Rubric for Evaluation of Group Supervision Challenge Presentation

1=Strongly Disagree

2=Somewhat Disagree

3=Neither Agree or Disagree

4=Somewhat Agree

5=Strongly Agree

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
1. Required elements of presentation are present					
2. Student seeks input and is open and nondefensive when input is provided					
3. Student is able to formulate a reasonable plan for how to address the challenge, going forward					
Total Points =					

Research:

Method of Instruction in Research Content Area:

Students demonstrate their ability to apply research methods and design skills through two primary methods:

1. Students will complete assigned readings, discuss the application of concepts covered in readings during supervision sessions, and complete corresponding mini-assessments on a

variety of topics that address the application of research principles to various issues in research. Topics covered include the following:

Week	Topic	Reading
1-2	Forming Research Questions and Hypotheses	Patten, M.L. (2017). Proposing empirical research, 5th ed. New York: Routledge pp 1-25.
3-4	Participatory Action Research	Walker, M. L. (1993). Participatory action research. <i>Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin</i> , 261-291.
5-6	Research Ethics	DeVries, R, Anderson, M.S. & Martinson, B.C. (2006). Normal misbehavior: Scientists talk about the Ethics of research, <i>Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics</i> , 43-50.
7-8	Instrument Design	Colton, D. & Covert, R. W. (2007). <i>Designing and constructing instruments for social research and evaluation</i> . San Francisco: Josey Bass, pp. 3-63
9-10	Program Evaluation	McNamara, C. (n.d.) <i>Basic guide to program evaluation (including outcomes evaluation)</i> . Free Management Library https://managementhelp.org/evaluation/program-evaluation-guide.htm
11-12	Knowledge Translation	Sudsawad, P. (n.d.) <i>Knowledge translation: Introduction to Models, Strategies, and Measures</i> . Center on Knowledge Translation for Disability & Rehabilitation Research at American Institutes for Research https://managementhelp.org/evaluation/program-evaluation-guide.htm
13-14	Emergent research Practices & Processes	Hesse-Biber, S. N & Leavy, P. (2006). <i>Emergent Methods in Social Research</i> Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp 375-381

All readings, mini-assessments and due dates are located on d2l.

2. The Internship student will contract with a faculty member to supervise the student's development and implementation of a research project, to be completed under the supervision of a supervising faculty member. The project may be developed by the student or may be an ongoing part of a faculty member's research, however, if the project is a part of a larger faculty project, the student should have primary responsibility for a discrete part of the project. The faculty member and student will complete and sign the Independent Study/ Internship/Preceptorship Course Form (<https://www.coe.arizona.edu/dps/students>). This form should be completed and signed by both the student and supervising faculty member prior to the start of the semester in which the student is enrolled for the Research Module of the Internship. This component is designed to allow for maximum flexibility in order for the faculty member and student to design the module in accordance with the student's educational interests and needs, however, the course methods, timelines and outcomes must be clearly reflected in the agreement, which serves as a contract between the student and the supervising faculty member.

Course Requirements in Research Content Area:

1. Students will complete assigned readings and take the associated mini-assessments that are designed to assess the student's ability to apply the concepts covered by that bi-weekly reading. All readings and quizzes are posted on the course d2l site.
2. Specific Requirements for completion of the research project will be determined by the faculty member supervising the student's research internship module as stated in the Internship Research Module Agreement , but must result in a fundable grant or publishable paper or conference presentation proposal that includes the following:
 - a. Clearly stated research question(s)
 - b. A clear rationale for the study (need, significance)
 - c. A review of existing literature and theory that inform the study
 - d. Methods
 - e. Results
 - f. Discussion/Implications/Recommendations
3. If IRB approval is required, the student will prepare and submit the required IRB forms (<http://rgw.arizona.edu/compliance/human-subjects-protection-program/HSPF-forms>). The project may not be initiated until IRB approval is obtained.
4. Within the first two weeks of class and prior to IRB submission, all students must complete and submit evidence of having satisfactorily completed the CITI Online Training program (<http://rgw.arizona.edu/compliance/human-subjects-protection-program/training-requirements>).

