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1. Michael
2. Michael

Provide an overview of presentation - present findings from Stage 1 of our research and then keen to hear your thoughts so will workshop at the end three questions.

Some definition of prof sup and our reasoning to use the term prof. sup.
3. This whakatauki is used by a number of commentators to describe and reflect the essence of professional supervision. It describes a collaborative approach within a supportive relationship, to address issues within a supervisee's nursing practice and professional role so that they and the service user and service benefit and hence the "basket is full". McKenna et al 2008
The background to our Aotearoa study

- The growth of professional supervision within the health and social services in Aotearoa has been well documented (Maidment & Beddoe, 2012; May & Stanfield, 2010).
- The evaluation of professional supervision has been promoted as best practice yet how this is translated into practice remains unclear and there have been repeated calls for further research into the place, role and process of evaluation in supervision (O’Donoghue, 2006; Beddoe, 2010).

4. Bev

Our starting point meeting over a coffee over a two year period with a shared interest in prof. supervision. Supportive of each other and had evolving discussions about research and what ifs.

We were all involved in writing about, providing and teaching about prof. sup.

We agreed that the practice of sup had been happening for many years, across numerous professions, that many practitioners believe sup is essential to good practice and that much time and resources are invested into the provision of sup. as an important part of safe and competent practice. We recognised that there criticism of
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Our starting point meeting over a coffee over a two year period with a shared interest in prof. supervision. Supportive of each other and had evolving discussions about research and what ifs.

We were all involved in writing about, providing and teaching about prof. sup.

We agreed that the practice of sup had been happening for many years, across numerous professions, that many practitioners believe sup is essential to good practice and that much time and resources are invested into the provision of sup. as an important part of safe and competent practice. Yet evaluation of prof sup did not seem to us to be well developed or imbedded into the practice of sup. Added to this much of the research is with trainees and students.

Despite this best practice guidelines such as those published by Te Pou recommending supervision is evaluated. These guidelines often describe informal and ad hoc method and proces sto do this.

We had also noted that there In increasing interest in paper and pencil instruments in evaluating supervision. These are usually completed by the supervisee and supervisor and are typically measures of satisfaction with the
supervisory relationship, for example the Manchester Clinical Scale of Supervision. In NZ we had heard of and worked with practitioners using such tools as Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ). The Supervisory Relationship Questionnaire (SRQ) and we had attended David Green’s presentation which included a discussion of the Leeds Alliance Scale of Supervision (Wainwright, 2010). This is a simple visual analogue scale to be used at the conclusion of each session measuring the supervisee’s opinion in terms of the approach of the supervisor (whether focused or not), the relationship with the supervisor (whether they understood each other or not) and whether the supervision met the supervisees needs (was it helpful or not). Such a tool allows for useful discussion and may add depth to the actual work of supervision. And one does not have to go far in the literature to find an unexpectedly large number of measurement tools often developed for the specific research context.

These factors were happening against a backdrop of increasing need to ensure the accountability of practice yet sup seems to have avoided the outcome evaluation measures that our professions are engaged in.

Notes for Bev
This tool is comparable to the session rating scale (Miller, Duncan, Sorrell & Brown, 2005) a brief user-friendly measure that demonstrates good reliability and validity, and it is designed to reflect the constructs measured in existing alliance measures (see Wainwright (2010) for a full discussion). Although it is too early for any tests of its utility to have been carried out the authors maintain that it is “easy to incorporate into regular supervision and is at least useful tool” (Green & Latchford, 2012: 184)

. O’Donovan and Kavanagh (2014) offer a full description of, a discussion of usefulness, and construction of these instruments and note the limitations of these instruments, as many have been developed for use with trainees and their supervisors and with clinical psychologists.
6. Bev

On the other hand others in the literature such as Michael Carroll suggesting the acid test of effective sup is the impact on client outcome. Many commentators and researchers will agree with this.

Carroll goes on to ask what have you learned from the past hour in sup with me? What shifts have taken place in the supervision room that have been transferred to your work? Great and powerful questions Carroll is discussing transformational learning – changes in action and behaviour. Both of which are critical to evaluating the effectiveness of sup and on the face of it seems to be a reasonable way of evaluating sup. Here the evaluation is 1 to 1 reliant on self report involves only the supervisor and supervisee and relates specifically to the learning of the supervisee in the session. Important part of the process of evaluating sup but is that all there is to it. Again this is both ad hoc and informal – we were asking is this enough and what else needs to be considered? And are we actually asking about impact on client outcome or the supervisee’s perception of this?
7. Bev
Perhaps evaluation is not as simple as it seems. Our review of the literature suggests

There is confusion in the literature between feedback and evaluation. At a simple level feedback is providing information on performance hoping that change follows and evaluation is a systemic approach to assessing the merit or worth or significance of some aspect of a process against a set of criteria. The focus here is on gaining insight into a process to enable reflection and assist with identifying future change. Further work is needed about what is it that we are focusing on a means of giving feedback or a means by which we are evaluating sup.

There are many more questions than answers in evaluating sup. Is it clear what needs to be evaluated? Is it the supervisory process and relationship; or is it changes in the supervisee’s behaviour, and skills; or is it a measure of change in the client’s behaviour? Is it an evaluation of the supervisor’s competencies or the supervisee’s attitude and use of supervision? Is it a self-assessment, is it at every session or three monthly or annually or should we using a more formal measure? Measures are suggested but usually in relation to a specific research task. Interestingly Wheeler and Barkham (2014) have evaluated many of these measures and have suggested five possible measures that they recommend to be
used routinely in sup. Research so that a broad cumulative evidence base for the effectiveness of sup can be built. These measures focus on the supervisory alliance, therapist professional development, the identification of supervisory issues and helpful aspects of supervision.

Ethical and professional questions which need answering include: What is the purpose of the evaluation, who has access to the results and how will the material be used as well as what constitutes sufficient or good enough evaluation? Should prof. sup be evaluated? How what and when and what happens in reality and what is relevant to experienced practitioners.
8. Bev

Milne and Watkins in their very useful Handbook published last year comment that “evaluation (of supervision) has advanced from nuisance to necessity. They present evidence that evaluation of supervision is now being implemented within clinical supervision, across individuals (supervisors and supervisees) and within systems (hospitals and training contexts).”

This conclusion surprised us and did not reflect our experience hence this study. Our view is that evaluation continues to be underdeveloped and not well understood we needed to find out what was the experience of evaluation of supervision in NZ for experienced practitioners.
The research purpose:

To explore and document the current status of evaluation and identifying issues, concerns and/or gaps and make appropriate recommendation about supervision evaluation in the Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Four aims:

I. To map and document the current practice
II. To ascertain interest to evaluating supervision.
III. To explore the need for a formal supervision evaluation tool
IV. To explore a theoretical framework for constructing such a tool

Wintec Ethics Approval for Study
Design of Study:

This study has a sequential design and employs a range of methods within a qualitative research methodology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage One:</th>
<th>Semi-structured interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The findings of these interviews forms the basis of this presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage Two:</th>
<th>On line survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Stage Three: | Development of evaluation process/tool |

10. Janet were conducted with 2 supervisors, 2 supervisees and 2 managers from each of the four professions – a total of 24 interviews.

**Stage Two:**
The interviews from stage 1 shaped the development of an online survey which was made available to practitioners, through professional networks, in July 2015.

**Stage Three:**
Subject to the responses from stage 2, a third stage will involve the exploration of a theoretical framework for constructing such an evaluation tool.
Stage One:

**Aims**
- To explore - map and document the current practice in terms of how supervision is valued and evaluated.
- To ascertain what the parties to supervision (supervisor, supervisee and funding organisation) consider of interest to evaluate.

24 Semi-structured interviews were conducted across mental health nursing, social work, psychology and counselling:

2 supervisors, 2 supervisees and 2 managers from each of the four professions.

Findings from this stage are presented here.
12. Janet

Participants

- Age range: 30’s – 70’s
- Gender: 4 males 20 females
- Ethnicity identified: 8 Maori & 16 Tauliwi
- All had a tertiary qualification
- Training in supervision:
  ranged from non-assessed short courses in supervision to postgraduate qualifications in supervision.
- All had been receiving supervision for a number of years and had experience of at least two supervision relationships.
- Of those currently providing supervision this range from several years to over 30 years.
**Interview questions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is their current practice of evaluation in supervision?</th>
<th>What would they consider to be an ideal or future for the evaluation of supervision?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e.g.: role of evaluation; policies and/or rationale for evaluating; information gathered; analysis and distribution of the information)</td>
<td>(e.g.: would they do differently, consider as ideal practice in evaluation and if a recognised evaluation process/tool would be of value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Bev
14. Michael

Many interviewees commented that they had not considered the evaluation of supervision prior to this interview...

Evaluation versus feedback appeared to be viewed as the same with many interviewees.

The frequency of any form of evaluation ranged from after every session to yearly with the following differences noted:

- Occurred at yearly appraisal
- No opportunity
- Several RNs used a tool
- Several interviewees never thought of it.
15. Michael

Consistent message about preference for a formal process/tool such as a questionnaire that captured a predetermined areas within professional supervision.
16. Michael

There was evidence that some participants held differing perceptions of what constituted informal versus formal.
17.Janet

Differences in understanding evaluation of supervision, as a requirement of competencies review versus evaluation from the purposes of evaluating relationship/process/dynamics and content. (This relates to the final bullet point in this slide)

When we discussed supervision people frequently came back to the importance of the relationship to effective supervision
Additional Themes Continued:

- Formal evaluation would enable supervisees to give feedback to supervisees.
- Cultural considerations in evaluation are critical. Evaluation processes from Te Ao Maori perspectives.
- Evaluation would grow the credibility of the supervision ‘profession’ (transparency is important).
- Potential benefits to the professions from having an ongoing supervision evaluation database capturing what is happening for professionals in contemporary work.

18. Janet
This workshop – we welcome your reflections on....

1. What thoughts do you have about our research thus far?
2. Will you do anything differently in your own supervision practice as a result of this presentation? If so what?
3. If a more ‘organised or formalised’ evaluation process was offered to the professions, what would you like to see included?

Please look out for and take part in our survey - thank you.

19. Michael
Feedback and questions
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