Praxis International
Technical Assistance on Supervised Visitation and Safe Exchange

STRENGTHENING STAFF SKILLS: ENGAGING WITH MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN SUPERVISED VISITATION CENTERS

Audio Conference Training Series for Supervised Visitation Grantees

DEVELOPING AND SUSTAINING A VISITATION CENTER THAT IS FAIR, RESPECTFUL AND PROMOTES SAFETY FOR CHILDREN AND THEIR MOTHERS WHO ARE BATTERED WOMEN IS AN IMPORTANT GOAL, BUT THIS CAN BE EASIER SAID THAN DONE! IT REQUIRES STAFF THAT CAN ENCOURAGE AND SUPPORT A PROBLEM-SOLVING, SAFETY-ORIENTED PARTNERSHIP WITH CHILDREN, MOTHERS AND FATHERS. AND EVEN THE MOST EXPERIENCED AMONG US CAN BE CHALLENGED BY THE SKILLS REQUIRED TO BE ENGAGED WITH FAMILIES IN THIS WAY. PLEASE JOIN US FOR THIS AUDIO CONFERENCE TRAINING SERIES TO EXPLORE SKILL DEVELOPMENT IN AREAS THAT COMMONLY PRESENT DILEMMAS FOR CENTER STAFF.

Part 3: Decision-making in Supervised Visitation Centers

February 25, 2010 ◊ 4:00-5:15 PM Eastern Time

FACILITATORS/TRAINERS: VALLI KALEI KANUHA, JENNIFER ROSE, & BETH MCNAMARA

Valli Kalei Kanuha, Ph.D., MSW is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa. Dr. Kanuha has worked as an activist, clinician, administrator, and consultant with community agencies, domestic violence programs, HIV/AIDS organizations, and other social service settings in the continental U.S. and Hawaiʻi for over 30 years. Her professional interests include violence against women of color, with a focus on Native Hawaiian, Pacific Island and Asian women; lesbian, gay and transgender issues; and multicultural practice, all areas in which she has published and trained extensively. Kalei has been involved with numerous community and national organizations in Minnesota, New York and Hawaiʻi, including Incite! Women of

Color Against Violence, The Violence Intervention Project in East Harlem, NY, The Asian and Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence in San Francisco, and Turning Point for Families in Hilo. For over 20 years she has been a consultant and trainer for Praxis International and Sacred Circle, National Resource Center to End Violence Against Native Women.

Jennifer Rose has been working as an advocate & activist to end violence against women for over 15 years. As the director of domestic violence services at the Walnut Avenue Women's Center, Jennifer worked to build a program that provided both crisis intervention and long term advocacy and support for survivors and their families. In this role she also opened a supervised visitation center that was part of a national demonstration initiative funded through the Office of Violence Against Women. Jennifer is currently working as a consultant, locally and nationally, to provide training and technical assistance on the issues of violence against women, engaging men who batter, oppression, community organizing, child welfare and LGBTQ issues. Jennifer received her BA in Anthropology and Women's Studies from Fort Lewis College and her MSW from San Jose State University.

Beth McNamara, is a social worker who received her degree from the University of Wisconsin. Beth is currently a program manager with Praxis International and the Co-Executive Director of Inspire Action for Social Change. Beth also provides training and technical assistance as a consultant for ALSO and currently serves as a faculty member for the Family Violence Department for the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. Beth has been an advocate to end violence against women for the past 22 years. She was the director of the Family Service Agency, Family Visitation Center in San Mateo, California for thirteen years. Over the course of her career in supervised visitation she planned, designed and operated five different supervised visitation centers. She was responsible for program development, sustainability, training, direct service, advocacy, and the supervision and mentoring of staff and volunteers. Beth has also worked as a domestic violence and sexual assault advocate, in a psychiatric unit, and in an inpatient and outpatient chemical dependency center.

PART 3: DECISION-MAKING IN SUPERVISED VISITATION CENTERS

Session Outline

A. Welcome and introductions

B. What informs decision-making in supervised visitation centers

    a) A framework for thinking ethically
    b) What informs your decisions
        a. Values and beliefs
        b. Holding a clear understanding of your role
            1. Foster safety for mother and their children

            2. With men who use violence: counteract the tactics of battering

            3. With mothers who are being battered: counteract the experience of battering

        c. Experience
        d. Training
        e. Policies and procedures
        f. Clarity about who and what is in front of us (different situations call for different responses)
        g. Understanding what is our desired outcome
        h. Others?

C. Break for questions

D. The decision-making process

    a) A framework for ethical decision-making

    b) Types of decisions in supervised visitation centers

        a. Decisions made only by the board or executive committee

        b. Decisions made only by the director or coordinator

> > c. Decisions made by the director or coordinator with input from staff
>
> > d. Decisions made by staff on their own
>
> *c)* Challenges/barriers to the decision-making process
>
> d) Strategies for making decisions in supervised visitation centers
>
> > a. Be prepared. (know the history, context and safety issues for each person using the center)
> > b. Respond to what is happening in the moment
> > c. Responding vs. re-acting
> > > i) The importance of front end work
> > > ii) Avoid personalization and power-struggles
> > > iii) How to work in crisis situations without feeling like you are in crisis
> > > iv) Knowing when you have to act NOW and when you can wait
> > > v) Engaging support from co-workers and supervisors
> > d. Develop a positive, safety-orientated, problem-solving partnership
> > e. Continually gauge and account for the risk of harm to a mother and her children
> > f. Remain calm and trust your instincts
> > g. Engage families in decision-making
> > h. Account for the social position and life experiences of each person involved
> > i. Be a team player, don't fly solo
> > *j.* Others….