Grading for Research Content Area:

Mini-Assessment Grades: 28 points (4 points each for a total of 28 points)

Research Project: 72 points (per contracted grading criteria)

The criteria for the project grade will be determined in advance by the faculty member supervising the research project and will be clearly documented on the Independent Study/ Internship/Preceptorship Course Form (<https://www.coe.arizona.edu/dps/students>)

Rubric/Criteria for Evaluation of Research Project:

The criteria to be used in evaluating the research project will be determined in advance by the faculty member supervising the research project and will be clearly stated in the "Evaluation" section of the Independent Study/ Internship/Preceptorship Course Form (<https://www.coe.arizona.edu/dps/students>).

Changes to Syllabus Content

Please be aware that the work and course requirements are subject to change at the discretion of the instructor with proper notice to the students.

Students Requiring Accommodation for Disabilities

It is the University's goal that learning experiences be as accessible as possible. If you anticipate or experience physical or academic barriers based on disability or pregnancy, please let me know

immediately so that we can discuss options. You are also welcome to contact Disability Resources (520-621-3268) to establish reasonable accommodations.

Please be aware that the accessible table and chairs in this room should remain available for students who find that standard classroom seating is not usable.

Threatening or Disruptive Behavior by Students

Disruptive and Threatening behavior is prohibited. “Disruptive behavior” is conduct that materially and substantially interferes with, or obstructs the teaching or learning process in the context of a classroom or educational setting. “Threatening behavior” means any statement, communication, conduct or gesture, including those in written form, directed toward any member of the University community that causes a reasonable apprehension of physical harm to a person or property. A student can be guilty of threatening behavior even if the person who is the object of the threat does not observe or receive it, so long as a reasonable person would interpret the maker’s statement, communication, conduct or gesture as a serious expression of intent to physically harm. Expectations for student conduct are located at <https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/5-308-Student%20Code%20of%20Conduct.pdf>

Academic Integrity

This instructor supports the Code of Academic Integrity of the University of Arizona. Plagiarism (presenting the ideas or writing of another as one’s own) or obtaining unauthorized assistance in any academic work is prohibited. Plagiarism may also include self-plagiarism (presenting work previously authored by the student without proper citation or attribution). Students can access the Code of Academic Integrity at <http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/codeofacademicintegrity/>

Note that the use of the same report, paper, presentation, etc. to meet requirements in more than one course will also be considered a misrepresentation and a violation of the Code of Academic Integrity. *If, however, the student and professors agree, different aspects of the same topic may be addressed in separate classes.*

Diversity Statement

The University of Arizona is committed to fostering a learning, working, and living environment free from all forms of discrimination, including harassment. The University’s Nondiscrimination and Anti-harassment Policy prohibits discrimination and harassment on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, and gender identity. The full policy is located at <http://policy.arizona.edu/human-resources/nondiscrimination-and-anti-harassment-policy>. It is important that all members of our community know where to turn if they have a concern under the policy. If you ever experience or witness discrimination or harassment, you are encouraged you to report this information to the appropriate University office.

If you have concerns related to discrimination or harassment about a University employee, please contact:

Office of Institutional Equity
University Services Building, #217
(520) 621-9449
<http://equity.arizona.edu/>

If you have concerns related to discrimination or harassment about another student, please contact:

Dean of Students Office
1212 E. University Blvd
(520) 621-7057
<http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/>

Students can contact these offices anonymously to receive information or ask questions. Complaints should be filed promptly. For definitions of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation, please see the University's Nondiscrimination and Anti-harassment Policy at: <http://policy.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/Nondiscrimination.pdf>. For information about Title IX, please visit: http://equity.arizona.edu/title_ix.

The University of Arizona is an equal opportunity, affirmative action institution. The University prohibits discrimination in its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, or gender identity and is committed to maintaining an environment free from sexual harassment and retaliation.

