The Clinical Supervisor

Strengths-Based Supervision: A Child Welfare Supervision Training Project

Cynthia A. Lietz[a]; Tamara Rounds[a]

[a] Arizona State University, Phoenix, Arizona, United States

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Strengths-Based Supervision: A Child Welfare Supervision Training Project

CYNTHIA A. LIETZ and TAMARA ROUNDS

Arizona State University, Phoenix, Arizona, United States

The process of supervision plays an important role in the implementation of practice models. Supervisors are responsible for training their supervisees regarding new practice techniques. Supervisors also monitor and evaluate the implementation of such practice. In addition, parallel process suggests that what happens in supervision can affect the way supervisees interact with clients. Acknowledging the role of supervision in the implementation of practice models, this paper describes a collaborative effort between Arizona's Division of Children, Youth and Families and ASU to develop continuing education to train child welfare supervisors in a model of strengths-based supervision. Specifically, the article discusses the development of this model of supervision, describes the training curriculum, and closes with findings from the training evaluations.

KEYWORDS child welfare, family-centered practice, parallel process, strengths, supervision

INTRODUCTION

As agencies identify theoretical frameworks to guide their practice, workers are often sent to extensive training regarding desired practice principles and skills. In addition to training, supervision remains critical when implementing new models of practice. The purpose of this paper is to describe a collaborative project that was conducted in 2008 between the School of Social Work at Arizona State University (ASU) and Arizona's Division of Children,

Youth and Families (DCYF). The aim of the project was to develop a model of supervisory practice congruent with the principles of Family-Centered Practice (FCP), a strengths-based framework informing child welfare practice. A continuing education program was then developed and used to train agency administrators and supervisors in this model of strengths-based supervision. The article describes the development of this model of supervision, provides a description of the training curriculum, and closes with findings from the training evaluations.

THE ROLE SUPERVISION PLAYS IN PRACTICE

Many acknowledge the functions of the supervisor in social services to be administrative, supportive, and educational (Caspi & Reid, 2002; Kadushin, 1992b; Munson, 1993; Shulman, 1993; Tsui, 2005). The educational role refers to a supervisor's responsibility to advance the practice of his or her supervisee. Supervision plays an important part in the learning process. Although training may provide the first step in developing new skills, organizational culture and leadership impact whether curriculum is infused into daily practice (Luongo, 2007). Furthermore, when conceptual material and practice skills are brought into clinical supervision, this process allows practitioners to apply what they are learning to actual cases, thus facilitating the process of integration. Shireman (2003) states "although training is more often discussed and evaluated, and numerous training curricula exist, supervision is an equally or more critical factor in assuring quality services" in child welfare practice (p. 403). In many ways, supervision can be the link between training and practice, as it is through this process that workers begin to assimilate new knowledge and create specific plans for bringing ideas to their work with clients.

In addition to the educational function, the administrative role of the supervisor involves monitoring practice. As supervisors play an important role in helping supervisees apply conceptual material, they are also responsible for evaluating the work of their supervisees, ultimately holding workers accountable for the quality of their practice. Inherent to supervision is a position of authority. While Kadushin's (1992a) study found that many supervisors struggle to effectively assert managerial authority, Murphy and Wright (2005) concluded supervisees expect to be evaluated and, in fact, find appropriate use of power can prompt growth in their practice. Although asserting this function may be difficult for some supervisors, the administrative role of supervision plays an essential role in assessing and ensuring the quality of practice.

Finally, in addition to the educational and administrative functions of the supervisor, the support role is relevant to the implementation of new practices as well. Luongo (2007) found that supportive supervision impacted

whether workers adopted new practice models in their daily work with clients. As child welfare case managers face the challenge of working in a field that is overwhelmed by task overload and complexity, the support function of the supervisor serves an essential part of allowing workers to manage these stressors (Jacquet, Clark, Morazes, & Withers, 2007; Landsman, 2007). Specifically, Deal (2004) suggests that supervision that is empathetic and genuine and includes an alliance between supervisor and supervisee can better facilitate learning by lending this needed support.

