

Professional Supervision Pilot Report

Tyson Walters

Ara Poutama Aotearoa | Department of Corrections

11 March 2026

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	Page 3
Why was the pilot created? Stakeholder Perspectives.....	Page 5
Pilot Design and Methodology.....	Page 7
What the Pilot was Intended to Support	Page 9
Exposure to Indirect Trauma	
Decision Making Integrity	
Professional Sustainability	
Observations and Early Insights.....	Page 11
Emotional and Cognitive Stress	
Safe and Defensible Practice	
Relational Complexity	
Wellbeing and Sustainability	
Engagement and Uptake	
Considerations Going Forward.....	Page 12
Clarity of Purpose	
Protected Time and Workload Realities	
Practitioner Readiness	
Supervisory Capability and Qualifications	
Closing Reflections.....	Page 14
References.....	Page 16
Appendix.....	Page 17
A: Leadership TOR	
B: Practitioner TOR	
C: Contracting Template	

Executive Summary

This report outlines the development and delivery of a professional supervision pilot for probation officers in the Auckland area, initiated in response to senior leadership concerns regarding the demands placed on probation officers managing high-risk and complex caseloads.

The pilot was co-designed by practice leader Tyson Walters and practice manager Clara McNeil and was informed by Tyson's completion of a master of professional supervision from the University of Auckland. Established supervision theory was structured into the pilot design to align with best practice.

Community corrections leadership identified concerns related to practitioner wellbeing, sustained exposure to high stakes decision making, and the potential impact of workload pressures on burnout, isolation, and decision quality. The pilot was designed as a supportive and developmental initiative to provide structured reflective space for probation officers working with high-risk caseloads.

The pilot was delivered as formal professional supervision supported by structured contracting, confidentiality parameters, as well as safe and ethically focused practice safeguards. Participation for probation officers was voluntary. Of ten probation officers who were offered spots for the pilot, only three proceeded to formal engagement.

Key themes relevant to practitioners participation in the pilot include:

- Probation officers are experiencing significant emotional and cognitive stress associated with managing high-risk cases.
- Probation officers reported suffering ongoing rumination and difficulty disengaging from work outside office hours.
- Probation officers were highly focused on safe and defensible decision making, in response to the nature of the risk they were carrying.
- Probation officers are facing complex relational dynamics from not only their caseloads, but from their co-workers as well.

The pilot highlighted differences amongst probation officers in motivation to engage in professional supervision, and it is suspected that workload pressures in combination with lack of choice for selecting a supervisor impacted on low uptake and participation. In future, clear messaging regarding the purpose and intent behind professional supervision, protected time allocation for participation, and supervisor capability are important considerations should there be further trials or pilots run.

When considered alongside research on occupational stress and indirect trauma exposure within correctional environments, professional supervision can be understood as a protective mechanism for roles with high exposure to stress and indirect trauma. Consideration may therefore be given to the role that professional supervision could play within Community Corrections as part of Ara Poutama's broader duty of care and workforce development approach for probation officers.

Why was the pilot created? Stakeholder perspectives

The professional supervision pilot was created in response to concerns raised by senior operational leadership within community corrections regarding demands experienced by probation officers managing individuals assessed as high risk of harm, complex and high needs, and at high risk of reoffending.

Senior Operational Leadership Perspectives

Leadership identified the cumulative impact of probation work and the pressure associated with sustained exposure to high-stakes decision-making. The deputy general manager described a desire to create:

...a space wherein they could off load their thoughts and feelings around the high risk and complex needs cases they are working on and to seek input into strategies around how to manage themselves when working with such cases as a means to support their wellbeing.

Similarly, the general manager communities, partnerships & pathways identified an interest in reducing perceived negative outcomes for probation officers such as:

...wobbles, burn out, poor decision making and isolation for staff.

These concerns reflect not only wellbeing considerations, but also decision integrity and workforce sustainability for probation officers. In consideration of these perspectives, the pilot aimed to support probation officer development and offer structured support within a demanding practice environment.

Practice Manager Perspective

Alongside wider departmental interest in professional supervision, discussions between practice managers and senior leaders identified a need for a differentiated level of professional support beyond existing practice leadership input. While practice leaders routinely provide guidance and consultation that extends beyond technical case direction,

there remains a distinction between practice leadership and formal professional supervision in terms of academic training, intent, and scope.

