Soldner, J. L., McCarthy, A., Levine, A., & Taylor, A. (2022). Professional Disposition Considerations in Clinical Supervision: A Social Justice and Disability Perspective. *Rehabilitation Counselors and Educators Journal*, *11*(3).

Commentary & Discourse Forum

Professional Disposition Considerations in Clinical Supervision: A Social Justice and Disability Perspective

James L. Soldner[1] [a], Amanda McCarthy[2], Allison Levine[3], Aryn Taylor[4]

[1] University of Massachusetts Boston, [2] Northern Illinois University, [3] University of Iowa, [4] University of Northern Colorado

Keywords: Social justice, supervision, counselor education, disability, trainee, dispositions

https://doi.org/10.52017/001c.57696

Rehabilitation Counselors and Educators Journal

Vol. 11, Issue 3, 2022

The concept of social justice has been discussed in the counseling profession for decades and is considered an ethical obligation when providing services to clients. Counselor educators and supervisors are also responsible for integrating social justice into their work when teaching and training counseling trainees (i.e., supervisees, students). The evaluation of professional dispositions of counseling trainees is a required task of counselor educators. While much has been discussed regarding the process of professional disposition assessment, there has been less discussion of appropriate evaluation processes when working with trainees with disabilities and intersecting identities. Lack of intentionality with evaluation practices, especially integrating a social justice lens, could lead to inaccurate and harmful evaluation of trainees with disabilities and intersecting identities. The purpose of this paper is to synthesize the concepts of social justice with supervision and disability to offer a more robust discussion regarding supervision practices that may lead to more accurate and helpful evaluation of trainees.

Social justice has emerged as an essential value of significance in helping professions (Dollarhide et al., 2021; Levine et al., 2021). Societal structures and equity are fundamental to social justice (Goodman et al., 2004). Vera and Speight (2003) defined social justice as "a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable, and all members are physically and physiologically safe and secure" (p. 3). The use of equity, instead of equality, in the definition of social justice acknowledges the societal differences in the distribution of resources depending on the status, power, and privilege of an individual or group. The advantages and disadvantages distributed throughout society are central to social justice (Miller, 1999). In the United States, the social advantages of wealth, power, and privilege are more likely to be held by white people, men, heterosexuals, and people without disabilities (Ivey & Collins, 2003). Therefore, individuals from minority groups are frequently excluded from full societal participation, leading to acts "social injustice and subjugation" (Harley et al., 2007, p. 41).

Social justice is a foundational component of the practice of rehabilitation counseling. Rehabilitation counselors specifically work to alleviate social injustices experienced by people with disabilities. Social justice work is defined as "scholarship and professional action designed to change societal values, structures, policies, and practices, such that disadvantaged or marginalized groups gain increased access to these tools of self-determination" (Goodman et al., 2004, p. 795). While social justice work has been infused in counselor education, Harley et al. (2007) emphasized much of this work has been an illusion of desegregation, with the absence of true cultural transformation of organizations and institutions. Thus, additional attention to the authentic presence of social justice work in rehabilitation counselor education is necessary to develop fully professionals that acknowledge "power structures that perpetuate the cycle of able-bodism, racism, sexism, heterosexism, and classism" (Harley et al., 2007, p. 42).

A particularly pertinent power structure in counseling and counselor education, where oppression may be perpetuated or could be mitigated, is clinical supervision. Specifically, the ways in which supervisors use social justice-informed practices in the evaluation of their supervisees is underrepresented in counselor education literature. Supervisors and counselor educators are responsible for evaluating supervisees and students in an ongoing manner; however, many of these evaluations are informal and based on existing norms within a training program (Levine et al., 2019). Notably, discussions around the evaluation of professional dispositions, or nonacademic competencies, among trainees have not surrounded the importance of social justice, especially when concerning trainees with disabilities and/or intersecting marginalized identities. The purpose of this article is to put forth a comprehensive dis-

a James.Soldner@umb.edu

cussion of professional dispositions, in light of socially just supervision practices across rehabilitation counseling practice, education, and training domains.

Social Justice Imperative in Counselor Education and Supervision

Social justice has historically been considered one of the foundational values of the counseling profession and is considered a moral and ethical responsibility for all counselors (American Counseling Association, 2014 [ACA]; Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification, 2017 [CRCC]; Dollarhide et al., 2021). Counselors are expected to demonstrate an awareness and practice of social justice approaches to ensure that all clients, including those with disabilities, have equitable access to the resources, opportunities, and outcomes experienced by all members of society. According to Dollarhide and colleagues (2021), counseling activities aligned well with social justice include elements such as: (a) client and community empowerment, (b) counselor leadership, (c) advocacy, (d) social activism, and (e) and personal/professional "allyhood.". These counseling activities rooted in social justice can and should be learned and then demonstrated by all counselors through personal awareness, experience, education, and training (i.e., supervision), as well as subsequent professional counseling practice.