Parallel Process

In addition to considering the relevance of the functions of supervision and the implementation of practice, the concept of parallel process also highlights the role of supervision in practice. Shulman (2005) describes parallel process as an inherent part of the supervisory relationship, "meaning the way in which the clinical supervisor interacts with the supervisee models what the supervisor believes is at the core of any helping relationship" (p. 26). Parallel process is seen as an extension of psychodynamic concepts such as transference and counter-transference, referring to unconscious reactions that play out in the supervisor/supervisee relationship (Pearson, 2000; Ringel, 2001). Parallel process can also be linked to systems theory suggesting subsystems are embedded within a larger system leading to parallels or repeating patterns (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002). In relation to supervision, the supervisor and supervisee represent one subsystem while the supervisee and his or her client represent another subsystem. Theoretically, parallels or reenactments will exist between what is happening in supervision and what is happening in practice and vice versa (Deal, 2004; Friedlander, Siegel, & Brenock, 1989). Parallel process suggests "our supervisees learn more about practice from the way we work with them than from what we say about their actual practice" (Shulman, 2005, p. 24). If we acknowledge the potential impact parallel process can exert, we must be mindful that our supervision parallels the principles of any practice model we seek to be implemented by our supervisees.

Cohen (1999) applies this idea specifically to strengths-based practice. He suggests that problem-centered supervision could undermine strengths-based practice considering the parallels that exist between the process of supervision and the process of practice. Specifically, Cohen (1999) states, "In parallel process situations, problem-centered supervision would render strengths-based practice very difficult indeed and could result in the strengths-oriented supervisee developing either a powerful resistance to the supervision or a grand confusion in his or her work with clients" (p. 462). For example, it is not uncommon for supervisory conferences to focus on problems with cases. In this situation, workers observe this supervisory practice and, in response, potentially focus their own questions with

clients on problem resolution as well. If this is the practice an agency is seeking, that is fine. However, as many organizations are moving to models of practice that are strengths-based, it is possible that problem-focused supervision may undermine the implementation of strengths-based practice.

Project Purpose

DCYF adopted Family-Centered Practice (FCP), an integration of strengths-based practice principles informing child welfare as the guiding framework to their work. However, after years of training their workers in FCP, administrators expressed concern that the agency was not consistently applying strengths-based practice principles to the degree the agency desired. When dialoguing about this issue, supervision was highlighted as a potential way to advance the implementation of FCP based on Cohen's (1999) premise that strengths-based practice may be undermined when the supervisory practice does not parallel desired practice principles. In light of this discussion, DCYF collaborated with ASU to develop a series of three continuing education classes that trained supervisors in a model of strengths-based supervision. The purpose of the project was to advance the practice of FCP by enhancing the way in which principles of FCP were paralleled in supervision.

DEVELOPMENT OF A MODEL OF STRENGTHS-BASED SUPERVISION FOR DCYF

The purpose of this project was to develop a model of supervision seeking to parallel principles of FCP. Seeking to remain congruent with FCP principles, it seemed equally important that the process of developing training curriculum would acknowledge the expertise of the audience and engage in collaboration in the development of content for this training series. To accomplish this, ASU consulted with the DCYF training unit to contextualize the content with other trainings, initiatives, and events that would inform this project. In addition, an online self-report survey was sent to all employees working in the area of child protection prior to the training series to assess their current perceptions of supervision through a series of closed- and open-ended questions. A link to the survey was sent per e-mail by an agency administrator and all potential participants received one reminder e-mail requesting they complete the survey. A sample of 789 supervised employees including agency administrators, unit supervisors, and case managers responded to the survey, a 72% response rate. No identifying information was collected and the online survey was managed through Snap software, ensuring responses could not be linked to e-mail addresses, further protecting anonymity.

The closed-ended questions collected demographic data regarding position, years of experience in child welfare, and age. In addition, three

subscales were created to measure (1) supervisor availability, (2) supervisor/
supervisee relationship, and (3) level of critical thinking that occurs in super-
vision from the perspective of the supervisee. Finally, three additional items
were evaluated: one question asked respondents to estimate the number of
hours supervision occurred per week, one item asked respondents whether
they participate in group supervision, and one final item asked each respon-
dent to rate their level of satisfaction with supervision. Regression analysis
was used to examine which variables predicted a supervisor's satisfaction
with supervision. As seen in Table 1, years of experience and number of
hours spent in supervision were not significant predictors of satisfaction.
However, supervisor availability, quality of the relationship, level of critical
thinking, and participation in group supervision did predict a respondent's
level of satisfaction with supervision prior to the implementation of this
project. These findings informed the development of this training series by
lending support to the areas of the supervision model that related to these
specific variables. In essence, the pretest survey allowed the team to explore
the perceptions of supervisees regarding what was valued in current super-
visory practice so that these practices could be emphasized and strengthened
in supervisory practice across the agency.