The pilot was also viewed as an opportunity to contribute insight into wider organisational conversations occurring at a national level regarding the potential introduction of professional supervision across Ara Poutama Aotearoa, particularly in the absence of a defined delivery model.

Several considerations were identified at the outset of the trial. These included ensuring that the professional supervisor (Tyson) had access to appropriate supervision, whilst recognising that such provision is not readily available within Ara Poutama and cannot be provided by a direct line manager. Consideration was also given to whether the absence of supervisor choice during the pilot period, and the significant workload pressures faced by practitioners managing complex caseloads might influence uptake.

Notwithstanding these considerations, there was a shared view that the pilot could provide meaningful space for practitioners to process the stress associated with high-risk casework and to experience an additional layer of structured professional support.

Professional Supervisors Perspective

In addition to the leadership and practice management perspectives outlined above, the design of the pilot was also informed by the perspective of the supervisor responsible for developing and delivering the initiative.

Having previously worked in multiple high-risk practice contexts, including probation practice, custodial case management, and intelligence functions, there was a clear awareness of the pressures faced by practitioners operating in complex risk environments. These roles involve sustained exposure to high stakes decision making, complex client dynamics, and detailed information relating to serious offending behaviour.

From this perspective, there was a strong recognition that probation officers operate within a demanding professional environment and require structured support to

sustain reflective practice and sound decision-making. While a range of organisational supports exist, it was considered that the level of structured reflective support available to practitioners did not always fully meet the depth of need associated with these roles.

At the same time, professional supervision is an established practice within many human service professions, and there have been ongoing discussions and exploratory initiatives within Ara Poutama regarding the possible introduction of professional supervision more broadly. The pilot therefore presented an opportunity to contribute constructively to these wider organisational conversations.

As a trained professional supervisor working outside of government practice contexts, there was an opportunity to draw on this expertise to design and offer a supervision model aligned with recognised supervision frameworks. The intent was to support probation officers by providing structured reflective space while also contributing insight that could inform any future development of professional supervision within the organisation.

Pilot Design and Methodology

The pilot was resourced from within the Auckland practice leadership team, with Tyson splitting his time between delivery of the pilot and attending to other portfolios associated with his role as a practice leader. Tyson had recently returned to Ara Poutama following completion of a master of professional supervision from the University of Auckland. This qualification allowed integration of established supervision theory into the development of the pilot.

Participation for probation officers was voluntary by design. Practitioners identified by leadership as working with high-risk and complex cases were invited to engage, with final participation determined by the practitioner. This approach preserved professional autonomy and ensured engagement was grounded in willingness rather than compliance.

All potential participants were provided with written terms of reference (TOR) outlining purpose, scope, confidentiality parameters, and safeguards. This was followed by an in-person meeting to review the TOR document, clarify expectations, and answer questions. Formal contracting occurred only after practitioners elected to proceed.

Sessions were scheduled monthly for one hour, with protected time allocated. Meetings were conducted in person within Department of Corrections infrastructure, with preference for neutral locations away from the probation officers normal workplace to support focused engagement away from operational pressures.

The pilot was grounded in the Reflective Learning Model (Davys & Beddoe, 2010), a recognised framework within professional supervision practice. The model supports structured examination of complex cases, relational dynamics, professional judgement, organisational context, and identification of informed next steps.

Safeguards were woven into the pilot, with session content remaining confidential except where ethical or safety concerns required escalation. This was by design to allow probation officers a safe space to speak freely on topics of their choice to support professional practice.

Arranging appropriate supervision support for Tyson initially proved challenging, as capacity across most areas of Ara Poutama was limited due to operational demands. Support was ultimately provided through the Kaupapa Māori Practice Team within Tumu Herenga, DCE Māori. In particular, Senior Advisor Kaupapa Māori Supervision Leon Te Hau O Te Rangi Allen made himself available to provide supervision support, which was greatly appreciated. Nicola Schwass, in her role as Pou Herenga Kaupapa Māori Supervision, was also integral in supporting the pilot programme.

The professional supervision pilot was envisioned to run for around six months, with a review process built in at the halfway point. Unfortunately, the pilot was wrapped up early due to the early conclusion of the supervisors (Tysons) contract with Ara Poutama.

