Reflections on the Pedagogical Foundations in Counselor Education

Eric R. Baltrinic
The University of Alabama

Carrie Wachter Morris
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Reflections on the Pedagogical Foundations in Counselor Education

Reflections on the Pedagogical Foundations in Counselor Education

Eric R. Baltrinic, Carrie Wachter Morris

In this article, we provide a summary and concluding remarks to this special edition on signature pedagogies in counselor education. We summarize contributing authors' perspectives and considerations for bolstering the profession's discussion on teaching and pedagogical foundations. Focusing on how contributing authors assessed and used the concept of signature pedagogies to facilitate the broader discussion on pedagogical foundations, we pose reflections and offer considerations for future instructional research in counselor education.

The impetus for this special issue was in response to Sexton's (1998) call, over 20 years ago, to identify the pedagogical foundations in counselor education. We were struck by Sexton's identification of three domains worth mentioning. The first is foundational knowledge areas, which pertain to *what* graduate students aspiring to be counselors and counselor educators need to know to successfully engage in the profession. These knowledge areas have been addressed to some extent in the profession's literature and evolving accreditation standards (e.g., The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Program [CACREP], 2015), but not recently within the context of a broad pedagogical structure (Korcuska, 2016). Second, Sexton suggested we learn more about *how* knowledge is most efficiently presented to students (and we would add how knowledge is evaluated). Third, and the reason for this special issue, Sexton called for more attention to the theoretical and conceptual models used by counselor educators to guide pedagogy in the profession (i.e., *how* and *why*).

Sexton (1998) also encouraged counselor educators to offer scholarly views on the pedagogical foundations in counselor education by challenging the profession to develop conceptual and research foundations for teaching. To generate ideas and positions on this matter, we incorporated Shulman's (2005a) multifaceted concept of *signature pedagogies* to be used as a broad pedagogical framework for further articulating and expanding on Sexton's proposed foundations (i.e., the *what, how*, and *why* of pedagogical foundations in counselor education). We found it compelling that Sexton suggested examining pedagogical practices common to the profession at least seven years before Shulman's (2005a) seminal publication, *Signature Pedagogies in the Professions*. Believing that Shulman's complex term holds promise, we offered a signature pedagogies framework and its multidimensional meanings to responders to prompt reflectivity, to encourage analysis of teaching practice, to identify pedagogical trends in the profession, and to generate instructional research ideas.

In this issue, we, along with an exemplary group of counselor education researchers, revisited the professional dialogue about pedagogical foundations in counselor education, and did so in the context of a signature pedagogies framework (Shulman, 2005a). We felt that responders could better examine the current state of pedagogical foundations by employing an academically sound and encompassing framework such as signature pedagogies. By

Eric R. Baltrinic, The University of Alabama; Carrie Wachter Morris, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Eric Baltrinic, erbaltrinic@ua.edu

having authors examine what we do as a profession to prepare our students, all using the same framework, we hoped to shed light on our foundational approaches to teaching.

Accordingly, we asked readers and contributing authors to consider the broad and specific features and the surface, implicit, and deep structures of a signature pedagogy. Each author was asked to respond related to a topic of their expertise and do so at a level of practice that is most meaningful (i.e., at the profession, the program, or the course level). We also provided examples of how other helping professions have identified and used signature pedagogies, whether it be determining one salient approach for a profession (i.e., field experience in social work), or examining one's own teaching at the course level to determine signature approaches to clinical mental health counselor preparation (i.e., Brackette, 2014); all of which, in our view, are perspectives welcome at the table of a professional discussion of pedagogy in counselor education.

Most importantly, we were interested in how authors interpreted and applied the signature pedagogies framework toward identifying a solid conceptual base for collaborative dialogues about common teaching approaches in counselor education. We were not disappointed. We urge readers to read and reread these important contributions and to consider the plurality of possibilities offered therein for moving our profession's pedagogical foundations forward.