Class Resources

National Science Foundation: A guide for proposal writing. CFDA 47.076. Downloaded from: <https://www.nsf.gov/pubs/1998/nsf9891/nsf9891.htm>

Writing a Research Grant Proposal Downloaded from: <http://www.mrc.ac.za/researchdevelopment/researchgrant.pdf>

American Psychological Association (2010) Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th Ed. Downloaded from <http://www.apastyle.org/manual/>

University of Arizona Course Syllabus Policy: Undergraduate (with Template). Downloaded from <http://policy.arizona.edu/faculty-affairs-and-academics/course-syllabus-policy-undergraduate-template>

Counseling Program Rehabilitation & Mental Health and School Counseling Clinical Practice Manual. Downloaded from https://www.coe.arizona.edu/sites/coe/files/2015-2016_student_fac_clin_prac_man_updated_2.1.16.pdf

Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification: Code of Professional Ethics for Rehabilitation Counselors (2017). Downloaded from: www.crcrcertification.com/code-of-ethics

American Counseling Association (2014). 2014 ACA Code of Ethics. Downloaded from www.counseling.org/Resources/aca-code-of-ethics.pdf

American School Counselor Association (2016). Ethical Standards for School Counselors. Downloaded from: <https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/Ethics/EthicalStandards2016.pdf>

American Mental Health Counselors Association (2015). AMHCA Code of Ethics. Downloaded from <http://connections.amhca.org/HigherLogic/System/DownloadDocumentFile.ashx?DocumentFileKey=d4e10fcb-2f3c-c701-aa1d-5d0f53b8bc14&forceDialog=0>

Bernard, J.M. & Goodyear, R. K. (2014). Fundamentals of Clinical Supervision, 5th Edition, Pearson. Order from: <https://www.pearson.com/us/higher-education/program/Bernard-Fundamentals-of-Clinical-Supervision-5th-Edition/PGM233439.html>

University of Arizona
Counselor Education & Supervision Doctoral Program
 Department of Disability and Psychoeducational Studies
 College of Education, PO Box 10069, Tucson, Az, 85721-0069

Semester: _____ Year: _____

FORM I: DOCTORAL STUDENT EVALUATION OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY TEACHING SUPERVISOR (2 pages)
(Mid-term & Final)

Student: _____ **University Faculty Teaching Supervisor:** _____

Your specific feedback is important because it assists the University Faculty Teaching Supervisor in meeting doctoral student needs and creating as efficient a supervisory learning process as possible. Please complete sections I and II below.

I Please respond to the following requests for narrative feedback on the teaching supervision you received.

- a) The most valuable piece(s) of supervision the University Faculty Teaching Supervisor provided was/were
- b) Some suggestions for the University Faculty Teaching Supervisor to increase my (and others') learning experience would be....
- c) Additional comments about the University Faculty Teaching Supervisor:

#	Rating
0	N/A
1	Strongly disagree
2	Disagree
3	Agree
4	Strongly Agree

II	Rating
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor scheduled, and consistently completed supervisory meetings; or rescheduled with sufficient notice.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor provided timely, balanced, objective, and descriptive feedback based on my work in the classroom and in supervision.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor modelled instructional techniques as needed or requested.	0 1 2 3 4