What the Pilot Was Intended to Support

The pilot was not designed to target any single issue within probation practice. Rather, it involved the provision of structured professional supervision to probation officers working with complex and high-risk caseloads. Professional supervision is widely recognised as supporting practitioners operating in demanding environments by providing reflective space to examine practice, process professional experiences, and strengthen decision making.

Through the provision of supervision, it was anticipated that practitioners may experience benefits commonly associated with professional supervision in high-exposure roles. These include support in managing cumulative exposure to trauma-related material, navigating complex relational dynamics with individuals on caseloads, reflecting on challenging decision making, and contributing to practitioner wellbeing and sustainability in demanding practice environments.

Exposure to Stress and Indirect Trauma

Probation officers managing high-risk individuals are routinely exposed to traumatic narratives, volatile interpersonal dynamics, and the consequences of serious harm experienced by victims of crime. While practitioners may not experience primary trauma directly, sustained exposure to the work associated with complex caseloads can result in regular exposure to stress and indirect trauma.

The literature identifies indirect trauma in three related forms, all of which are relevant to probation practice:

- **Vicarious trauma** refers to the impact that can occur through repeated engagement with clients who have experienced trauma. Through ongoing relational exposure to clients traumatic histories and lived experiences, practitioners may experience shifts in their emotional responses, worldview, or sense of safety and trust (McCann & Pearlman, 1990).

- **Secondary traumatic stress** relates to probation officers reading and interacting with traumatic content, including reviewing reports, case files, victim impact statements, or detailed descriptions of offending behaviour. Exposure to such material may contribute to intrusive thoughts, emotional reactivity, or heightened vigilance (Bride, 2007).

- **Compassion fatigue** reflects emotional and physical strain associated with sustained helping roles, particularly when practitioners are consistently working with distress, risk, and complex human behaviour over extended periods (Figley, 1995).

Research across helping professions indicates that cumulative exposure to indirect trauma is associated with increased stress, disrupted sleep, emotional exhaustion, and reduced professional wellbeing (Newell & MacNeil, 2010). Within high responsibility environments such as probation practice, these impacts may influence clarity of judgement, sustained engagement, and confidence in decision making.

Through the provision of professional supervision, practitioners were anticipated to have access to structured reflective space to examine the impact of cumulative exposure to stress and indirect trauma associated with their work, while maintaining accountability to role expectations within Ara Poutama and wider public safety obligations.

Decision Making Integrity

High risk probation practice requires defensible judgement within organisational policy and risk frameworks. Research indicates that elevated stress may negatively influence adherence to established organisational practice standards and decision-making expectations (Schaefer & Williamson, 2018).

Professional supervision provides practitioners with an opportunity to examine reasoning processes, test assumptions, clarify documentation rationale, and reflect on complex decisions made under pressure. Through participation in the pilot, it was anticipated that supervision would support probation officers to strengthen reflective decision making within demanding practice environments.

Professional Sustainability

Professional supervision also carries a recognised restorative function within many helping professions. Providing practitioners with reflective space to examine the emotional and relational demands of their work can support clarity of role, professional confidence, and ongoing engagement with practice.

Research within correctional environments demonstrates that occupational stress and reduced trust in supervisory or practice support structures are associated with burnout and diminished professional functioning (Lambert et al., 2012). Compromised wellbeing has also been linked to deviations from organisational best practices and reduced decision-making consistency (Schaefer & Williamson, 2018). Professional supervision models have been shown to strengthen sustained use of corrections-focused best practices over time (Labrecque & Smith, 2017; McNeill et al., 2010).

Within this context, the pilot provided an opportunity for probation officers to engage in reflective supervision that may contribute to practitioner wellbeing, professional sustainability, and continued engagement with complex practice.

Observations and Early Insights

Although the pilot operated for a limited period, several consistent themes emerged from the probation officers involved.

Emotional and Cognitive Stress

Participants demonstrated significant emotional strain associated with managing high-risk cases. Visible distress emerged in several sessions. The process and structure associated with the pilot, and the subsequent safe supervision space, allowed stress that had accumulated over time to surface in a professionally grounded forum.

Safe and Defensible Practice

Practitioners frequently focused on ensuring safe and defensible practice. Sessions involved reviewing risk formulations, testing decision pathways, and strengthening confidence in professional judgement.

Relational Complexity

Boundary management, manipulation, peer perceptions, and workplace relational strain were recurring topics. Practitioners reflected on how interpersonal dynamics within their workplaces influenced engagement and decision making. The focus on relationships was not only in regard to their allocated caseloads, but within the culture of the office they practiced within as well.