Notable Themes and Commentary

As mentioned, contributing authors in this special edition were asked whether a signature pedagogy exists in the counseling field for topic areas of their respective expertise. Further, authors were asked to explain the signature pedagogy using the definitions distilled from Shulman (2005a, 2005b) by Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020). If authors could not identify a signature pedagogy, they were asked to posit whether one could or should exist. In either case (i.e., the existence of a signature pedagogy or not), authors were asked to comment on the signature pedagogies framework itself and link it to the state of pedagogical foundations in counselor education. What follows in this section is our view of the notable and robust themes from the authors'

contributions and our overall impressions of these contributions for the pedagogical foundations in counselor education.

Clinical Supervision

We would be hard-pressed to find someone more responsible for the advancement of supervision in counseling (and arguably other helping professions as well) than L. DiAnne Borders. In this issue, Borders compellingly argues that supervision *is* the signature pedagogy in counseling, and in fact, counseling is a leader in its signature pedagogy of clinical supervision. Despite the existing literature on supervision, Borders (2020) suggests that more work is needed to understand the deep structures of supervision, which could serve to illustrate the underlying structures of counseling's signature pedagogy. Additionally, Borders also notes the importance of a supervision pedagogy guided by professionals' ability to think like a supervisor, the implementation of which involves "practice with actual supervisees, with the guidance of intentional and scaffolded supervision of supervision" (2020, p. 14).

We agree that the profession should acknowledge, celebrate, and elevate its signature pedagogy of clinical supervision. We also agree that because signature pedagogies are always evolving, along with the challenges and needs of the profession, it is a good idea to learn from the developments of other professions. One could argue that is what we are doing here by applying the signature pedagogies framework — born by examining the teaching practices of many disciplines — to the development of pedagogical foundations in counseling. We agree that clinical supervision is a *singular* signature pedagogy in our profession. And, we acknowledge there is room for other recognizable and distinct pedagogies in other topic areas. In other words, along with agreement on the presence of this signature pedagogy, we also believe it is essential for scholars to explore the potential for signature pedagogies in other topic areas within the counseling profession (e.g., multicultural counseling, social justice, research, leadership, etc.). We commend Borders for her thoughtful article and also remind readers of Shulman's (2005a) perspective that it is within the classroom that signature pedagogies are

born; and, although we can claim a signature pedagogy of supervision, there is more work to be done to illuminate both the signature features of supervision and those in other topic areas. Finally, because, counselor training programs require students to engage in a developmentally sequenced curriculum (Wood et al., 2016), counseling students do not necessarily begin their learning with clinical supervision as the chief pedagogical vehicle. Two questions remain. First, are there other signature approaches used to teach master's students prior to their engagement in field experiences? Second, are there considerations or adaptations to the signature pedagogy of supervision for preparing doctoral students?

Doctoral Teaching Preparation

When considering the existence of signature pedagogies for doctoral teaching preparation, Barrio Minton (2020) offers a thoughtful and informative review of the existing literature in counselor education. The author believes it safe to conclude that the profession is moving to the use of formal approaches to doctoral teaching preparation, which is not only encouraging but is in fact the right thing to do given the importance and prominence of counselor educators' teaching roles (Davis et al., 2006). Responding to Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020), Barrio Minton identifies two doctoral teaching preparation practices from the emergent counselor education literature: supervision (of teaching) and mentoring. And, although Barrio Minton highlights curricular and practical themes that support the presence and use of doctoral teaching practices, she also questions whether there is sufficient research evidence to label these two practices as signature pedagogies for doctoral teaching preparation in the profession.

For Barrio Minton, the presence and mainstream use of formal doctoral teaching preparation practices suggest broad (i.e., existing or pervasive across most, if not all, counselor education doctoral programs) features of a signature pedagogy. Specific approaches to doctoral teaching preparation include supervision and mentoring, both of which are approaches supported by the existing literature. We agree with these observations and agree with the author that doctoral teaching preparation research lacks information on classroom-based approaches

for preparing doctoral students to teach. In other words, despite some support for using supervision or mentoring approaches, which can be formal or informal and related to students' field experiences, we know little to nothing about classroom-based approaches (e.g., teaching courses) to teaching preparation. This is partially true when we consider whether doctoral programs are requiring their students to take a formal course before engaging in supervised teaching experiences, and assuming that all programs are supervising their doctoral students teaching experiences to some degree.