The responses to the open-ended questions were also used to inform
development of the model of supervision, and quotes were incorporated into
the training curriculum allowing for input from DCYF employees to remain
evident throughout the project. We emphasize this point, because the impact
of the quotes by supervisees was a striking part of the training presentations.
Attendees seemed particularly engaged when anonymous quotes from their
own supervisees were shared. In many ways, these quotes helped the
content to come alive. It is important to note that while 458 of the responses
provided suggestions for improving supervision, 509 were statements that
emphasized positive aspects of supervision at this agency. The content was
developed in such a way that good work was acknowledged through these
appreciative statements while quotes offering suggestions for improvement
were also discussed. Although the model of strengths-based supervision
was new to this agency, the trainers did not take a position that supervisory

TABLE 1 Regression Analysis Predicting Level of Satisfaction with Supervision

Variable	B	$SE\ B$	β	p
Length of Time at CPS	.003	.019	.003	.892
Hours Spent in Supervision	−.043	.029	−.035	.129
Supervisor Availability	.299	.030	.255	**.000**
Quality of Supervisor-Supervisor Relationship	.129	.012	.360	.000
Level of Critical Thinking in Supervision	.555	.063	.316	.000
Participation in Group Supervision	.040	.020	.043	.053

Note: Adj. $R^2 = .72$.

practices indicative of these ideas were not already happening to some extent. Throughout the agency, we found examples of supervisors engaged in group supervision even though this had not previously been an agency expectation. We also observed many supervisors who seemed quite skilled at developing supportive relationships with supervisees. The purpose of this model of supervision was not to change everything that was currently happening at the agency, but yet to create consistency to supervisory processes allowing these positive practices to spread across the agency.

The two open-ended questions asked "What do you appreciate about the current supervision you receive?" and "What would improve the current supervision you receive?" Two qualitative data analysts reviewed 509 quotes from question one and 458 quotes from question two. Analysis of the open-ended questions occurred using strategies described by Coleman and Unrau (2008). Specifically, open coding was initially used to look for common words and ideas within the meaning units. From this first-level analysis, a list of master codes was developed. These master codes were then used to code each individual quote. Ultimately, each quote was linked with other quotes representing similar ideas integrating related meaning units into categories. The primary categories discussed by respondents included (1) having a relationship with the supervisor that is based on respectful give-and-take communication, (2) availability of the supervisor and a desire for scheduled, ongoing supervision, and (3) comments related to modeling strengths-based practice.

Relationship with the Supervisor Based on Respectful Give-and-Take Communication

The majority of comments ($N = 250$) on this survey related to having a relationship with one's supervisor based on respectful give-and-take communication. When respondents reported being satisfied with the supervision they received, they often responded to the open-ended questions with statements such as, "My supervisor is receptive to communication and is willing to consider what I have to offer" and "My supervisor is fair and reasonable. I can talk to her and know that she will provide me with sound advice." When people were not satisfied with supervision, they also commonly connected this with the relationship, stating "[supervisors] need to treat case managers with respect and not be condescending" and "My supervisor has nothing positive to say, only negatives."

Related to comments regarding supervisory relationships, 31 respondents discussed the importance of respect and, for many, issues related to hierarchy and collaboration were identified. For example, one person stated, "The supervision I receive is empowering; my supervisor will ask for my opinion." Another respondent said, "There is never a time I felt inferior to my supervisor." Similarly, one respondent stated, "The ability to communicate openly

and exchange ideas without feeling inferior or inadequate is what works in supervision." When people spoke positively about collaboration, they also expressed a desire for sincere, direct feedback. Specifically, 27 respondents suggested a need for more feedback. One respondent stated, "I think I am doing well, but I am never really told if I am or not." Related, one supervisee stated, "I would like to receive constructive criticism from my supervisor, instead of just telling me I'm doing a good job." These quotes suggest that these supervisees are not opposed to feedback and, in fact, they desire it. Yet, the way in which power is asserted and feedback given is of the utmost importance. These specific quotes were included in the training series, allowing attendees to see the value of feedback that is given from a position of respect.