As evidence, CRCC and their Code of Professional Ethics for Certified Rehabilitation Counselors (CRC) consists of several foundational values within the scope of a social justice framework, including respecting human rights and dignity, promoting self-advocacy and self-determination, and appreciating culture and the diversity of human experience (CRCC, 2017). In turn, these values inform the CRCC's six core principles of ethical behavior: (a) autonomy, (b) beneficence, (c) fidelity, (d) justice, (e) nonmaleficence, and (f) veracity. In particular, the justice-specific principle of CRCC's ethical code outlines the need to be fair in the treatment of all clients and provide appropriate services to all, which is closely aligned with Dollarhide et al. (2021) overview of a social justice approach in counseling service and activity. Furthermore, the CRCC's code of ethics includes several enforceable standards of ethical practice with direct relevance to social justice in rehabilitation counseling practice and supervision, including Section A (The Counseling Relationship), Section C (Advocacy and Accessibility), Section D (Professional Responsibility), and Section H (Supervision, Training, and Teaching). An important theme embedded throughout the CRCC's standards of ethical practice, in general, is the importance of rehabilitation counselors to have a primary obligation to their client and their client's welfare and rights, as well as a commitment to respecting and promoting cultural diversity – all values and principles well-aligned with a social justice framework in rehabilitation counseling and the broader counseling profession (CRCC, 2017).

Furthermore, in 2015, the ACA adopted the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC; Ratts et al., 2015), which are intended to provide a framework for understanding the complex sociocultural dynamics counselors and clients bring into a professional counseling relationship (Fickling et al., 2019). The MSJCC model was intended as a framework to be used in both supervision and counseling practice environments to both plan supervision and counseling interventions. Furthermore, the MSJCC has a particular focus on praxis and intersectionality to promote counselor competency and development, especially as it relates to multicultural and social justice competencies. As a result, the MSJCC should be integrated into broader clinical supervision and more narrowed social justice supervision approaches. In fact, the multicultural competence of supervisors has consistently been found to be positively associated with the supervisory working alliance and supervisee satisfaction with supervision (Crockett & Hays, 2015; Inman, 2006). Multiculturally competent supervision seems to be key to engaging counselors in the supervision process, formulating positive working relationships with supervises, and in turn, helping counselors form positive working relationships with their clients. As further evidence for the infusion of social justice issues into counselor education, supervision, and practice, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) standards highlight the importance of supervisors attending to a diverse spectrum of cultural factors (Standard 6.a.iii) and fostering in all trainees the awareness and need to address issues of culture, power, and privilege from clients from diverse backgrounds (Standard 6.b.iii) (Borders, 2014). However, these ACES standards, though relevant to multicultural and social justice issues in counseling, do not specifically operationalize what supervisors are expected to do with this information in a supervisory capacity. Therefore, the MSJCC and other intentional social justice supervision models and approaches are needed.

Social Justice Supervision Models

Social justice supervision has been conceptualized as supervision in which social justice is practiced, modeled, coached, and used as a metric throughout supervision. According to Dollarhide et al. (2021), social justice supervision is defined as, "supervision in which social justice is practiced, modeled, and taught with goals: (a) supervisee and client liberation and (b) transformation of the profession toward greater social justice overall" (p. 105). The social justice supervision model proposed by Dollarhide et al. (2021) is informed by the aforementioned MSJCC framework in several ways, including: (a) intersectionality of all identity constructs in the supervisor-counselor-client supervisory triad; (b) systemic perspectives of oppression and agency are maintained on all systems in the triad; (c) the goal of supervision shifts to facilitation of the trainee's culturally informed healing skills that transcend the prevailing White, middle-class American paradigms; and (d) the ultimate transformation toward a socially just profession becomes paramount. According to Dollarhide et al. (2021), the overarching goal of the social justice supervision model is *transformation*, in that social justice is embedded into all counseling, supervision, and counselor education-related interactions. The social justice supervision model is intended to enhance the cultural and social justice counsel-

ing skills of the trainee, monitor the quality of cultural and social justice counseling services provided by the trainee, and assess the trainee's social justice awareness and overall mental health. Furthermore, there are several key characteristics and steps in the process of a social justice supervision framework. In particular, the four key steps in the process require: (a) the supervisor conducting a self-evaluation, (b) the supervisor facilitating the trainee's identity exploration, (c) the supervisor modeling and teaching social justice systems work with the trainee, and (d) the supervisor and trainee process social justice work. For a more thorough explanation of each of the four steps as part of a social justice supervision model and approach, see Dollarhide et al. (2021).

The social justice supervision model posited by Dollarhide and colleagues as well as the contributions from ACA, ACES, and CRCC, all support the importance of social justice supervision. Notably, however, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) does not explicitly address social justice supervision. The standards require only that training programs incorporate social justice models at some point in the educational curriculum. Furthermore, CACREP stipulates that programs systematically assess students in a variety of areas, including professional dispositions (PDs); however, there is limited available guidance for programs regarding equitable assessment and the use of validated instrumentation.

Of particular interest in the current paper is the notion of professional disposition assessment. According to CACREP (2016), professional dispositions are defined as the commitments, characteristics, values, beliefs, interpersonal functioning, and behaviors that influence the counselor's professional growth and interactions with colleagues. This definition is expansive and requires counselor educators to delineate traditional methods of assessment in higher education (e.g., quizzes, essays, exams) from the assessment of non-academic qualities of trainees. Professional disposition assessment may take place in a more informal manner, such as by assessing a trainee's tone via email or observing how they interact with a peer during class. Given that counselor educators are tasked with determining the appropriateness of students to enter the counseling profession, these various informal interactions are an essential component of the gatekeeping process. However, if they are not coupled with systematic evaluations using validated measurement, these observations may disproportionately disadvantage students from marginalized groups (Levine, 2020).