Barrio Minton (2020), similar to Borders (2020), suggests looking to practices in other disciplines and to use gleaned lessons to inform, and potentially improve, our own approaches. At the course level and program levels, Barrio Minton encourages the exploration of optimal methods used by instructors across disciplines to help students develop knowledge and skills related to teaching, particularly, those knowledge and skills areas related to didactic or classroom-based approaches, and connecting these didactic approaches (e.g., self-directed adult learning approaches, specific content knowledge, and course design features) to practical experiences such as teaching field experiences. We believe these explorations will help us to fill a gap in the literature about how teaching courses are developed, what content areas are essential for student development, what skills are needed for instructor delivery, important student learning outcomes, and the degree to which these approaches are present across counseling programs.

Ideally, every counselor education doctoral program offers at least one teaching instruction course prior to supervised teaching field experiences. We still wonder, what are the common curricular, learning, and instructional elements (i.e., the broad features) of teaching-related content courses? Additionally, are there signature approaches (i.e., deep structures) to delivering teaching courses, and if so, what are they?

Leadership and Supervision

Luke and Peters (2020), similar to Borders (2020), acknowledge the signature nature of supervision, but suggest a specific supervision model and its application to developing leadership skills in the

counseling profession. Specifically, noting the robust foundations of clinical supervision, the authors offer the Leadership Supervision Model (LSM) as a prospective signature pedagogy in counseling, which is proposed as a means for developing counseling students' leadership skills. Grounded in counseling scholarship, the authors believe the LSM has potential to be used pervasively across counseling programs. The deep structure of the LSM is similar to other supervision models (e.g., The Discrimination Model; Bernard, 1979), offering content knowledge and parameters for supervisor and supervisee roles and functions. Finally, the LSM is described as being flexible, with its implementation adapting to individual, triadic, or group delivery modes.

When considering the application of the LSM at the course level, the authors suggest leadership and experiential activities, service learning, and immersion opportunities as specific surface structures of a signature pedagogy. The authors further suggest programs require students to complete leadership activities within their total required hours during field experience courses such as practica or internship. Additionally, supervisors employing the LSM could modify their supervision contracts to include leadership, require recording of students engaged in leadership activities, teach leadership-specific documentation, facilitate leadership-centric reflection activities, and increase their own scope of practice to include leadership supervision. Looking to other disciplines, Luke and Peters (2020) suggest adapting apprenticeship models to guide those supervision and cocurricular mentoring efforts needed to assist students with counseling leadership skill development. Overall, we agree with these authors' innovations and with their consideration of using the LSM as a signature approach to leadership development. Looking forward, a couple of questions remain. In addition to field experiences, can leadership skills be developed through students' experiences in didactic courses? If so, are there signature approaches to doing so? We also wonder how the LSM may be applied to assessing and responding to the differing developmental needs of master's and doctoral counseling students? We believe these questions could serve as an inroad into future pedagogical foundations research.

Multicultural Counseling and Social Justice

We agree with the authors that counseling students need to become culturally competent counseling and social justice advocates. Accordingly, students' competency development must acknowledge the centrality of both clients' and practitioners' cultural identities and their mutual impact on the counseling process. It stands to reason, then, that counseling educators' approaches to teaching about multicultural and social justice competencies (MCSJC) should be of prime importance to the profession. In their thoughtful contribution to this issue, Chang and Rabess (2020) identify and examine existing evidence to ascertain whether there is a signature approach to MCSJC instruction, emphasizing the importance of not limiting MCSJC instruction to a single multicultural counseling course.