Supervisor Availability and a Desire for Scheduled, Ongoing Supervision

In addition to speaking about the supervisory relationship, the second most common response ($N = 143$) to the open-ended questions related to supervisor availability and supervisees' desire for ongoing, scheduled supervision. Supervisees who were satisfied with supervision commonly made comments such as, "My supervisor is always around or makes sure I am able to get a hold of her when I need her"; "I appreciate that my supervisor always finds time to meet with me"; and "My supervisor offers me support, insight and is available to answer any questions." However, others were less satisfied with their supervisors' availability, stating things like, "I wish supervision happened more often. My supervisor is out of the office way too much" and "Supervision does not and has not happened for years." Along with speaking about availability, many quotes related to a desire for ongoing, planned supervision. One respondent stated, "I would like more regular scheduled supervision," while another stated, "One thing that I believe would help is to have at least one or two set meetings a month where we could discuss areas of need or improvement and successes." Finally, another stated, "There are supervisors checking in but currently no consistent supervision occurs unless something goes wrong." Supervisor availability, consistency, and ongoing meetings were important to these respondents.

Modeling of Strengths-Based Principles

Finally, the last category of quotes that were relevant to the development of this training series yet occurred with less frequency ($N = 27$) related specifically to the idea of parallel process and modeling of strengths-based principles. One respondent who was pleased with supervision stated, "My supervisor has an open door, listens well and is approachable. Her strengths add to my strengths, there is collaboration, and we are family-centered."

Similarly, another respondent stated, "He gives positive feedback, respects my opinions and gives me the needed 'pat on the back.'" Others suggested they wanted increased attention to modeling strengths-based practice. For example, one person stated, "I need a supervisor who provides more positive and supportive feedback. Someone who understands the job is difficult and also acknowledges strengths, not just what needs improvement." Finally, related to parallel process, one respondent stated, "As a person who feels negative breeds negative and positive breeds positive, all I feel bestowed on me as a case-manager is negative. Very little is said about what one does right or good job." These comments suggest that supervisees want direct feedback about improvements, but also want their successes acknowledged and strengths realized.

STRENGTHS-BASED SUPERVISION

Findings from the survey were shared with leaders at DCYF and further dialogue occurred regarding incorporating the perceptions of DCYF staff with the goals of agency administrators. In addition, ASU faculty with expertise in the process of supervision and strengths-based practice were able to join in this partnership, providing information to the team regarding research and knowledge relevant to the project. Important dialogue occurred throughout this collaboration, leading to the development of a model of strengths-based supervision that was conceptualized for the purpose of enhancing the practice of FCP by deliberately modeling strengths-based principles in the process of supervision at DCYF. Once the model was developed, the project trained almost 250 supervisors and administrators covering the four elements of this model. These four elements represent an integration of relevant knowledge regarding supervision and strengths-based practice from the literature with the perceptions of DCYF staff and the goals of the agency leadership:

1. To parallel the principles of FCP. (Session #1)
2. To integrate the use of both individual and group supervision. (Session #2)
3. To integrate the use of both crisis and in-depth supervision processes. (Session #3)
4. To fully engage all three functions of supervision. (Session #3)

Parallel the Principles of Family-Centered Practice

The first element of this model of strengths-based supervision presented the concept of parallel process to the supervisors attending Session I of this series of trainings. A definition of parallel process was shared with the audience,

and the presenter provided examples of this dynamic to help bring clarity to this somewhat abstract concept. The attendees were asked to reflect on this idea and to share with others what parallel process means using their own words. The audience was also given some time to speak with one another about a time they observed this dynamic at work in their own supervisory practice. This reflection and discussion allowed attendees to become further sensitized to parallel process.

Once attendees developed an understanding of parallel process along with the ability to recognize this dynamic in their own supervision practice, Cohen's (1999) assertion that problem-centered supervision makes strengths-based practice very difficult was shared with the audience. These child welfare supervisors were challenged by the idea that what they did in supervision could reinforce practice principles or, in fact, their supervision could undermine practice principles when there was a contradiction between the principles and what was being observed in supervision.

Once the attendees mastered the concept of parallel process, the attendees were asked to identify the agency's practice model and to talk specifically about the practice principles. The supervisors at this training discussed FCP as the practice model of the agency and extensive time was spent identifying the core principles of FCP. FCP consists of a set of core ideas and principles that in many ways fit the values of social work practice. Specifically, Meezan (2000) suggests programs grounded in FCP "are driven by a set of articulated beliefs and principles that respect the family, recognize and build upon its strengths, see it as the critical force in the child's life, and address children's needs in its context" (p. 5). Together the leaders of this agency developed a one-page handout that provided an efficient snapshot of the core concepts of their practice model as seen in Figure 1.