The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor demonstrated empathy and concern for my role as a doctoral student instructor as evidenced by active listening, asking questions, and open and respectful interactions.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor clearly outlined expectations, responsibilities, goals, and objectives for both our roles.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor provided additional assistance as needed or requested.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor offered additional instructional resources as needed or requested.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor encouraged and facilitated critical thinking and problem solving.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor maintained a supportive relationship that encouraged my increased independence as the semester progressed.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor encouraged me to analyze my instructional skills and provided support and guidance during that process.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor offered assistance with instructional documentation.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor communicated in a supportive and encouraging manner.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor discussed limitations or necessary changes needed to improve my instructional skills.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor modeled professional and interpersonal behaviors that facilitated my learning in how to work effectively and efficiently with learners in the classroom and in office meetings.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor assessed my skill level and interpersonal style at the time my instruction role began.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor established and maintained clear and appropriate professional boundaries and ethical behavior with me.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor created a supportive learning environment and fostered my unique style, development, and creativity; and did not seek my imitation of her/his methods.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor used methods for helping me recognize areas of inexperience or discomfort so that I will continue my development as an instructor.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor considered the stages of my development as an instructor and tailored supervision to each stage.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor evaluated my progress in instruction, including changes in me, changes in learners in my class, my current abilities, and made recommendations for future development as an instructor.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor demonstrated awareness of contextual power, culture, gender, ethnicity, and learner accessibility issues (toward me and learners in my class).	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor articulated a personal philosophy of instruction, drawn from existing philosophies and models.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor structured supervision, facilitated problem-solving, and implemented supervisory interventions within a range of instructional modalities.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor addressed distinctive issues and trends that arose in my role as instructor.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Teaching Supervisor demonstrated a working knowledge of instructional ethical and legal issues.	0 1 2 3 4

University of Arizona
Counselor Education & Supervision Doctoral Program
 Department of Disability and Psychoeducational Studies
 College of Education, PO Box 10069, Tucson, Az, 85721-0069

Semester: _____ Year: _____

FORM G: DOCTORAL STUDENT EVALUATION OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY SUPERVISION SUPERVISOR (2 pages)
(Mid-term & Final)

Student: _____ **University Faculty Supervisor:** _____

Your specific feedback is important because it assists the University Faculty Supervisor in meeting doctoral student needs and creating as efficient a supervisory learning process as possible. Please complete sections **I** and **II** below.

I Please respond to the following requests for narrative feedback on the supervision you received.

- a) The most valuable piece(s) of supervision the University Faculty Supervisor provided was/were
- b) Some suggestions for the University Faculty Supervisor to increase my learning experience would be....
- c) Additional comments about the University Faculty Supervisor:

#	Rating II
0	N/A
1	Strongly disagree
2	Disagree
3	Agree
4	Strongly Agree

II	Rating
The University Faculty Supervisor scheduled, and consistently completed supervisory meetings; or rescheduled with sufficient notice.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor discussed what to expect from supervisees, what is un/acceptable behavior from me as a supervisor, and my University Faculty Supervisor.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor provided timely, balanced, objective, and descriptive feedback.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor Supervisory demonstrated supervisory techniques as needed or requested.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor demonstrated empathy and concern for my role as doctoral student supervisor as evidenced by behaviors such as active listening, asking questions, and facilitating open and honest interactions.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor clearly outlined expectations, responsibilities, goals, and objectives for both our roles.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor provided additional assistance as needed or requested.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor encouraged and facilitated critical thinking and problem solving.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor maintained a supportive relationship that encouraged increased independence as the semester progressed.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor encouraged self-analysis of my supervisory work and provided support and guidance during the process.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor offered assistance with the placement and supervisory documentation process.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor communicated in a respectful, supportive, and encouraging manner.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor discussed problems or necessary changes needed to improve my supervisory skills.	0 1 2 3 4

The University Faculty Supervisor modeled professional and interpersonal behaviors that facilitated my learning in how to work effectively and efficiently with students in individual, triadic, and group contexts.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor assessed my skill level and interpersonal style at the time my supervisory role began.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor established and maintained clear and appropriate professional boundaries and ethical behavior with me.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor created a supportive learning environment and fostered my unique style, development, and creativity; and did not seek my imitation of her/his methods.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor used methods for helping me recognize areas of inexperience or discomfort so that I will continue my development as a supervisor.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor considered the stages of my development as a supervisor and tailored my supervision to each stage.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor evaluated the progress of supervision I provided, including changes in me, my counselor trainee, and that trainee's clients, my current abilities, and made recommendations for future development as a counselor.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor demonstrated awareness of contextual power, privilege, culture, gender, ethnicity, and economics (toward me, my counselor trainee's, and that trainee's clients).	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor articulated a personal model of supervision, drawn from existing models of supervision and from my preferred supervisory and counseling style.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor structured supervision, facilitated problem-solving, and implemented supervisory interventions within a range of supervisory modalities (live and/or recorded supervision).	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor addressed distinctive issues and trends that arose in my role as supervisor.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Faculty Supervisor demonstrated a working knowledge of supervisory ethical and legal issues.	0 1 2 3 4

University of Arizona
Counselor Education & Supervision Doctoral Program
 Department of Disability and Psychoeducational Studies
 College of Education, PO Box 10069, Tucson, Az, 85721-0069

Semester: _____

Year: _____

FORM I: MASTER'S COUNSELOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF UNIVERSITY DOCTORAL SUPERVISOR (2 pages)
(Mid-term & Final)

MA Student: _____ **University Doctoral Supervisor:** _____

Your specific feedback is important because it assists me in my developmental growth as a professional and it creates an efficient feedback process. Please complete sections I and II below.

I Please respond to the following requests for narrative feedback on the supervision you received.

- a) The most valuable piece(s) of supervision the University Doctoral Supervisor provided was/were
- b) Some suggestions for the University Doctoral Supervisor to increase my learning experience would be....
- c) Additional comments about the University Doctoral Supervisor:

#	Rating
0	N/A
1	Strongly disagree
2	Disagree
3	Agree
4	Strongly Agree

II	Rating
The University Doctoral Supervisor scheduled, and consistently completed supervisory meetings; or rescheduled with sufficient notice.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor discussed what to expect in my placement, what is un/acceptable behavior from me, my site supervisor, and my faculty supervisor.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor provided timely, balanced, objective, and descriptive feedback.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor demonstrated supervisory techniques as needed or requested.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor demonstrated empathy and concern for my role as a student as evidenced by behaviors such as active listening, asking questions, and facilitating open and honest interactions.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor clearly outlined expectations, responsibilities, goals, and objectives for both our roles.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor provided additional assistance as needed or requested.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor offered additional sources of information as needed or requested.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor encouraged and facilitated critical thinking and problem solving.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor maintained a supportive relationship that encouraged increased independence as the semester progressed.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor encouraged self-analysis of my counseling and provided support and guidance during the process.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor offered assistance with the placement and documentation processes.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor communicated in a respectful, supportive, and encouraging manner.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor discussed problems or necessary changes needed to improve my supervisory skills.	0 1 2 3 4

The University Doctoral Supervisor modeled professional and interpersonal behaviors that facilitated my learning in how to work with others effectively and efficiently at the university and at the site.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor assessed my skill level and interpersonal style at the time my role began.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor established and maintained clear and appropriate professional boundaries and ethical behavior with me.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor created a supportive learning environment and fostered my unique style, development, and creativity; and did not seek my imitation of her/his methods.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor used methods for helping me recognize areas of inexperience or discomfort so that I will continue my development as a supervisor.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor considered the stages of my development as a counselor and tailored my supervision to each stage.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor evaluated the progress of counseling I provided, including changes in me, my clients, my current abilities, and made recommendations for future development as a counselor.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor demonstrated awareness of contextual power, privilege, culture, gender, ethnicity, and economics.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor articulated a personal model of supervision, drawn from existing models of supervision and from my preferred supervisory and counseling style.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor structured supervision, facilitated problem-solving, and implemented supervisory interventions within a range of supervisory modalities (recorded supervision).	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor addressed distinctive issues and trends that arose in my role as counselor.	0 1 2 3 4
The University Doctoral Supervisor demonstrated a working knowledge of supervisory ethical and legal issues.	0 1 2 3 4

University of Arizona
Counselor Education & Supervision Doctoral Program
 Department of Disability and Psychoeducational Studies
 College of Education, PO Box 10069, Tucson, Az, 85721-0069

Semester:

Year:

FORM J: UNIVERSITY FACULTY EVALUATION OF DOCTORAL STUDENT PROVISION of SUPERVISION (3 pages)
(Mid-term & Final)

Doctoral Student:

University Faculty Supervisor:

Please use the scale below to evaluate the doctoral student's knowledge and skill in the following categories:

1. Integration of the learning objectives of supervision.
2. Philosophy of supervision, as described in the Philosophy of Supervision paper.
3. Skill as a supervisor based on observation/supervision.