Overall, Chang and Rabess (2020), similar to Barrio Minton (2020), question whether there is sufficient evidence to support the existence of a singular signature pedagogy for instruction. Specifically, the authors suggest a lack of research evidence "to declare which styles of teaching and instruction are common," and importantly, which styles are "efficacious to the counseling profession in this content area" (p. 24). At the same time, the authors advocate for a multicultural counseling course as a starting point from which MCSJC are infused in every course across the curriculum. The authors conclude that the pervasive presence of multicultural content should be guided by a larger general framework. In other words, instructors should be having conversations with students about MCSJC at all points of program progression within each counseling course to help students understand the pervasive need to include clients' cultural considerations. When considering applying a larger MCSJC pedagogical framework across all courses, we encourage readers to consider (beyond the single MCSJ course) students' development, not in general terms, but within their *respective* and *unique* cultural contexts. For example, assignments may vary to increase knowledge competencies and then awareness competencies prior to challenging students to develop counseling and advocacy skills. Overall, we agree with the authors that to guide students' navigation of MCSJC instruction across the curriculum, counselor educators should ask: what do students need to know and

be able to do (consistently and ethically) as a result of completing this coursework?

In discussing MCSJC instruction at the course level (i.e., content and field experience), Chang and Rabess (2020) examine the surface, deep, and implicit structures posed by Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020) and then pose a series of compelling research questions. At the surface level, multicultural content instructors can include journal writing, self-examination papers, reactions to culturally evocative films or books, and attending cultural events, to name a few. Chang and Rabess also suggest instructors regularly consider cultural factors when reviewing case studies and related work samples. Deep structures (i.e., how) are guided by the self-reflective nature and consequential self-awareness of instructors. We urge readers to consider this suggestion and consider higher education adaptations of Gloria Ladson-Billings' (1995a, 1995b) *Culturally Relevant Pedagogy*, from which instructors can (a) continuously examine their own cultural competence, (b) consistently approach the *how* of instruction, (c) authentically facilitate difficult conversations, and (d) competently guide student learning through the lens of their respective cultural contexts. Next, Chang and Rabess (2020) recommend MCSJC instruction be guided by implicit structures directly rooted in the American Counseling Association *Code of Ethics* (2014), which requires counselor educators to embrace a multicultural approach in support of the diverse needs, contexts, and social justice concerns of individuals.

Finally, the authors pose several very compelling research questions for those interested in future research and to offer readers prompts for considering whether there is a signature approach to MCSJC instruction. We were intrigued by three questions in particular. First, how do counselor educators across programs prepare professional counselors to think and act like advocates? Second, what pedagogy is key or unique to training counselors to be culturally competent? And third, what teaching methods do counselor educators use to teach counselors-in-training to be culturally competent? To this third question, we encourage readers to further explore culturally relevant pedagogy and its application to counselor education research and instruction.

Quantitative Research

The question of whether a signature pedagogy exists for doctoral-level quantitative research instruction is aptly addressed in this special issue by Balkin (2020). The author candidly suggests that there is no signature pedagogy in this area, but one is needed. He further suggests that in order for a signature approach to materialize, we must first consider contextual factors and systemic barriers and maintain a focus on training students to evaluate and expand research opportunities in our profession. Contextually, a signature pedagogy should meet the needs of emerging counseling researchers who develop skills for designing and conducting research that is profession-centered, sustainable, and fundable. Additionally, instructors should be aware and account for the varied interest and anxiety levels of students taking research courses. Systemically, we're encouraged to consider, in most cases, quantitative (and other) research courses are taught by faculty from noncounseling programs, the illumination of which would make a quality descriptive research study in our opinion. This begs the question: If we are unable to provide content instruction for research methods, then how do we steer students toward achieving the goal of thinking and performing like counseling-oriented researchers?

Balkin suggests that those identifying and subsequently delivering a signature pedagogy should account for contextual and systemic issues. Minimally, the author believes that the deep structures of a potential signature pedagogy should contain strategies for promoting students' learning and self-efficacy while attending to students' research dispositions. Overall, Balkin emphasizes that instructors of quantitative research should convey a sense of the role and importance (and belief; i.e., implicit structure) of counseling research to clients, communities, and stakeholders. Finally, for purposes of future research, Balkin (2020) noted we know more about the "what" of quantitative research instruction than the "how," which suggests the need to more closely examine the deep structures in this area, and we agree! Balkin suggests that quantitative research instruction be community-focused and client-centered, which we label as two identifiable deep structures of quantitative instruction.