Sandau-Beckler, Salcido, Beckler, Mannes, and Beck (2002) assert that child welfare agency administrators and supervisors must adopt the principles of FCP if such principles are to be infused into the daily practice of agency employees. As DCYF supervisors came to agree upon the core concepts and principles of FCP, they were then asked to speak about how their supervision could parallel these very principles. Extensive dialogue occurred regarding how these core concepts and principles could be relevant in the process of supervision. For example, the idea of collaboration was raised. Kisthardt (2006) states that in strengths-based practice "the helping relationship becomes one of collaboration, mutuality, and partnership. Power with another, not power over another" (p. 175). DCYF seeks increased collaboration between workers, families, and their communities to meet the needs of children in Arizona. If it is expected that workers collaborate with families, supervisors talked about the importance of modeling a collaborative spirit in their supervision as well. While supervision has a hierarchical function, attendees of these trainings also identified several ways they could increase collaboration without undermining their own supervisory authority. Murphy

Key Concepts:

Strengths	*Internal and external resources that support families as they grow.*
Resilience	*The ability to rebound and grow stronger from difficult experiences.*
Empowerment	*Overcoming barriers and providing opportunities for people to accomplish their own goals/dreams.*
Collaboration	*People solve problems more effectively when a group of committed individuals bring together their strengths/expertise.*
Hope	*A belief that good things can grow from difficult experiences and that change is possible.*
Membership	*We all desire a connection to a community, and it is this support that sustains us.*
Relationships	*Positive change/growth happens in the context of trusting relationships.*
Creativity	*Individualized plans that offer creative and flexible solutions better meet the unique needs of families.*
Diversity	*Each family's culture and values are to be celebrated, because these practices, beliefs and history make each family special and unique.*

FIGURE 1 Key concepts of family-centered practice (FCP) (as discussed by DCYF leaders, 2008).

and Wright (2005) found that supervisees expect power differentials and see appropriate use of power as something that contributes to their professional development. Furthermore, empowerment and collaboration was also seen as highly valuable and something that did not interfere with appropriate use of authority. Struggling with this balance between supervisor authority and a desire for collaboration was important in that it paralleled the very struggle of their workers to increase collaboration while acknowledging a level of authority in the lives of families.

Another important theme to this discussion related to the idea of hope. The supervisors at this training agreed that hope was an important part of FCP. They acknowledged that workers must believe that all families are capable of growth and change. A belief in one's capacity to grow, learn, and change is highlighted by Saleebey (2006) and Kisthardt (2006) as a critical part of shifting from a practice that attends only to problems, to one that is focused on strengths. This belief does not mean that all families will change, just that they can change. Important dialogue occurred regarding what gets communicated, overtly and covertly, to families when one does not believe in their capacity to grow. During this discussion, supervisors were able to identify their role in modeling this belief in capacity as well as times their

own frustration might undermine this core principle. One supervisor in particular shared a story about how she noticed that when she was negative about a family, this was picked up by her supervisee, leading the conversation about that case to become hopeless. She wondered if those moments in supervision kept her supervisees from seeing the potential of certain families.

As the supervisors who attended Session I of this training engaged in dialogue about how FCP principles can be applied to their interactions with their supervisees, the audience was able to move past theoretical material and begin to see what this looks like in practice. As this discussion closed, supervisors appeared more mindful about their supervision practice. Changes in middle management and supervision are a necessary part of infusing FCP in child welfare (Sandau-Beckler et al., 2002). Deliberate attention to applying FCP principles to supervision was a way of using the dynamic of parallel process to support the implementation of strengths-based practice at this child welfare agency.

Integrate the Use of Individual and Group Supervision

In addition to modeling the principles of FCP, strengths-based supervision also supports the use of both individual and group supervision modalities as a way of integrating the principles of FCP. Session II of this training series highlighted the purpose of individual and group supervision and presented facilitation skills for both formats.

The practice of individual supervision was consistently used at DCYF prior to this training. One-on-one supervisory conferences with supervisees offer many benefits. First, individual supervision allows supervisors to get to know their supervisees in greater depth. FCP focuses on relationships and supports the idea that change happens in the context of relationships built on trust and open communication (Sandau-Beckler et al., 2002). Interpersonal skills that can lead to positive working relationships between supervisee and supervisor create opportunity for growth and learning (Deal, 2004; Shulman, 2005). This one-on-one time with one's supervisee can also allow a supervisor to engage in a strengths assessment, bringing about an understanding of the experience, abilities, and characteristics that aid that worker in doing the difficult work of child welfare. Identifying and working within a worker's strengths is another way principles of FCP can be modeled. Finally, individual supervision creates a safe place for having the sometimes difficult, direct conversations that need to happen in supervision. Despite the difficulty some supervisors find in asserting managerial authority (Kadushin, 1992a), engaging in direct, honest conversations is critical (Shulman, 2005). The administrative function of the supervisor requires supervisors to monitor and evaluate the practice of their workers. This type of direct feedback needs to be given in the context of that one-on-one relationship between supervisee and supervisor. Individual supervision allows for the development of a

relationship in which the supervisee's strengths are realized while an established trust allows for honest and direct communication.