Doctoral students must achieve a minimum average score of "acceptable" in each of the three categories. For scores of "minimal" or lower, the University Faculty Supervisor and student will implement a plan of action to address the issue(s).

#	Rating	Definition
0	Insufficient	The doctoral student does not demonstrate an understanding of this concept or learning objective. Philosophy of Supervision paper: Student does not address the issue.
1	Minimal	The doctoral student can discuss the concept or issue, but does not integrate it within his/her overall framework. Philosophy of Supervision paper: The doctoral student names the concept or issue, but does not provide a basic definition of the concept or issue.
2	Acceptable	The doctoral student has an adequate grasp of the concept or issue and sometimes integrates it within his/her overall framework. Philosophy of Supervision paper: The doctoral student names and provides a basic definition of the concept or issue, but does not explain the concept or issue.
3	Excellent	The doctoral student is familiar with the concept or issue and often integrates it within his or her overall framework. Philosophy of Supervision paper: The doctoral student names, defines, and explains the concept or issue.
4	Exceptional	The doctoral student exhibits an excellent grasp of the concept, and consistently integrates it within his/her overall framework. Philosophy of Supervision paper: The doctoral student names, defines, and explains and integrates the concept or issue appropriately.

1. Integration of Learning Objectives in Supervision	Score
The doctoral student is familiar with the major models of counseling supervision in terms of philosophical assumptions and implications.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student can articulate a personal model of supervision, drawn from existing models of supervision and from the student's preferred counseling styles.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student facilitates the counselor trainee-client and supervisor-therapist- client relationships.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student evaluates and identifies problems in counselor trainee-client and supervisor-therapist-client relationships.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student structures supervision, facilitates problem-solving, and implements supervisory interventions within a range of supervisory modalities (live and/or recorded supervision).	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student addresses distinctive issues and trends that arise in supervision.	0 1 2 3 4

The doctoral student is sensitive to contextual variables such as power, privilege, culture, gender, ethnicity, and economics (toward counselor trainee's and that trainee's clients).	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student demonstrates a working knowledge of supervisory ethical and legal issues.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student is cognizant of the requirements and procedures associated with his/her own professional license(s) or application for such license(s), and counselor trainees' potential applications for state professional licenses.	0 1 2 3 4
2. Fundamentals of Supervision in the Personal Philosophy of Supervision Paper	Score
Evidence of systems and contextual thinking.	0 1 2 3 4
Clarity of purpose and goals for supervision.	0 1 2 3 4
Clarity of supervisory roles and relationships.	0 1 2 3 4
Evidence of awareness of personal and professional experiences that impact supervision.	0 1 2 3 4
Preferred supervision model and connection between own therapy model and supervision model.	0 1 2 3 4
Evidence of sensitivity to contextual factors including, but not limited to, trainee's professional developmental phase, training setting, culture, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, age, sex, gender, and economics.	0 1 2 3 4
Clarity of preferred process of supervision (individual/group; live/audio/video/technology-assisted; frequency, contracting; evaluation).	0 1 2 3 4
Evidence of sensitivity to ethics and legal factors.	0 1 2 3 4
Awareness of requirements for counseling membership, CACREP supervisory requirements (including field experience paperwork), and standards for being the designated supervisor of record.	
Integrated relevant literature in the philosophy paper.	0 1 2 3 4
3. Doctoral Student Skill as a Supervisor (as observed by the University Faculty Supervisor)	Score
The doctoral student is aware of the influence of external systems on the supervision of the counseling trainee (limitations, resources).	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student demonstrates awareness of contextual power, privilege, culture, gender, ethnicity, and economics (toward counselor trainee's and that trainee's clients).	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student negotiates a clear contract for supervision at the beginning of the supervisory relationship with counseling trainees.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student discusses the counselor trainee's skill level at the time that supervision begins, and assesses the counselor trainee's interpersonal style.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student describes the structure of the supervision process, specifically articulating responsibilities, goals, and objectives.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student maintains clear and appropriate professional boundaries and ethical behavior with counselor trainees.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student creates a supportive learning environment and fosters the counseling trainee's unique style, development, and creativity not imitation of the doctoral student.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student uses methods for helping the counselor trainee recognize areas of inexperience or discomfort so that the trainee will use site supervision and referral appropriately.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student assumes appropriate responsibility for facilitating professional growth in the counselor trainee and uses various methods to foster that development.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student considers the stages of development of the counselor trainee and tailors supervision to each stage.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student evaluates the progress of supervision, including changes in the counselor trainee and that trainee's clients, the trainee's current abilities, and makes recommendations for future development as a counselor.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student is transparent with the University Faculty Supervisor. The doctoral student is open to and solicits formative and feedback, and seeks guidance as needed.	0 1 2 3 4
The doctoral student addresses his/her own development as a supervisor, and identifies actions necessary to promote future development as a supervisor.	0 1 2 3 4