On review of Balkin's contribution, we immediately acknowledged that his article fits best when

considering the quantitative research training of doctoral students. (See Jorgensen & Umstead [2020] in this issue for a discussion of research training for master's students.) Although, we do feel compelled to mention that in our experience, not many counselor education doctoral programs are teaching their own doctoral research courses, a point clearly articulated in Balkin's article. Assuming a counselor education course taught its own quantitative courses, we wondered if Community Based Learning (CBL) wouldn't be worth considering for guiding the *how* of quantitative instruction, which may dovetail nicely for doctoral students engaged in both methods courses and those engaged in research-focused field experiences. CBL is a pedagogical approach for integrating student learning with community engagement that involves community members at all stages of research from inception to dissemination of results (Strand, 2000). A CBL approach necessitates reciprocal and jointly beneficial partnerships among instructors, students, and community stakeholders and provides guidance for surface structures as well. From a pedagogical perspective, CBL could assist instructors with designing and implementing action-based, off-campus experiences, a process helpful for preparing well-rounded and effective practitioners (Zlotkowski & Duffy, 2010).

When considering a signature pedagogy for quantitative research, we acknowledge that counseling pedagogy pervasively includes "learn by doing" instruction methods throughout the curriculum. Accordingly, how could counselor educators' quantitative research content courses expand their classroom instruction to include applied experiences (i.e., in the research domain), particularly in ways that merge knowledge with applied experiences in the community (e.g., conducting small sample research in a counseling clinic, or agency setting)? Perhaps we need to more carefully consider content instruction in the context of how it differs from, relates to, and integrates with field work experiences. Finally, if we succeed in developing a realistic signature pedagogy for quantitative instruction, should it consider future doctoral students who may themselves become teachers of quantitative research? In effect, do signature approaches need to include features that help with teaching students to conduct

real-world and professionally relevant research *and* to learn the tenets of a research pedagogy.

Master's Research Training

Master's level research training is necessary not only for the development of strong evidence-based practice across settings, but also to lay a foundation for our future doctoral students and counselor educators. While Jorgenson and Umstead note that there is not yet a signature pedagogy in master's research, they echo Balkin's (2020) statement that a signature pedagogy is needed. They provide a summary of the challenges of connecting research to practice for master's students preparing to enter the field and note that counseling is largely without a unified approach to training our master's students in research. With a lack of a consistent link between research and practice (see Jorgenson & Duncan, 2015; Umstead, 2019), master's level counselors in training may not see research as pertinent to their professional identities, or they may identify it as an aspect of the counseling profession that is saved for doctoral students.

Throughout her response, Jorgenson highlights areas where counselor education can better build a foundation to establish a signature pedagogy around research preparation for master's students. We concur with her recommendations at the professional, program, and course level. When reflecting on her professional-level recommendations, she calls for an infusion of a counselor-researcher or practitioner-researcher identity that comes from building research as a support for clinical practice throughout graduate-level training. That idea is both simple and yet challenging in practice, as it really means that we need to engage with developing the researcher identity concurrently with the practitioner identity in our training programs (see Jorgenson & Duncan, 2015). This point parallels the one made by Balkin (2020) and would be better accomplished with attention to program-level shifts, like having counselor educators, rather than faculty from other professions (e.g., statistics, educational research, educational psychology), teach research courses. Where that isn't possible, these program-level shifts can still be accomplished by attending to linking research and practice in other courses (e.g., building data collection and/or data analysis into clinical practica or internships) and in faculty intentionally

linking research to practice, including by involving students in research-focused discussions, and intentionally using terms like *counselor-researcher* or *practitioner-researcher* throughout training programs. Doing these things while also building Jorgenson and Umstead's course-level recommendations would go a long way toward putting additional attention on building the research foundation of our master's-level training.

Research of Teaching

The advancement of our profession's pedagogical foundations requires reflective and rigorous approaches to researching teaching practice. In fact, signature pedagogies, the focalizing concept for this special issue, was generated from extensive fieldwork and observation of teaching practices across professions and intuitions, and over time (Shulman, 2005a). And, even though important (and potentially pervasive) teaching approaches are born in practice, there can be no advancement of pedagogical foundation in counselor education without instructional research. To that end, Prosek (2020) provides guidance for using the surface, deep, and implicit structures of signature pedagogies to formulate research questions. Surface structure research questions can be used to investigate teaching techniques and the impact of in-class activities or assignments. Prosek advises researchers to be proactive and mindful of the intent of surface-structure-guided investigations, implying that researchers should avoid post hoc approaches. Deep structure investigations are noted as more challenging, but important for helping us consider the role of adult learning, including how students learn (Borders, 2020), and for illuminating instructors' philosophical underpinnings. Finally, implicit-structure-guided investigations can help us uncover the dispositional awareness, reflectivity, and actions of instructors, and identify those dispositions across the profession. In this regard, we wonder if there is a set of dispositions related to teacher identity, teacher empathy, teacher values, and reflectivity that pervades instruction in our profession.

In addition to formulating signature pedagogy-informed research questions, Prosek (2020) offers valuable considerations to teaching researchers for research design, sampling, and analysis, and consid-

erations for improving the quality of teaching manuscripts in counselor education. We will highlight three points from her article. First, researchers of teaching need to be mindful of power differentials when conducting research on their own classrooms. The author suggests, and we agree, that using research teams, protecting the anonymity of students, spearing the instructor from data collection, and staggering analysis until after grades are assigned are important ways to account for power differentials in teaching research. Second, when developing manuscripts, it is important to carefully and intentionally identify a researcher's deep and implicit structures within the method section. Finally, when designing cross-institutional research, researchers need to consider the fidelity issues that transcend the investigation of surface-level structures. Although easier said than done, we believe that fidelity measures should connect instructors' teaching methods, students' active learning processes, and instructors' teaching interventions to the student learning outcomes. Overall, we encourage readers to consider applying the content of Prosek's (2020) article, including the three aforementioned points, to (a) increase the quality of pedagogical evaluation in the counseling field, and (b) formulate and rigorously pursue instructional research questions with integrity and intent for the future good of counselor educations' pedagogical foundations.

Reflections and Future Directions

We, along with several contributing authors in this special edition, employ the multidimensional concept of signature pedagogies at the professional, program, and course levels to revisit and expand the professional dialogue of pedagogical foundations. The intent of this special edition is to generate scholarly perspectives to move us in the direction originally proposed by Sexton (1998). We believe the content of this special issue provides a spark of reengagement and a focal point for discussions of the foundational elements of pedagogy in counselor education.

Reflecting on the process of contributing to and reviewing the articles in this special issue, we are duly inspired by the contributing authors' perspectives. In this final section, we highlight future considerations for advancing the pedagogical foundations conversation and related research.

1. Supervision appears to be signature, but we need more research on supervision pedagogy across the curriculum.

- Supervision is a signature pedagogy used in counselor education with *established* clinical applications, *potential* leadership training applications, and *emerging* doctoral teaching preparation applications. Although supervision is used at the doctoral level and for field experience at the master's level, it is worth exploring models for using supervision as a vehicle to support master's students' skill development in content-based courses. In other words, when considering supervision as a signature pedagogy, are there ways to infuse supervision as a pedagogical strategy throughout the curriculum at both the doctoral and master's levels, including content-based courses?
- The deep structures of supervision pedagogy need additional attention in future research, including research design and conceptualizations grounded in students' underlying learning processes.

2. There is a consistent theme throughout that highlights a focus on learning through active application and practice.

- With few exceptions, authors consistently underscore what we would note as a disciplinary value on practical application and experience. Whether speaking about supervision, research training, leadership, or multicultural counseling and social justice, authors often mention the impact of hands-on training and skill development.
- Developmentally appropriate supervision is one clear way that our identified signature pedagogy builds upon that hands-on value. We posit that as we, as a field, explore more of the deep structures of our pedagogy, part of what we may want to begin could lie within the interweaving of our developmental focus and skills-based application.