Just as individual supervision provides an opportunity to parallel FCP, implementation of group supervision is also a supervisory process that fits the agency's overall practice model. Group supervision is one format of supervision that involves discussing cases with a set of peers typically led by a supervisor (Caspi & Reid, 2002; Dolgoff, 2005; Tsui, 2005). Ferguson (2009) suggests group supervision is efficient, can create opportunity for mutual aid, and may lead to increased cohesion within the team. Although research regarding group supervision is limited, one study found students appreciated receiving field instruction as a group, because they appreciated the opportunity to learn from one another (Bogo, Globerman, & Sussman, 2004). Another study suggested that group supervision can increase the level of critical thinking that occurs in supervision (Lietz, 2008). FCP acknowledges the importance of community. Specifically, Saleebey (2006) discusses the value of membership and our need for belonging, and Kisthardt (2006) suggests that all communities are rich in resources. Considering the strengths present in communities and the importance of membership, conducting group supervision can be a way of creating rich connections and conversation within one's workplace.

In addition to valuing membership and community, FCP and strengths-based practice also assert problem solving through group reflection leads to better decision making (Saleebey, 2006; Sandau-Beckler et al., 2002). Models of team decision making as highlighted in Casey's Family to Family philosophy illustrate the idea that child welfare decision making is improved when a group of people come together to find solutions (DeMuro & Rideout, 2002). If we agree that decision making about children and families occurs better in a group setting and should include members of one's community, creating similar spaces in which reflective dialogue can occur within child welfare agencies fits this principle. A growing number of leaders acknowledge group supervision as a useful process in child welfare (Landsman, 2007; Lietz, 2008; Strand & Badger, 2005; Sundet, Mermelstein, & Watt, 2003). When discussing group supervision in child welfare, Davis (2002) even suggests it is a "source of nourishment" to workers as they learn from one another in a professional context (p. 195).

At DCYF, group supervision was implemented. The meetings became known as "supervision circles" to represent the idea that teams are connected through their work in child welfare. In most cases, supervisors at this agency were responsible for the supervision of five or six child welfare workers. These teams were brought together for supervision circles led by each supervisor to conduct case reviews and to troubleshoot dilemmas as they arose. Supervision circles demonstrate principles of FCP as they bring together strengths and unique experiences of each worker in a community collected for the purpose of supporting one another through reflective dialogue.

Integrate the Use of Both Crisis and In-depth Supervision Processes

Session III of this training series discussed the final two elements of the model; to integrate crisis and in-depth supervision, and to continue to engage all three functions of supervision. Along with an integration of individual and group supervision, this model of strengths-based supervision expects supervisors to be available for crisis-oriented supervision when needed while also engaging in consistent, scheduled supervision that is planned and leads to in-depth discussions. Crisis-oriented supervision is essential in child welfare as supervisees often need to process complicated case questions urgently as they arise. However, in addition to this crisis-oriented supervision, the strengths-based model of supervision also expects that individual and group supervision sessions occur consistently on a regular basis even when questions or crises do not exist. Nathan (1993) found that child welfare supervision often occurs out of a crisis model, responding on an as-needed basis rather than including planned and ongoing reflection and dialogue. While crisis supervision supports supervisees in a moment, scheduled supervision allows for in-depth analysis of one's practice. During these supervisory conferences, workers and supervisors have the opportunity to engage in critical thinking and reflective dialogue. Collins-Camargo (2006), Deal (2004), Lietz (2009), and Sundet and colleagues (2003) assert critical thinking in supervision is necessary to address the complexity inherent in child welfare work. In addition, while crisis-oriented supervision seeks to alleviate immediate problems, ongoing scheduled supervision allows supervisors to explore not only the struggles but also the successes of their supervisees. In crisis-oriented supervision, supervisors rarely have time to explore cases in-depth, to develop creative solutions, or to ask supervisees about their successes. Cohen (1999) states, "supervision for strengths-based practice should not be crisis-driven consultation, initiated when the supervisee 'needs help'. Clearly, this would reflect a problem orientation rather than a strengths orientation" (p. 464). As supervisors seek to model FCP principles in their supervision, responding to urgent needs of supervisors remains important while ongoing, in-depth supervision that leads to reflective dialogue is essential in moving supervision away from a problem focus.

Fully Engage All Three Functions of Supervision

Along with focusing on supervision that models the principles of FCP, the last element of this model expects that supervisors remain mindful of engaging in all three of their supervisory functions: administrative, supportive, and educational. Previous work acknowledges the importance of all three of these roles in accomplishing effective supervision (Kadushin, 1992b; Munson, 1993; Shulman, 1993). As DCYF seeks to build their supervisory

practice, this training discussed the importance of maintaining an understanding of the importance of all three roles. In essence, the roles have not changed according to this model of supervision. Instead, efforts were made to perform these roles to fit the principles of FCP.

EVALUATION

This series of supervision trainings was evaluated through the administration of a satisfaction survey given at the end of the final session. A total of 189 surveys were collected at all five locations representing a 75% response rate. The survey included seven closed-ended questions along with an optional section for leaving additional feedback. Table 2 provides the mean score on each survey item, showing that all items ranged between 3.37 and 3.88 on the 1-to-4-point scale, suggesting a high level of satisfaction with the training series. In addition to the closed-ended items, the open-ended responses demonstrated satisfaction with this project as well. Only two comments suggested any dissatisfaction, and these comments related to the barrier of traveling to the trainings, not any concerns with the actual content. The remaining 27 comments suggested the trainings were well received. Specifically, one attendee stated, "I will use the suggestions taught in this training," while another stated, "This was one of the most meaningful trainings I have attended." Overall, the comments on the evaluation tool characterized the training series as "engaging," "relevant," and "worthwhile."

Future research is needed to evaluate the potential impact this training series had on the practice of supervision and, ultimately, the practice of FCP. Posttest data will ultimately be collected to allow for pre- and posttest comparisons to responses on the items administered prior to the implementation of the training series. In addition, although conducting research that links changes in supervision to practice is quite challenging, further research in this area is also needed (Harkness & Hensley, 1991; Tsui, 1997).

TABLE 2 Mean Scores on Training Evaluation Surveys

Item	*N*	*M*	*SD*
The instructor demonstrated enthusiasm.	189	3.87	.34
The instructor was knowledgeable.	188	3.88	.32
Content of trainings was relevant to my job.	188	3.64	.52
I incorporated aspects of these trainings into my work at DCYF.	185	3.37	.52
I would recommend this training to my coworkers.	186	3.53	.56
I found the handouts useful.	188	3.37	.61
Overall, I was satisfied with this series of trainings.	188	3.54	.55

Scale for survey: Strongly agree = 4, agree = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1.

CONCLUSION

Ellett, Collins-Camargo, and Ellett (2006) state, "In order to enable supervisors to be effective in their work, child welfare agencies must support and provide training grounded in how to promote a positive organizational culture" (p. 50). To this end, this paper describes a collaborative effort between ASU and DCYF to develop a series of continuing education classes to train child welfare supervisors and administrators in a model of strengths-based supervision. Shulman (2005) suggests that supervision plays an important role in modeling effective practice while Sandau-Beckler and colleagues (2002) conclude child welfare agencies must model principles of FCP if such practice is to be infused into the daily work with families. This project sought to develop FCP at this large, public child welfare agency by first affecting the practice of supervision. Although future research is needed to evaluate the impact of this training on supervision and direct work with children and families, informally, the response to this training series was quite positive. Attendees reported they appreciated a renewed focus on the principles of FCP, and they also seemed to benefit from the opportunity to dialogue with other supervisors about how to model these practice principles in supervision. Leaders at this child welfare agency were pleased with the content of the training and requested that the curriculum be incorporated into the ongoing supervisor core training conducted at DCYF. Therefore, future supervisors will also be trained regarding this model, creating opportunity for future research.

REFERENCES

Bogo, M., Globerman, J., & Sussman, T. (2004). The field instructor as group worker: Managing trust and competition in group supervision. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *40*(1), 13–26.

Caspi, J., & Reid, W. (2002). *Educational supervision in social work*. New York: Columbia Press.

Cohen, B. (1999). Intervention and supervision in strengths-based social work practice. *Families in Society*, *80*(5), 460–466.

Coleman, H., & Unrau, Y. (2008). Analyzing qualitative data. In R. Grinnell & Y. Unrau (Eds.), *Social work research and evaluation* (pp. 387–408). New York: Oxford Press.