As the University Faculty Supervisor, I assessed that this doctoral student has successfully integrated the learning objectives into his or her theory and practice of counseling supervision. This student has also demonstrated an acceptable level of knowledge and skill in the provision of counseling supervision, and has received ratings at and above "acceptable" for each of the three evaluation categories.

University Faculty Supervisor Signature

Date

As the Counselor Education and Supervision Doctoral Program student, I have read my University Faculty Supervisor's assessment and have had the opportunity to discuss it prior to signing it.

Doctoral Student Signature

Date

University of Arizona
Counselor Education and Supervision Doctoral Program
 Department of Disability and Psychoeducational Studies
 College of Education, PO Box 10069, Tucson, Az, 85721-0069

Semester: _____

Year: _____

FORM K: UNIVERSITY FACULTY SUPERVISOR EVALUATION OF DOCTORAL STUDENT PROGRESS in INSTRUCTION (3 pages)
(Mid-term and Final)

Student: _____ **University Faculty Teaching Supervisor:** _____

Please use the scale below to evaluate the doctoral student's knowledge and skill in the following 15 dimensions:

#	Rating	Definition
0	Insufficient	The doctoral student does not demonstrate an understanding of this concept or learning objective.
1	Minimal	The doctoral student can discuss the concept, but does not integrate it within an overall framework.
2	Acceptable	The doctoral student has an adequate grasp of the concept and sometimes integrates it within an overall framework.
3	Excellent	The doctoral student is familiar with the concept and often integrates it within an overall framework.
4	Exceptional	The doctoral student exhibits an excellent grasp of the concept and consistently integrates it within an overall framework.

1. Intrapersonal Skills		Score
The student is self-aware, insightful, self-controlled, cooperative, and adaptable.		0 1 2 3 4
The student is aware of own strengths and limitations.		0 1 2 3 4
The student is non-defensive.		0 1 2 3 4
The student exhibits good judgment and discretion in both student and professional activities.		0 1 2 3 4
2. Interpersonal Skills		Score
The student collaborates with peers, gives and receives constructive feedback.		0 1 2 3 4
The student collaborates with University Faculty Teaching Supervisor.		0 1 2 3 4
The student communicates appropriately and effectively.		0 1 2 3 4
The student develops and maintains positive relationships with peers and faculty.		0 1 2 3 4
The student demonstrates ethical responsibility.		0 1 2 3 4
3. General Behavior		Score
The student is dependable and prompt.		0 1 2 3 4
The student uses suggestions, and summative and formative feedback.		0 1 2 3 4
The student can work independently.		0 1 2 3 4
The student is comfortable assuming responsibility.		0 1 2 3 4
The student demonstrates initiative.		0 1 2 3 4
The student demonstrates cultural competence and multi-cultural sensitivity.		0 1 2 3 4
4. General Teaching		Score
The student understands the major roles, responsibilities, and activities of counselor educators.		0 1 2 3 4
The student knows instructional theory and methods.		0 1 2 3 4
The student demonstrates a personal philosophy of teaching and learning.		0 1 2 3 4
The student demonstrates course design, delivery, and evaluation methods appropriate to instructional objectives.		0 1 2 3 4
The student assesses student needs and implements techniques to promote learning.		0 1 2 3 4
5. Professionalism		Score
The student demonstrates a professional semi-formal appearance, facial expression and body language are congruent throughout sessions, has an enthusiastic and invigorating presence, appears comfortable with the audience and maintains eye contact, and does not or minimally relies on notes.		0 1 2 3 4