Wellbeing and Sustainability

Several participants self-reported difficulty maintaining work/life balance, disrupted sleep, and rumination about case decisions outside working hours. Some described pressure related to peer perception and navigating complex interpersonal relationships within their teams. These factors were recognised as influencing clarity of thinking and overall professional functioning.

Engagement and Uptake

Of approximately ten practitioners offered participation, three progressed to formal contracting and engagement. Two additional practitioners expressed interest but were unable to proceed due to operational demands. Additionally, probation officers were only presented with one choice of supervisor to work with, which could have been a barrier to engage for some participants. It is of note that inquiries about participating in the pilot were also received from service managers who wanted support.

The variability in engagement with the pilot suggests differing levels of readiness for professional supervision within Community Corrections at Ara Poutama, and highlights the influence of workload pressures and familiarity with reflective practice.

Considerations Going Forward

The professional supervision pilot provided insight into both practitioner need and organisational factors relevant to the implementation of professional supervision within Community Corrections spaces at Ara Poutama. The following considerations are offered for reflection in any future exploration of structured supervision.

Clarity of Purpose

Clear articulation of the purpose of professional supervision is essential. Early conversations with practitioners indicated that understanding what supervision was, and equally what it was not, was important for engagement. Distinguishing professional supervision from line management, performance oversight, and other supports reduces ambiguity and strengthens confidence in participation.

Future implementation would benefit from consistent organisational messaging that positions professional supervision as developmental and preventative, while aligned with public safety and organizational expectations.

Protected Time and Workload Realities

Operational demands and workload pressures significantly influence practitioner engagement. Although the pilot allocated protected time in principle, competing responsibilities likely impacted participation.

Reflective practice requires intentional capacity on the part of the practitioner. Without organizational support with protected time to engage in supervision, engagement is likely to remain limited to practitioners who are already predisposed or able to prioritise reflective space. Sustainable implementation would therefore require recognition that supervision time is not optional, but an investment in practice integrity and workforce sustainability.

Practitioner Readiness

Variability in probation officer uptake could suggest differing levels of readiness for professional supervision. For some practitioners, structured reflective supervision represented a new form of professional engagement. Familiarity with reflective practice may influence comfort levels, particularly in environments traditionally oriented toward operational performance.

Gradual introduction to the benefits associated with professional supervision, leadership endorsement, and ongoing clarification of scope may support increased engagement over time.

Supervisory Capability and Qualification

The pilot was delivered by a practitioner with formal postgraduate training in professional supervision. The theoretical grounding and structured methodology were central to maintaining clarity of boundaries, confidentiality, and reflective depth.

If professional supervision were to be expanded in Ara Poutama for probation Officers, consideration would need to be given to supervisory capability, qualification pathways, and quality assurance mechanisms to ensure consistency and adherence to recognised professional standards.

Closing Reflections

The pilot was initiated in response to leadership concerns regarding the demands placed on probation officers working with high-risk caseloads. Engagement demonstrated both the depth of responsibility carried by practitioners and the cumulative strain associated with sustained exposure to complex cases, as well as public safety expectations.

When considered alongside research on indirect trauma exposure and occupational stress, structured professional supervision can be understood not merely as a

developmental enhancement, but as a protective mechanism within roles with high exposure to stress and indirect trauma.

Within this context, professional supervision may reasonably be viewed as part of Ara Poutama's broader duty of care toward probation officers entrusted with managing risk and preventing harm in the community.

Consideration may therefore be given to the role that professional supervision could play in strengthening probation officer workforce sustainability, decision integrity, and public safety outcomes over time.