Collins-Camargo, C. (2006). Clinical supervision in public child welfare: Themes from findings of multi-site study. *Professional Development*, *9*(2/3), 100–110.

Davis, B. (2002). Group supervision as a learning laboratory for the purposeful use of self in child protection work. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, *22*(1/2), 183–198.

Deal, K. H. (2004). Effective interpersonal and critical thinking skills. In M. Austin & K. Hopkins (Eds.), *Supervision as collaboration in the human services* (pp. 35–46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

DeMuro, P., & Rideout, P. (2002). *Team decision making: Involving the family and community in child welfare decisions*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E Casey Foundation.

Dolgoff, R. (2005). *An introduction to supervisory practice in human services*. New York: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Ellett, A., Collins-Camargo, C., & Ellett, C. (2006). Personal and organizational correlates of outcomes in child welfare: Implications for supervision and continuing professional development. *Professional Development*, *9*(2/3), 44–53.

Ferguson, S. (2009). Clinical supervision in child welfare. In C. Potter & C. Brittain (Eds.), *Child welfare supervision* (pp. 296–329). New York: Oxford University Press.

Friedlander, M. L., Siegel, S. M., & Brenock, K. (1989). Parallel process in counseling and supervision: A case study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *36*, 149–157.

Harkness, D., & Hensley, H. (1991). Changing the focus of social work supervision: Effects on client satisfaction and generalized contentment. *Social Work*, *36*(6), 506–512.

Jacquet, S., Clark, S., Morazes, J., & Withers, R. (2007). The role of supervision in the retention of public child welfare workers. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, *1*(3), 27–54.

Kadushin, A. (1992a). Social work supervision: An updated survey. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *10*(2), 9–27.

Kadushin, A. (1992b). *Supervision in social work* (3rd ed.). New York: Columbia Press.

Kadushin, A., & Harkness, D. (2002). *Supervision in social work*. New York: Columbia Press.

Kisthardt, W. (2006). The opportunities and challenges of strengths-based, person-centered practice: Purpose, principles, and applications in a climate of systems' integration. In D. Saleebey (Ed.), *The strengths perspective in social work practice* (4th ed.) (pp. 171–196). Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Landsman, M. (2007). Supporting child welfare supervisors to improve worker retention. *Child Welfare*, *86*(2), 105–124.

Lietz, C. (2008). Implementation of group supervision in child welfare. *Child Welfare*, *87*(6), 31–48.

Lietz, C. (2009). Critical theory as a framework for decision making in child welfare. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, *3*(2), 190–206.

Luongo, G. (2007). Re-thinking child welfare training models to achieve evidence-based practices. *Administration in Social Work*, *31*(2), 87–96.

Meezan, W. (2000). Translating rhetoric to reality: The future of family and children's services. *Family Preservation Journal*, *5*(1), 1–19.

Munson, C. (1993). *Clinical social work supervision*, 2nd ed. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press.

Murphy, M., & Wright, D. (2005). Supervisees' perspectives of power use in supervision. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *31*(3), 283–295.

Nathan, J. (1993). The battered social worker: A psychodynamic contribution to practice, supervision and policy. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, *7*(1), 73–80.

Pearson, Q. (2000). Opportunities and challenges in the supervisory relationship: Implications for counselor supervision. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, *22*(4), 283–294.

Ringel, S. (2001). In the shadow of death: Relational paradigms in clinical supervision. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *29*(2), 171–179.

Sandau-Beckler, P., Salcido, R., Beckler, M. J., Mannes, M., & Beck, M. (2002). Infusing family-centered values into child protection practice. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *24*(9/10), 719–741.

Saleebey, D. (2006). *The strengths perspective in social work practice*, 4th ed. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Shireman, J. (2003). *Critical issues in child welfare*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Shulman, L. (1993). *Interactional supervision*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Shulman, L. (2005). The clinical supervisor-practitioner working alliance: A parallel process. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *24*(1/2), 23–47.

Strand, V., & Badger, L. (2005). Professionalizing child welfare: An evaluation of a clinical consultation model for supervisors. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *27*, 865–880.

Sundet, P., Mermelstein, J., & Watt, J. W. (2003). The role demonstration model of supervision. *Professional Development*, *6*, 60–67.

Tsui, M. (1997). Empirical research of social work supervision: The state of the art 1970–1995. *Journal of Social Service Research*, *23*(2), 39–54.

Tsui, M. (2005). *Social work supervision: Contexts and concepts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.