3. Pedagogy is inextricably linked to curriculum sequencing and accreditation standards.

- It is clear to us that we cannot identify signature pedagogies in counselor education without considering program curriculum sequences and the influence of accreditation standards on the sequencing and implementation of its content and field experiences. Anecdotally, we know that students, for a number of reasons, deviate from a developmental course sequence. How do we account for those deviations in our pedagogy? Should they be accounted for?
- We need to know more about how, and to what extent, counseling programs promote particular teaching styles based on the sequence of the curriculum and the developmental needs of students (see Granello & Hazler, 1998).

4. Approaches to multicultural instruction are evident but need to be more clearly linked to underlying or pervasive pedagogies.

- We agree that, beyond a single multicultural counseling course, it is important to infuse MCSJCs across the curriculum, but also believe there are pervasive pedagogies that can help instructors do so regardless of the specific taught course. Perhaps we should revisit Fong's (1998) recommendations that we maintain an active and pervasive classroom climate of openness and tolerance and attend to the social interactions and processes during instruction as a means to engage students' development of competencies. To do so, instructors could also consider adaptations of culturally relevant pedagogy as a common approach to all courses containing infused MCSJ elements.
- We recommend readers revisit Fong's (1998) critique and suggestions within Sexton's special issue. Specifically, the author noted that developmental and skills-based approaches are not sufficient for assisting instructors with infusing MCSJC content across the curriculum. Instructors must acknowledge and account for the needs of diverse learners, rather than making assumptions about developmental needs of counseling students. This is an area where the potential for supervision to be used in combination with knowledge, awareness, and skill development in coursework could be particularly effective.

5. The term *pedagogy* may be necessary but not sufficient for counselor education.

- We need to know more about the deep structures of pedagogy in counselor education, as current evidence may not be sufficient to suggest pervasive approaches across programs in our profession. Perhaps it is time to look at the term *pedagogy* itself, which has been conceptualized in the general literature as child-focused rather than adult-focused (Knowles, 1980), and in some cases the term is conceptualized as being teacher-centered versus learner-centered (Hase & Kenyon, 2000).

- While the term *pedagogy* is still ubiquitously used in our journals and in our professional discussions (including this one), it is plausible that the foundations for teaching in counselor education may lie with a wider definition of adult learning. Specifically, we can look within the continuum of learning approaches that more logically align with a developmentally sequenced curriculum (i.e., pedagogy, andragogy, and heutagogy).

6. Research of teaching is advancing but lacks linkages to underlying pedagogies and to student and client outcomes.

- We need to consider both single and cross-institutional classroom research designs and incorporate appropriate research question-driven methods, and we need to teach future counselor educators to do the same.

- There is a lack of studies that look beyond singular approaches, whether those be assessments of using a specific teaching technique or examining syllabi for a particular course of knowledge base (Barrio Minton et al., 2014, 2018). Mapping methods of instructional delivery within and across programs would be particularly relevant and useful, including programs with varying capacities and foci. Researchers could compare programs' learning outcomes and identify related teaching methods used by faculty throughout the curriculum, including how teaching and learning impacts client outcomes (in a field experience or after) would also be helpful.

Conclusion

In this article and within the articles contained in this special issue, we explore the pedagogical foundations of counselor education through the signature pedagogies framework. We hope this scholarly conversation was engaging. Whether you are a sole instructor looking to hone a consistent approach to instruction, or a teaching researcher looking to identify pervasive trends across programs, there is a place at the table of this conversation for you. As before, we are excited to see what you, our capable colleagues, do next.

References

American Counseling Association. (2014). *ACA code of ethics*. Author.

Balkin, R. S. (2020). The challenge of counseling research in developing a signature pedagogy for quantitative methods. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling, 2*(2), 47-52.