The student speaks clearly, correctly, precisely, and at a volume and pace that is easily understood.	0 1 2 3 4
The student uses a variety of modes and media to increase clarity and address diverse learner needs (e.g. repeats a word while pointing to it on a slide and/or writing the word on the board).	0 1 2 3 4
The student fully grasps the material and can elaborate on student questions succinctly and comprehensively.	0 1 2 3 4
The student is flexible in meeting learners' needs (e.g., availability for questions and has an active presence).	0 1 2 3 4
6. Course Syllabus	Score
The student's syllabus contains: pre-requisites, accurate course description; student-learning tone; describes course format and outcomes, instructor beliefs and assumptions; course schedule with due dates and times; assignment rubrics; reading material and assignments; grading protocol and point allotment; academic policies or procedures; and examples of opportunities for provision of feedback to learners and solicitation of feedback from learners.	0 1 2 3 4
7. Lesson Plan	Score
The student's title or theme is clearly stated.	0 1 2 3 4
The student's instructional objectives are clear, concise, and measurable.	0 1 2 3 4
The student's lesson plan follows a logical, interesting, and relevant sequence with effective chunking of content.	0 1 2 3 4
8. Content Knowledge	Score
The student demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the lesson material.	0 1 2 3 4
9. Organization and Preparation	Score
The student is organized and prepared for class.	0 1 2 3 4
The student optimizes online and physical spaces and provides instruction.	0 1 2 3 4
The student provides a meaningful and engaging opening.	0 1 2 3 4
The student's lesson follows a logical, interesting, and relevant sequence.	0 1 2 3 4
The student's pacing and sequencing reflect chunking of content.	0 1 2 3 4
The student provides a meaningful and engaging closure.	0 1 2 3 4
The student completed all components of the lesson in the allotted time.	0 1 2 3 4
10. Accessibility and Rapport with Learners	Score
The student interacts effectively with learners.	0 1 2 3 4
The student is sought out by learners for assistance.	0 1 2 3 4
11. Classroom Management	Score
The student appropriately addresses classroom issues such as timely arrival, conduct, and technology use.	0 1 2 3 4
12. Delivery of Material (lecture and/or discussion)	Score
The student's delivery of material is clear.	0 1 2 3 4
The student's delivery style engaged learners in the process.	0 1 2 3 4
The student's clear use of strategies engaged learners throughout the session.	0 1 2 3 4
The student's instructional objectives related to content.	0 1 2 3 4
The student's instructional objectives were effectively communicated.	0 1 2 3 4
The student's warm-up establishes prior knowledge, relevance, and interest.	0 1 2 3 4
The student's ongoing informal assessment reinforces chunked content and provides useful feedback to learners.	0 1 2 3 4
The student's natural assessment-based closure occurred within the allotted time.	0 1 2 3 4
13. Documentation	Score
The student maintains documentation on learner progress, assignments, participation, attendance, concerns, etc.	0 1 2 3 4
14. Improvements in Instructional Practice	Score
The student implements changes based on self-awareness, experiences in the classroom, learner feedback, and supervisory formative and summative feedback to promote professional development.	0 1 2 3 4

Student strengths:

Areas that require further development:

Student Signature

Date