References

- Bride, B. E. (2007). Prevalence of secondary traumatic stress among social workers. *Social Work, 52*(1), 63–70.
- Davys, A., & Beddoe, L. (2010). *Best practice in professional supervision*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Figley, C. R. (1995). Compassion fatigue: Toward a new understanding of the costs of caring. In B. H. Stamm (Ed.), *Secondary traumatic stress: Self-care issues for clinicians, researchers, and educators* (pp. 3–28). Sidran Press.
- Labrecque, R. M., & Smith, P. (2017). Does training and coaching matter? An 18-month evaluation of a community supervision model. *Victims & Offenders, 12*(2), 253–274.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Barton-Bellessa, S. M., & Jiang, S. (2012). Examining the relationship between supervisor and management trust and job burnout among correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 39*(7), 938–957.
- McCann, I. L., & Pearlman, L. A. (1990). Vicarious traumatization: A framework for understanding the psychological effects of working with victims. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 3*(1), 131–149.
- McNeill, F., Raynor, P., & Trotter, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Offender supervision: New directions in theory, research and practice*. Routledge.
- Newell, J. M., & MacNeil, G. A. (2010). Professional burnout, vicarious trauma, secondary traumatic stress, and compassion fatigue: A review of theoretical terms, risk factors, and preventive methods. *Best Practices in Mental Health, 6*(2), 57–68.
- Schaefer, L., & Williamson, H. (2018). Probation and parole officers' compliance with case management tools: Professional discretion and override. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 62*(14), 4565–4584.

Appendix A: TOR for Leadership

1:1 RPS with a Supervision Lens

Informal Terms of Reference – Leadership

1. The intention of this 1:1 support is to provide practitioners working with individuals who are considered complex, high risk and demanding, a forum for individual, focused support, anchored in practice and with a supervision lens.
2. Practitioners identified for engagement in this process will be contacted by the Practice Manager, providing them with information and an informal Terms of Reference. The leading Practice Leader will also be introduced and included into the communication. This should provide them with the information they require to make an educated decision around engagement.
3. Engagement and participation with this process is entirely at the discretion of the practitioner and will not be enforced.
4. Sessions will be held in person, in an agreed space that is comfortable for the practitioner and Practice Leader. Bookable rooms at Ara Poutama sites which have available parking are of preference. Neutral spaces for these sessions to take place away from the practitioner's home site will provide an increased ability for practitioners to remove themselves from the operational 'noise' surrounding their role and be able to focus into the session.
5. Practitioners will be provided with 'protected' time to participate in sessions on a monthly basis. This time should allow for one hour for the session to take place, plus travel as required.
6. Sessions will be anchored in a process model from supervision literature, such as the Reflective Learning Model attached.
7. Best practice around supervision will be built into this process. This would also include the development of a modified Practice Development Agreement, termed as 'contracting' in supervision terms.
8. A review of how sessions are progressing, as well as the structure/relationship between the individual practitioner and Practice Leader will be built in to ensure that agreed goals identified by the practitioner are being achieved via the practice and collaboration in this space, and that the practitioner's needs are being met.
9. The Practice Leader leading on this will meet with another Ara Poutama leader, external to the Practice Leadership team, on a regular basis to discuss wider approaches to this process and to ensure it is also closely aligned with current practice. Issues related to risk management would be a regular part of these discussions to ensure best practice is in place. Confidentiality would be maintained and no identifiable details of practitioners or individuals in Ara Poutama's care will be discussed during these meetings.
10. Acknowledging that the intention of this process is to support best practice for practitioners, but that the outcomes for success are not pre-determined; this methodology will be reviewed at incremental periods of three and six months following its commencement.
11. There are limits to confidentiality, related to safety and ethics in practice which would see an advancement of concerns if something happened in a session. The initial approach would be for the Practice Leader to do this in partnership with the practitioner, and for the process to be practitioner led, however if there are immediate safety concerns these would be escalated to the appropriate manager via the Practice Leader.