Baltrinic, E. R., & Wachter Morris, C. (2020). Signature pedagogies: A framework for pedagogical foundations in counselor education. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling, 2*(2), 1–11.

Barrio Minton, C. A. (2020). Signature pedagogies: Doctoral-level teaching preparation. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling, 2*(2), 39-46.

Barrio Minton, C. A., Wachter Morris, C. A., & Bruner, S. L. (2018). Pedagogy in counselor education: 2011–2015 update. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 57*, 227–236. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12112

Barrio Minton, C. A., Wachter Morris, C. A., & Yaites, L. D. (2014). Pedagogy in counselor education: A 10-year content analysis of journals. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 53*, 162–177. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00055.x

Bernard, J. M. (1979). Supervisor training: The discrimination model. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 19*(1), 60–68. http://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1979.tb00906.x

Borders, L. D. (2020). Signature pedagogy and beyond: Reflections on Baltrinic and Wachter Morris (2020). *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling, 2*(2), 12-20.

Brackette, C. M. (2014). The scholarship of teaching and learning in clinical mental health counseling. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 139*, 37–48. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20103

Chang, C. Y., & Rabess, A. (2020). Response to signature pedagogies: A framework for pedagogical foundations in counselor education: Through a multicultural and social justice competencies lens. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling, 2*(2), 21-27.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2015). *CACREP 2016 standards*. http://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards/

Davis, T. E., Levitt, D. H., McGlothlin, J. M., & Hill, N. R. (2006). Perceived expectations related to promotion and tenure: A national survey of CACREP program liaisons. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *46*, 146–156. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00019.x

Fong, M. L. (1998). Considerations of a counseling pedagogy. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 38*, 106–112.

Granello, D. H., & Hazler, R. J. (1998). A developmental rationale for curriculum order and teaching styles in counselor education programs. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 38*, 89–105.

Hase, Stewart & Kenyon, C. (2000). From andragogy to heutagogy. *Ultibase Articles, 5*, 1–10.

Jorgensen, M. F., & Duncan, K. (2015). A phenomenological investigation of master's-level counselor research identity development stages. *The Professional Counselor, 5*(3), 327–340. http://dx.doi.org/10.15241/mfj.5.3.327

Jorgensen, M., & Umstead, L. K. (2020). Developing a signature pedagogy in master's research training. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling, 2*(2), 53-61.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education*. Association Press/Follett.

Korcuska, J. S. (2016). In the spirit of what might be lost: Troubling the boundaries of good fit. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 55*(3), 154–158. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12042

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice, 34*(3), 159–165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491.

Luke, M., & Peters, H. C. (2020). Supervision as the signature pedagogy for counseling leadership. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling, 2*(2), 28-38.

Prosek, E. A. (2020). Research of teaching in counselor education: A collective effort of improved rigor. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*, *2*(2), 62-71.

Sexton, T. L. (1998). Reconstructing counselor education: Issues of our pedagogical foundation. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 38*, 66–69. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1998.tb00559.x

Shulman, L. S. (2005a, Summer). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus, 134*(3), 52–59.

Shulman, L. S. (2005b, February). *The signature pedagogies of the professions of law, medicine, engineering, and the clergy: Potential lessons for the education of teachers*. Paper presented at the Math Science Partnerships Workshop of the National Research Council's Center for Education, Irvine. CA. https://taylorprograms.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Shulman_Signature_Pedagogies.pdf

Strand, K. J. (2000). Community-based research as pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Fall*, 85–96.

Umstead, L. K. (2019). Exploring counselors' use of research in practice: A CQR study. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Carolina–Greensboro. Greensboro, NC.

Wood, S. M., Lingertat-Putnam, C., & Barrio Minton, C. A. (2016). Program structure and curriculum sequencing. In *ACES teaching initiative taskforce best practices in teaching in counselor education report*. https://acesonline.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/ACES-Teaching-Initiative-Taskforce-Final-Report-2016.pdf

Zlotkowski, E., & Duffy, D. (2010). Two decades of community-based learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 123*, 33–43. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.407