Recently, Levine et al. (2021) highlighted the importance of utilizing a social justice framework when conducting professional disposition evaluation and as part of clinical supervision, in general. According to Levine and colleagues, "Movement forward in supervision requires supervisors to introspectively introduce their own disposition and skills regarding supervision" (p. 14). Moreover, the authors make specific recommendations for embodying social justice while evaluating professional dispositions, including: (a) remaining accountable to ethical codes regarding social justice (e.g., having competence, awareness, and knowledge related to inequality and systemic oppression); (b) fostering and modeling social justice via advocacy in counseling practice and beyond; and (c) using supervision as a forum for development and facilitation of social justice and advocacy skills (Levine et al., 2021). A social justice approach to supervision and professional disposition evaluation provides a more equitable experience for counseling students, and especially those who are members of historically marginalized communities (Levine et al., 2021).

Disability and Social Justice Supervision

A social justice approach to supervision is fundamentally critical when working with trainees with disabilities who are enrolled in CACREP-accredited programs. While there is no standard definition of disability applicable to all systems and agencies, the definition of disability applied to CACREP standards "is the umbrella term for impairments, activity limitations and participation restrictions referring to the negative aspects of the interaction between an individual (with a health condition) and that individual's contextual factors (environmental and personal factors" (World Health Organization, 2011, p. 4). It is estimated that 1 in 4 adults living in the United States have some type of disability (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2022). Shin et al. (2011) found that only 20% of CACREP-accredited programs in their survey maintained admission data regarding disabilities, and fewer yet (about 13%) retained any data to show graduation rates among trainees with disabilities. Without data to inform decisions, it is difficult to improve the field's ability to recruit and train diverse counselors, including counselors with disabilities.

Outside of training programs, higher education continues to be an area where students with disabilities are not experiencing the same outcomes as their peers. Completion rates for students with disabilities are generally lower than completion rates for students without disabilities (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019). Furthermore, it has been well documented that faculty perspectives of students with disabilities are wide ranging and highly variable (Papadakaki et al., 2022; Sniatecki et al., 2015). Specifically, while most faculty have positive attitudes towards students with disabilities and the accommodation process, students with mental health issues and/or learning difficulties tend to be perceived more negatively when compared to students with physical disabilities. Students report their perceptions of faculty as being unwelcoming or resistant, leading to decreased instances of self-advocacy and potential withdrawal from a training program (Becker & Palladino, 2016; Coduti et al., 2016; Quinlan et al., 2012). In addition to the broader higher education landscape, there is evidence that students with disabilities experience similar barriers to success in training programs within the counseling and related programs (Lund et al., 2020).

Lack of Disability Knowledge

Prior to the proposed 2024 CACREP standards, disability was not saliently infused into the core counseling curricu-

lum for all counseling specializations (Rivas, 2020). Both of the rehabilitation counseling specializations held detailed curriculum standards related to disability and working with individuals with disabilities since the merger in 2017. Therefore, through no fault of their own, it may be unlikely that all counselor educators have much exposure to disability content through formal educational channels. There is evidence that formal education and training surrounding disability in counseling may be inconsistent and highly dependent on individual professors and supervisors (Rivas & Hill, 2018). Supervisors and educators without a background in disability may also not be familiar with some of the nuances of accommodations, as well as difficulties and delays trainees with disabilities sometimes face regarding accommodations and access to the learning environment (Lund et al., 2020). One salient example of this is that a student must work with their site supervisor to establish onsite accommodations, as a student's university/class accommodations likely will not always align with their fieldwork or office setting.

Given that many counselor educators have not had sufficient opportunities to explore disability concepts during their academic and clinical training, these counselor educators may not feel confident teaching these concepts in academic or clinical training. Further, counselor educators and supervisors may insert their own perspectives regarding disability into their teaching and supervising, which is particularly harmful given the biases against people with disabilities by many people without disabilities (Smart, 2016). Such ableism, or discrimination in favor of non-disabled people, is problematic in terms of accurately evaluating trainees with disabilities in counselor education and needs to be addressed in counselor education (Smith et al., 2008).

Ableism is defined as "a form of discrimination or prejudice against people with disabilities that is characterized by the belief that these individuals need to be fixed or cannot function as full members of society" (Smith et al., 2008, p. 86). These attitudes impact how people with disabilities are treated in all environments, such as workplaces, communities, and educational settings. Ableist attitudes result in reduced access to health care, education, employment, and increases in bullying, poverty, and violence against people with disabilities. Despite progress regarding disability awareness, Friedman (2016) and Antonak and Livneh (2000) found that many people hold unconscious prejudice towards people with disabilities despite believing their conscious views of people with disabilities are positive. While progress has been made, ableist views still affect people with disabilities, including those in counselor education programs.

Another barrier experienced by trainees with disabilities in counselor education programs surrounds evaluation from supervisors and educators regarding professional dispositions (Sabella et al., 2019). Levine et al. (2021) outlined the need to implement more inclusive evaluation in relation to professional dispositions. While issues of social justice need to be considered during the evaluation of professional dispositions, there are some unique considerations when working with trainees with disabilities. A key piece, as emphasized by Levine et al. (2021), is the supervisor's self-awareness, humility, and desire to learn about other groups and cultures, which is considered paramount to effective social justice supervision.