Appendix B: TOR for Practitioner

1:1 RPS with a Supervision Lens

Practitioner Terms of Reference

1. The intention of this 1:1 support is to provide practitioners working with individuals who are considered complex, high risk and demanding, a forum for individual, focused support, anchored in practice and with a supervision lens.
2. Engagement and participation with this process is entirely at the discretion of the practitioner and will not be enforced.
3. Sessions will be held in person, in an agreed space that is comfortable for the practitioner and Practice Leader. Bookable rooms at Ara Poutama sites which have available parking are of preference. Ideally this will be at a neutral location, away from the practitioners' home site; this will allow for increased focus away from operational demands.
4. Practitioners will be provided with 'protected' time to participate in sessions on a monthly basis. This time should allow for one hour for the session to take place, plus travel as required.
5. Sessions will be anchored in a process model from supervision literature, such as the Reflective Learning Model attached.
6. Best practice around supervision will be built into this process. This would also include the development of a modified Practice Development Agreement, termed as 'contracting' in supervision terms.
7. A review of how sessions are progressing, as well as the structure/relationship between the individual practitioner and Practice Leader will be built in to ensure that agreed goals identified by the practitioner are being achieved via the practice and collaboration in this space, and that the practitioner's needs are being met.
8. The Practice Leader leading on this will meet with another Ara Poutama leader, external to the Practice Leadership team, on a regular basis to discuss wider approaches to this process and to ensure it is also closely aligned with current practice. Issues related to risk management would be a regular part of these discussions to ensure best practice is in place. Confidentiality would be maintained and no identifiable details of practitioners or individuals in Ara Poutama's care will be discussed during these meetings.
9. Acknowledging that the intention of this process is to support best practice for practitioners, but that the outcomes for success are not pre-determined; this methodology will be reviewed at incremental periods of three and six months following its commencement.
10. There are limits to confidentiality, related to safety and ethics in practice which would see an advancement of concerns if something happened in a session. The initial approach would be for the Practice Leader to do this in partnership with the practitioner, and for the process to be practitioner led, however if there are immediate safety concerns these would be escalated to the appropriate manager via the Practice Leader.
11. Recording and reporting of sessions will be limited to times and dates, as well as outcomes from reviews (at three and six month periods as previously noted). The details of the sessions will remain largely confidential, with the exception of imminent concerns requiring escalation. Practitioners will be encouraged to maintain their own notes or reflections from sessions.

Appendix C: Contracting Template

- Working definition.
 - The practice leadership professional supervision pilot is a structured, collaborative process between a probation officer and a qualified supervisor that focuses on reflective practice, professional development, and accountability.
 - Its purpose is to enhance the practitioner's competence, professional development, ethical decision-making, and wellbeing while ensuring that practice aligns with organizational standards and public safety objectives.
 - Supervision provides a safe space to critically examine casework, explore challenges, and strengthen skills to support effective rehabilitation and risk management of individuals on sentence.

- Practitioners voice:
 - What goals do you have in connection with this supervision pilot?
 - What are your learning objectives?
 - What support do you require, or what needs do you have?
 - How can these needs best be met?
 - How can your culture and values be recognised in this space?
 - Would you like the sessions to be trauma informed to provide support?

- Frequency
 - Monthly

- Duration
 - Sessions to be one hour in length.
 - The pilot is currently estimated to operate for six months, until June 2026.

- Venue
 - Hosted within Department of Corrections infrastructure. Currently arrangements are being made to use either Boston Road, or Regional Office.

- Costs
 - N/A

- Confidentiality (and its limitations)
 - Participants are provided confidentiality within the sessions. The limits of confidentiality relate to matters associated with ethics and safety.

- Accountability to professional bodies or organisational policy

- Participants are accountable to their role requirements as agreed by Ara Poutama.
- Record keeping. What records will be kept, where will they be kept, and who will have access.
 - The PO/SP are encouraged to maintain their own records of sessions.
- Preparation. What preparation for each session is agreed between the parties.
 - Prior to meeting the PO/SP is expected to have prepared a topic or case for discussion in the supervision space.
- Agenda setting. How will the agenda be set, whose agenda is it?
 - The agenda is 99% set by the PO/SP, with room for the Supervisor to add an agenda item if required.
- Feedback and review. When will this occur, how will it occur, and who will have access to the review.
 - Feedback and review to take place after 3 supervision sessions have take place, and then again after 6 sessions.
- Processes for dealing with conflict and complaint.
 - Issues are to be dealt with in a timely manner, initially between the supervisor and supervisee.
 - If the issue can not be resolved at that level, than it can be escalated to the respective managers for support.
- The supervisory relationship. How is it developed and maintained?
 - Prior to contracting all participants have been provided an overview of the importance of the working alliance in the supervision space.
 - This will also be addressed in ongoing sessions, and as part of the review process.
- Degree of access to supervisor.
 - Outside of the monthly session the Supervisor is available by email.
 - Each participant will also have a local Practice Leader on site to provide support, and participants are encouraged to maintain an active connection and engagement with their local Practice Leader to compliment their engagement with this supervision pilot.
- Missed appointments and timeframes for rescheduling.
 - Missed appointments are to be rescheduled within one week.
 - The party who was unable to attend the appointment will primarily be responsible to reorganise the session.

Practitioner Signature:

Supervisor Signature: