

Appendix I

Observation of supervision

Name of who is being observed:

Name of who is observing:

Date of the observation of supervision:

Issue / Element	What are you trying to notice?	Evidence and commentary
Appropriateness/ impact of setting	Are there things about the setting that make it difficult? Is it sound proofed? Is it formal / informal – does this fit the conversation/what is the effect of this on the conversation? Are there interruptions or diversions?	
Evidence of preparation supervisor and supervisee	How can you tell what has happened just before/just after and what is done about this? Do they negotiate what they are there for? How do they arrive in the room?	
Agenda setting, decisions on priorities	Whose agenda? How is it negotiated? How do they decide what to concentrate on? Who takes the lead for what? How do they negotiate these roles?	
Quality of relationship issues	How would you describe what you see? What are your hunches? How aware are they/how explicit are they about what is going on?	

<p>Use of authority</p>	<p>How is the working alliance negotiated? Who is taking responsibility and how is it being expressed? Attention to issues such as procedure, policy, timescales?</p>	
<p>Balance of functions (explicit or not?) Management / Support / Development/ Negotiation Balance of task, process, climate</p>	<p>Since we can't always fit it in to one session, it can make sense to be explicit – e.g. 'it's a bit of a case review day but let's not lose sight of that learning issue'. We often manage this by switching between task (what shall we do?) and process (how is this working for you?) and climate (how are we doing here? Am I being too directive? How is it leaving you feeling?).</p>	
<p>Balance of stakeholder perspective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Users • Other Agencies • Organisation • Supervisee 	<p>Are they introduced explicitly? Is sufficient attention paid to them? Who gets, who doesn't? How does this emerge?</p>	
<p>Case discussion content (use of Kolb cycle)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience • Feelings • Analysis • Action 	<p>Is the right story told? Who does all the talking and to what end/purpose? Is there discipline in the story telling? Evidence of 'bad habits' – e.g. verificationism; pursuing one hypothesis; making unchecked assumptions. Explicitness about how risk is being assessed? Is the 'harm' named? Notice moments of dissonance for you or them. Assess quality of information management, dynamic exploration and analysis – does the action make sense in the light of the discussion? Is the decision defensible; is there evidence of being grounded in theory/research? what would your comments be re EBP?</p>	

Continuity (last session, next session)	Linkage between sessions and accountability for achievement? Feedback? What has happened on an ad hoc basis in between?	
Clarity of decision making and planning	Are they both clear about the status of decisions at the end and how do you know?	
Emotional intelligence	Self, other, motivation, conversation management?	
Containment and boundaries	Emotions? Allowed or not? Expressed or not? Acknowledged, contained or ignored?	
Performance Management	Is there clear feedback (positive or critical) about performance? Is it well delivered? Is there mention of standards/benchmarks or expectations? If there is a more challenging conversation/issue how is this handled? How does this 'land' with the supervisee? Attention to self-esteem?	
Reflections and notes about the process. This is to inform evaluation of intervention – e.g. limitations, unanticipated 'successes', incidental and predicted outcomes		