McCaughan and Hill (2015) argued that interpersonal skills, warmth, emotional stability, and self-awareness are characteristics important and necessary to the counseling profession. However, counselor educators and supervisors are tasked with making judgements regarding trainee performance, which can leave room for biased decisions. For example, without clear and predetermined procedures, it can be challenging to recognize the source of the behavior to respond appropriately. In addition, people with disabilities are susceptible to negative bias, and professional disposition ratings lack interrater reliability. Therefore, any issues with interrater reliability can result in separate counselor educators rating the same behavior differently (Garner et al., 2020). For example, a trainee with a speech fluency issue may not speak up in group supervision out of fear of exacerbating their speech concern and being outed in a group setting. The trainee could be incorrectly labeled as lacking self-awareness because they are seemingly not monitoring their participation in class and remain relatively silent. A different counselor educator, considering disability factors, may consider the trainee's behavior in other settings and recognize how it is important to consider the trainee's lived experience as an asset and shape the learning environment to be more accessible to all trainees to participate and meet the goals of the course. Without a social justice lens, professional disposition assessment can negatively influence trainees with disabilities in counselor education programs, especially during the clinical training phase.

Proactive Social Justice

Given the factors trainees with disabilities in counselor education programs face regarding professional dispositions evaluation, it is critical for socially just supervision practices to be implemented when teaching and supervising all trainees, especially future counselors with disabilities. While avoiding biased actions is important for effective supervision and evaluation of trainees with disabilities, it is not enough. Instead, socially just supervision and evaluation of professional dispositions of trainees with disabilities also requires a proactive approach.

First, socially just supervision practices require supervisors who are willing to evaluate their beliefs and values honestly regarding disability and the impact of those beliefs and values on the supervision process (Asakura & Maurer, 2018; Lund et al., 2020). Supervisors displaying high levels of self-awareness and cultural humility regarding their own disability attitudes can help to ensure ableist attitudes are less prevalent during the evaluation of professional dispositions. This is especially important given implicit bias against people with disabilities (Antonak & Livneh, 2000).

Engaging in ongoing and regular reflective practices is recommended to better understand one's own cultural humility, which is essential for mitigating biases. Foronda et

al. (2016) identified, and Gonzalez et al. (2021) later validated, five components of cultural humility that may be useful to supervisors: (1) openness (the ability to be open to the diversity of worldviews); (2) self-awareness (accurate awareness of one's strengths and areas of growth); (3) egoless (maintain humility and work to secure and maintain social justice in all interactions); (4) supportive interactions (provide appropriate and positive assistance during interactions); and (5) self-reflection and critique (ongoing process of maintaining awareness of how thoughts, feelings, and behaviors impact interactions). Using this framework, for example, a supervisor may notice that a trainee may be reluctant to share vulnerabilities during individual supervision, but this framework would help guide the supervisor to examine 'why' instead of assuming it is because the trainee is not interested in learning. Cultural humility is central to socially just supervision because new situations and opportunities for self-reflection as a supervisor are presented everyday (Foronda et al., 2016).

Trainee Assessment

Actively advocating for trainees with disabilities during the evaluation process, including professional disposition evaluation, is also necessary for supervisors who employ socially just practices. Lund et al. (2020) defined a socially just supervisor as someone who is effective at communicating with and/or on behalf of trainees with disabilities. Adding to the concept of cultural humility, culturally competent assessment therefore uses many of the traditional assessment methods, but within a structure of cultural competence (Sue et al., 2022). The concept of *contextual viewpoint* may be useful with implementing culturally competent assessment because a contextual viewpoint demands the acknowledgment that everyone is embedded in systems, such as culture and family, and these systems impact how they feel, behave, think, learn, and interact. For example, a trainee may be reluctant to seek help from their supervisor when needed because they had negative experiences in the past when asking for help or they believe they will be perceived as incompetent because they needed help. A culturally competent supervisor, adapting a contextual viewpoint, will consider these life experiences and dynamics with authority when evaluating and collaborating with the trainee.

The concept of collaborative assessment may also be useful for supervisors to adopt a social justice supervision approach (Sue et al., 2022) and could be applied to evaluation of professional dispositions. Originally discussed in the context of counselor and client relationships, a collaborative assessment approach obtains input from the trainee regarding the social and cultural factors that may be related to presenting barriers or problems, or even the factors that could be a source of support and encouragement for the trainee. The approach builds a structure for considering factors that contribute to observed behaviors evaluated by supervisors. A collaborative assessment approach validates the idea that the world aspires to be equitable, but that people with disabilities currently face many barriers.

Strategies for Collaborative Assessment

A collaborative assessment process would include intentional exchanges between the trainee and supervisor to explore the various factors contributing to trainee performance. Such an approach not only counterbalances the tendency of individuals to search for evidence to support one's ideas and ignore the rest (confirmatory strategy), but embraces the social justice perspective that individuals are not affected the same by the same conditions. Strategies for engaging in collaborative assessment from a social justice lens begin with the supervisor's awareness and recognition of their own positionality and cultural humility (Harley et al., 2002). From that starting point, supervisors can adapt existing mechanisms for supervisee assessments. For example, this could include combining formal and informal strategies for assessment, such as direct communication between a supervisor and trainee and the use of an empirically valid trainee assessment instrument, as a tool for conversation and dialogue around strengths and areas of need for the trainee. Similarly, a tool such as the Cultural Formulation Interview (CFI; American Psychiatric Association, 2013), in part, may be adapted to allow the trainee an opportunity to express their lived experiences, while the supervisor can use a guided approach to gaining more information about the trainees' cultural background, social context, stressors, and support systems.

Intersectionality

Importantly, social justice supervision must bridge the foundational concepts of being equitable in one's approach with the need to navigate systems and programs in a socially just manner. This is especially important when providing supervision and working with trainees who come from historically marginalized groups and have intersectional identities. Understanding intersectionality is essential for effective practice with social justice supervision, considering trainees interact not only with the immediate people around them, but also within systems that serve to perpetuate oppression and marginalization.

Intersectionality, a term posited by Kimberle Crenshaw and other Black feminist scholars, explains the interaction between one's identities and the systems which serve to oppress them; this is originally specific to the disproportionate discrimination experienced by Black women (Combahee River Collective, 1977/1995; Crenshaw, 1991). Understanding intersectionality as a supervisor means one understands that identities "are not separate, additive, dimensions of social stratification but are mutually defining, and reinforce one another in a myriad of ways" (Warner & Brown, 2011, p. 1237). Namely, intersectionality means there is an intersection between identities such as race, gender identity, ability, sexual orientation, and religious identity, which contributes to additional marginalization or oppression of a given person.

A supervisor working with trainees with disabilities who come from additional historically marginalized groups must understand that the presence of multiply marginalized identities requires their attention. For example, peo-

ple from historically marginalized racial and ethnic groups have been found to receive lower quality health care as compared to their White counterparts, (Gale et al., 2020)). Even more specifically, Black women have significantly higher rates of serious health conditions, such as hypertension and obesity, as well as more than double the rates of all women when looking at maternal or pregnancy-related mortality (Chinn et al., 2021). As such, when working with a trainee who is Black, identifies as female, has a disability, and is pregnant, a supervisor must be aware that this trainee is encountering multiple systems that have been demonstrated as being potentially life-threatening to them. Identities interact not only within the individual, interpersonal level of our experience, but also at all other levels people exist within (Levine & Breshears, 2019).

With an advanced social justice understanding and cultural humility, a supervisor can better contextualize and understand the ways in which a trainee may react in a given situation, or how they may be wary of interacting with certain professionals. In the same way a counselor uses their empathic understanding to identify the needs of their clients, a supervisor should be able to do the same for their trainees. As it pertains to professional dispositions, it is essential for supervisors to be able to see beyond a behavior, tone, or language to better assess what is happening for their trainee. For example, given the historic maltreatment of Black people by medical professionals, a Black trainee who is pregnant may react harshly to a medical provider from whom they are seeking client information. Understanding the historic and systemic inequities trainees with multiple marginalized identities experience allows the supervisor to not only be empathetic for their trainee, but also to advocate for them in various situations where their dispositions may otherwise be assessed as being inadequate (Levine et al., 2021).

Case Study

Vivian is a third-year counselor education graduate trainee enrolled in a CACREP-accredited rehabilitation counseling program in the southern region of the United States. While Vivian is a nationally certified counselor (NCC), she is beginning her internship at a community rehabilitation center in a conservative city. In the first supervision session, Vivian asserts her identities as a Black, lesbian, and disabled person are salient to her given the intersection of the social and political phenomena taking place in the country. She also identifies as a lover of natural hair and has her hair styled in sisterlocks. Vivian views her hairstyles as a way of feeling liberated and remaining connected to her roots. She is also a community organizer who strives to link community members with resources on local, state, and national levels. When queried by her supervisor, Vivian describes the effect of "state-sanctioned violence happening against Black and Brown bodies" (e.g., Breonna Taylor, Sandra Bland, & George Floyd), which shapes her focus and how she identifies as a healer (i.e., while she understands she is a counselor, she views her professional identity as a healer). She is highly interested in serving the community.

Joan is Vivian's supervisor at the community rehabilitation center and serves as the placement coordinator for the rehabilitation counselor education program where Vivian is a trainee. Joan identifies as a second-generation Mexican American, non-disabled, Christian woman who is an ally to all who experience oppression. Joan indicated she was raised in an urban city on the west coast, which contributes to her love and respect for all people. In the first supervision meeting, Joan thought she could enhance the supervisory alliance by engaging in explicit discourse around the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement by expressing her disdain with how incidents of violence against all people have been addressed. Moreover, this was the first thing Joan did after introducing herself. Joan engaged in this discourse with the assumption that this is a topic "people like Vivian" would "appreciate and value." During this conversation, Joan expressed that women experience the same oppression as Black people. Joan extended the conversation nearly ten minutes, citing her frustration with how the government is failing to protect both women and all people of color. Joan's disposition was jarring to Vivian and resulted in the trainee feeling reluctant to discuss anything about herself, wanting to focus solely on clients. Given what transpired, Vivian is feeling reluctant to discuss anything about herself with Joan given she perceives her supervisor's multicultural competence to be low. Vivian began to become irritated with Joan, thus not engaging in her mild attempts to connect on an interpersonal level in supervision. While Vivian's clinical work was not directly impacted, Joan became curious about what caused the rupture and how she might best serve Vivian as a trainee. Joan began to wonder how Vivian might establish relationships with current and future clients given that the supervisory relationship is ruptured.

When reflecting on the first supervisory meeting with Joan, Vivian was appalled at some of the ideological connections Joan inferred. For example, according to Joan, all Black folks want to discuss the current sociopolitical climate in America. While Vivian was not averse to having discourse on the sociopolitical climate that impacts Black people, Joan's approach perceivably centered on her distorted understanding. Also, Joan did not center the supervisory relationship with Vivian, rather centering on all types of oppression. This omission disregarded the unique experiences and pain that Black people may experience. Vivian's strengths as someone who is already doing the work in the community was not lifted up, which was a missed opportunity to bolster the supervisory relationship. A decolonial approach centers Vivian's strengths as someone who is a pillar in the community. Joan's comments on oppression did not center the nuances Black people may experience, which can be an impetus for an array of concerns (e.g., colorblindness, anti-Black sentiment) to arise in the supervisory relationship. Vivian received Joan's commentary on all oppression being "the same" as a slight to the pain Black people have historically experienced in America. Vivian's reluctance to share important information to her personhood impacts her development as a clinician in training (i.e., healer), thus impacting her effectiveness with clients.

Implications and Future Directions

To our knowledge, this is one of the first contributions to the rehabilitation counseling literature addressing social justice supervision and professional dispositions. Although rehabilitation counseling is a profession that has deep roots in social justice and continues to examine societal oppression of historically marginalized groups, additional work is needed in education, policy, practice, and research. The assessment of professional dispositions from a framework that includes social justice and disability considerations is a newer concept in counselor education. Implications and future directions are provided and separated by the salient stakeholders in rehabilitation counseling.

Implications for Counselor Educators and Supervisors

To infuse social justice in supervision authentically, there must be a shift from a compliance approach for including multicultural considerations in counselor education curriculum toward a commitment to social justice by understanding systems of oppression and their impact on trainees with disabilities and intersecting identities. Counselor educators and supervisors can commit to social justice by engaging in relevant continuing education and encouraging additional training for site supervisors. In CACREP-accredited counselor education programs, there can be an additional requirement for site supervisors to incorporate social justice in their supervision practices with trainees. Although disability curriculum is projected to be included in the forthcoming CACREP standards, there are many site supervisors who have not received disability-specific training and education. At the program level, site supervisors could be supported by their respective program in receiving multicultural and social justice supervision training. Evidence of any previous social justice supervision training could be requested by program personnel. Programs should also provide site supervisors with training opportunities relevant to social justice supervision. These training opportunities could be created and facilitated by relevant program faculty and/or staff. Furthermore, understanding the current chasm between professionals in the field and professional development opportunities within counseling, programs should consistently provide site supervisors with lists or listservs where other training opportunities are available. Additionally, programs should consider creating chapters of professional associations local supervisors can join, such as Counselors for Social Justice.

Counselor educators must also create policies and procedures within their programs that promote socially just evaluation of professional dispositions. A social justice mindset must also be embedded within the faculty discussions. For example, programs can audit current practices and policies to identify specifically where those practices account for systematic oppression of students with disabilities and other marginalized identities. How are programs supporting students with disabilities in understanding how accommodations requests can be different between the university system and a fieldwork site? What does program data identify regarding trends with students with disabilities and other intersecting identities? Faculty must recognize that trends showing students with disabilities as being consistently evaluated lower on professional disposition assessments most likely indicates a failure of the assessment, rather than a failure of those students. Due diligence regarding current practices and program data can help counselor educators understand trends within their program and become aware of more socially just practices.

Inherently, the supervisor-trainee relationship is one with an established hierarchy, with power leaning toward the supervisor given their role as the experienced counselor and assessor. As marginalized members of society, people with disabilities are less likely to hold power and privilege (Ivey & Collins, 2003). Therefore, it is important for the supervisor to understand systems of oppression, specifically as they relate to disability, and commit to a social justice lens to ensure their role is not one that perpetuates inequities. Moreover, continuous self-assessment and cultural humility are foundational to the counseling process and can be modeled by counselor educators and supervisors as they assess professional dispositions. This will help motivate practices to be socially just and inclusive of trainees' disability experience. By CACREP programs ensuring site supervisors receive social justice supervision training, there will be an intentional infusion of social justice, so it moves beyond a "buzz word" and into practice and actionable behaviors.

Implications for Research

It is essential for researchers to continue to explore social justice and supervision to understand the impact to current practice better. Without additional research, it is unclear how to improve practice and outcomes, particularly as they relate to professional disposition assessment during supervision for trainees with disabilities. Empirical research on the effectiveness of social justice supervision on the trainee experience is necessary to determine equitable practices. Additionally, there is a substantial gap in research examining professional disposition evaluation in counselor education, both within rehabilitation counseling and across all counseling specialties. Researchers must endeavor to better understand the experiences of students who are being evaluated on their professional dispositions, as well as to further identify barriers to implementing systematic, equitable disposition evaluation using validated instrumentation and interrater reliability measures. Finally, although rehabilitation counseling is steeped in a social justice foundation, research that better explains existing biases about rehabilitation counselors and educators would aid in the development of evidence-based practices for managing biases and developing socially just practices for education and practice.

Implications for Policy Makers and Leaders

Supervision, both as a counselor in training and as a professional, is critical to both policy makers and leaders of the counseling field. Supervision helps both professionals and

counselors-in-training develop as ethical practitioners who understand the importance of how ethics will manifest in different realms (e.g., policy maker, lobbyist, educator) of the profession. Policy makers and leaders who are socially just can advocate to refine or to establish policies and procedures that anchor social justice. For example, policy makers can form substantive relationships with stakeholders (e.g., community members, leaders of agencies, accrediting bodies, and universities) to begin outlining what standards would enhance the development of socially just supervisors. Policy makers and leaders who have an intimate understanding and experiential knowledge of the process will be better equipped to make informed recommendations to stakeholders. Policy makers and leaders who are intentional about the clinical relationship being socially just and advancing the counseling discipline are better equipped to institute policies and procedures that aid in demonstrating strong dispositional behaviors associated.

Conclusion

The current paper outlined important factors necessary for evaluating professional dispositions of counseling trainees with disabilities and intersecting identities using a social justice framework. Supervisors and educators must have a comprehensive understanding of social justice concepts related to professional counseling to overcome historic and systemic barriers experienced by trainees with disabilities (i.e., ableism). At the same time, educators and supervisors must recognize the limited specific and operationalized guidance available to supervisors and educators concerning the evaluation of professional dispositions for trainees with disabilities and/or additional marginalized identities. With these gaps in guidance, it is likely that trainees are experiencing inconsistent and inaccurate evaluations that are likely to harm their future success as a counselor.

Deliberately infusing social justice concepts into evaluation of professional dispositions with trainees with disabilities and/or multiple marginalized identities will improve evaluation practices. First, supervisors and educators must practice cultural humility by displaying openness, self-awareness, egoless, supportive interactions, and self-reflection and critique. Second, supervisors and educators must employ culturally competent assessment strategies. Implementing a contextual viewpoint and collaborative assessment strategies within the evaluation of professional dispositions can improve accuracy and fairness within the evaluation process. Finally, intersectionality of identities must be deliberately considered by understanding that these identities are not separate and additive.

References

American Counseling Association. (2014). *ACA code of ethics*. https://www.counseling.org/resources/aca-code-of-ethics.pdf

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Cultural Formulation Interview*. https://www.psychiatry.org/File%20Library/Psychiatrists/Practice/DSM/APA_DSM5_Cultural-Formulation-Interview.pdf

Antonak, R. F., & Livneh, H. (2000). Measurement of attitudes towards persons with disabilities. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, *22*(5), 211–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/096382800296782

Asakura, K., & Maurer, K. (2018). Attending to social justice in clinical social work: Supervision as a pedagogical space. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *46*(4), 289–297. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-018-0667-4

Becker, S., & Palladino, J. (2016). Assessing faculty perspectives about teaching and working with students with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *29*(1), 65–82.

Borders, L. D. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Another step in delineating effective supervision practice. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *68*(2), 151–162. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.2014.68.2.151

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2022). *Disability and health promotion*. https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/disabilityandhealth/

Chinn, J. J., Martin, I. K., & Redmond, N. (2021). Health equity among Black women in the United States. *Journal of Women's Health*, *30*(2), 212–219. https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2020.8868

Coduti, W. A., Hayes, J. A., Locke, B. D., & Youn, S. J. (2016). Mental health and professional help-seeking among college students with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, *61*(3), 288–296. https://doi.org/10.1037/rep0000101

Combahee River Collective. (1995). Combahee River Collective statement. In B. Guy-Sheftall (Ed.), *Words of fire: An anthology of African American feminist thought* (pp. 232–240). New Press. (Original work published 1977)

Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification. (2017). Code of professional ethics for rehabilitation counselors. *Author*. https://crccertification.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/CRC_CodeEthics_Eff2017-FinaLnewdiesign.pdf

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs. (2016). *2016 CACREP standards*. http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/2016-Standards-with-Glossary-5.3.2018.pdf

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity, politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241–1279. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Crockett, S., & Hays, D. G. (2015). The influence of supervisor multicultural competence on the supervisory working alliance, supervisee counseling self-efficacy, and supervisee satisfaction with supervision: A mediation model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *54*(4), 258–273. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12025

Dollarhide, C. T., Hale, S. C., & Stone-Sabali, S. (2021). A new model for social justice supervision. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *99*(1), 104–113. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12358

Fickling, M. J., Tangen, J. L., Graden, M. W., & Grays, D. (2019). Multicultural and social justice competence in clinical supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *58*(4), 309–316. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12159

Foronda, C., Baptiste, D. L., Reinholdt, M. M., & Ousman, K. (2016). Cultural humility: A concept analysis. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, *27*(3), 210–217. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043659615592677

Friedman, C. (2016). *Aversive ableism: Subtle prejudice and discrimination towards disabled people* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago]. http://hdl.handle.net/10027/20940

Gale, M. M., Pieterse, A. L., Lee, D. L., Huynh, K., Powell, S., & Kirkinis, K. (2020). A meta-analysis of the relationship between internalized racial oppression and health-related outcomes. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *48*(4), 498–525. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000020904454

Garner, C., Freeman, B., Stewart, R., & Coll, K. (2020). Assessment of dispositions in program admissions: The Professional Disposition Competence Assessment-Revised Admission (PDCA-RA). *Professional Counselor*, *10*(3), 337–350. https://doi.org/10.15241/cg.10.3.337

Gonzalez, E., Sperandio, K. R., Mullen, P. R., & Tuazon, V. E. (2021). Development and initial testing of the Multidimensional Cultural Humility Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, *54*(1), 56–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/07481756.1745648

Goodman, L. A., Liang, B., Helms, J. E., Latta, R. E., Sparks, E., & Weintraub, S. R. (2004). Training counseling psychologists as social justice agents: Feminist and multicultural principles in action. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *32*(6), 793–836. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000004268802

Harley, D. A., Alston, R. J., & Middleton, R. A. (2007). Infusing social justice into rehabilitation education: Making a case for curricula refinement. *Rehabilitation Education*, *21*(1), 41–52. https://doi.org/10.1891/088970107805059850

Harley, D. A., Jolivette, K., McCormick, K., & Tice, K. (2002). Race, class, and gender: A constellation of positionalities with implications for counseling. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *30*(4), 216–238. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2002.tb00521.x

Inman, A. G. (2006). Supervisor multicultural competence and its relation to supervisory process and outcome. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *32*(1), 73–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2006.tb01589.x

Ivey, A. E., & Collins, N. M. (2003). Social justice: A long-term challenge for counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*(3), 290–298. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000003031003004

Levine, A. (2020). Professional disposition evaluation for postsecondary trainees. In K. B. Wilson, S. L. Lusk, & S. Chao (Eds.), *Clinical supervision: Understanding diversity & interpersonal dynamics: Nuances and outcomes* (pp. 272–288). Aspen Professional Services.

Levine, A., & Breshears, B. (2019). Discrimination at every turn: An intersectional ecological lens for rehabilitation. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, *64*(2), 146–153. https://doi.org/10.1037/rep0000266

Levine, A., Henderson, R., Harley, D. A., & Wilson, K. B. (2021). Professional disposition evaluation for supervisors: A social justice approach. *Journal of Rehabilitation Administration*, *42*(1), 7–20.

Levine, A., Sung, C., & Strain, A. (2019). Gatekeeping in master's level rehabilitation counseling programs: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, *12*(2). https://repository.wcsu.edu/jcps/vol12/iss2/8

Lund, E. M., Wilbur, R. C., & Kuemmel, A. M. (2020). Beyond legal obligation: The role and necessity of the supervisor-advocate in creating a socially just, disability-affirmative training environment. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *14*(2), 92–99. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000277

McCaughan, A. M., & Hill, N. R. (2015). The gatekeeping imperative in counselor education admission protocols: The criticality of personal qualities. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *37*(1), 28–40. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-014-9223-2

Miller, D. (1999). Social justice and environmental goods. In A. Dobson (Ed.), *Fairness and futurity: Essays on environmental sustainability and social justice* (pp. 151–172). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/0198294891.003.0007

Papadakaki, M., Maraki, A., Bitsakos, N., & Chliaoutakis, J. (2022). Perceived knowledge and attitudes of faculty members towards inclusive education for students with disabilities: Evidence from a Greek university. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(4), 2151. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19042151

Quinlan, D., Swain, N., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2012). Character strengths interventions: Building on what we know for improved outcomes. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *13*(6), 1145–1163. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-011-9311-5

Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nassar-McMillan, S., Butler, S. K., & McCullough, J. R. (2015). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies: Guidelines for the counseling profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *44*(1), 28–48. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12035

Rivas, M. (2020). Disability in counselor education: Perspective from the United States. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, *42*(4), 366–381. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-020-09404-y

Rivas, M., & Hill, N. R. (2018). Counselor trainees' experiences counseling disability: A phenomenological study. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *57*(2), 116–131. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12097

Sabella, S. A., Bernacchio, C. P., Boland, E. A., & Schultz, J. C. (2019). The conceptualization and assessment of professional dispositions in rehabilitation counselor education. *Rehabilitation Research, Policy, and Education*, *33*(3), 198–211. https://doi.org/10.1891/2168-6653.33.3.198

Shin, R. Q., Smith, L. C., Goodrich, K. M., & LaRosa, N. D. (2011). Attending to diversity representation among Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) master's programs: A pilot study. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *33*(2), 113–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-011-9116-6

Smart, J. (2016). Disability, society, and the individual. *Pro-Ed*.

Smith, L., Foley, P. F., & Chaney, M. P. (2008). Addressing classism, ableism, and heterosexism in counselor education. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *86*(3), 303–309. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00513.x

Sniatecki, J. L., Perry, H. B., & Snell, L. H. (2015). Faculty Attitudes and Knowledge Regarding College Students with Disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *28*(3), 259–275. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1083837.pdf

Sue, D. W., Sue, D., Neville, H. A., & Smith, L. (2022). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

United States Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics. (2019). *Characteristics and outcomes of undergraduates with disabilities*. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2018/2018432.pdf

Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: Expanding our roles. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*(3), 253–272. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000003031003001

Warner, D. F., & Brown, T. H. (2011). Understanding how race/ethnicity and gender define age-trajectories of disability: An intersectionality approach. *Social Science & Medicine*, *72*(8), 1236–1248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.02.034

World Health Organization. (2011). *Disability*. https://www.who.int/health-topics/disability#tab=tab_1