E. Open session for final questions and/or comments

F. Wrap-up and closing

A Framework for Thinking Ethically[1]

http://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/decision/framework.html

This document is designed as an introduction to thinking ethically. We all have an image of our better selves-of how we are when we act ethically or are "at our best." We probably also have an image of what an ethical community, an ethical business, an ethical government, or an ethical society should be. Ethics really has to do with all these levels-acting ethically as individuals, creating ethical organizations and governments, and making our society as a whole ethical in the way it treats everyone.

What is Ethics?

Simply stated, ethics refers to standards of behavior that tell us how human beings ought to act in the many situations in which they find themselves-as friends, parents, children, citizens, businesspeople, teachers, professionals, and so on.

It is helpful to identify what ethics is NOT:

- Ethics is not the same as feelings. Feelings provide important information for our ethical choices. Some people have highly developed habits that make them feel bad when they do something wrong, but many people feel good even though they are doing something wrong. And often our feelings will tell us it is uncomfortable to do the right thing if it is hard.
- Ethics is not religion. Many people are not religious, but ethics applies to everyone. Most religions do advocate high ethical standards but sometimes do not address all the types of problems we face.
- Ethics is not following the law. A good system of law does incorporate many ethical standards, but law can deviate from what is ethical. Law can become ethically corrupt, as some totalitarian regimes have made it. Law can be a function of power alone and designed to serve the interests of narrow groups. Law may have a difficult time designing or enforcing standards in some important areas, and may be slow to address new problems.

---

[1] This framework for thinking ethically is the product of dialogue and debate at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics at Santa Clara University. Primary contributors include Manuel Velasquez, Dennis Moberg, Michael J. Meyer, Thomas Shanks, Margaret R. McLean, David DeCosse, Claire Andre, and Kirk O. Hanson. This article appeared originally in Issues in Ethics, V. 1, N. 2 (Winter 1988). It was last revised in May 2009.

- Ethics is not following culturally accepted norms. Some cultures are quite ethical, but others become corrupt -or blind to certain ethical concerns (as the United States was to slavery before the Civil War). "When in Rome, do as the Romans do" is not a satisfactory ethical standard.
- Ethics is not science. Social and natural science can provide important data to help us make better ethical choices. But science alone does not tell us what we ought to do. Science may provide an explanation for what humans are like. But ethics provides reasons for how humans ought to act. And just because something is scientifically or technologically possible, it may not be ethical to do it.

Why Identifying Ethical Standards is Hard

There are two fundamental problems in identifying the ethical standards we are to follow:

1. On what do we base our ethical standards?

2. How do those standards get applied to specific situations we face?

If our ethics are not based on feelings, religion, law, accepted social practice, or science, what are they based on? Many philosophers and ethicists have helped us answer this critical question. They have suggested at least five different sources of ethical standards we should use.

Five Sources of Ethical Standards

The Utilitarian Approach

Some ethicists emphasize that the ethical action is the one that provides the most good or does the least harm, or, to put it another way, produces the greatest balance of good over harm. The ethical corporate action, then, is the one that produces the greatest good and does the least harm for all who are affected-customers, employees, shareholders, the community, and the environment. Ethical warfare balances the good achieved in ending terrorism with the harm done to all parties through death, injuries, and destruction. The utilitarian approach deals with consequences; it tries both to increase the good done and to reduce the harm done.

The Rights Approach

Other philosophers and ethicists suggest that the ethical action is the one that best protects and respects the moral rights of those affected. This approach starts from the belief that humans have a dignity based on their human nature per se or on their ability to choose freely what they do with their lives. On the basis of such dignity, they have a right to be treated as ends and not merely as means to other ends. The list of moral rights -including the rights to

make one's own choices about what kind of life to lead, to be told the truth, not to be injured, to a degree of privacy, and so on-is widely debated; some now argue that non-humans have rights, too. Also, it is often said that rights imply duties-in particular, the duty to respect others' rights.

The Fairness or Justice Approach

Aristotle and other Greek philosophers have contributed the idea that all equals should be treated equally. Today we use this idea to say that ethical actions treat all human beings equally-or if unequally, then fairly based on some standard that is defensible. We pay people more based on their harder work or the greater amount that they contribute to an organization, and say that is fair. But there is a debate over CEO salaries that are hundreds of times larger than the pay of others; many ask whether the huge disparity is based on a defensible standard or whether it is the result of an imbalance of power and hence is unfair.

The Common Good Approach

The Greek philosophers have also contributed the notion that life in community is a good in itself and our actions should contribute to that life. This approach suggests that the interlocking relationships of society are the basis of ethical reasoning and that respect and compassion for all others-especially the vulnerable-are requirements of such reasoning. This approach also calls attention to the common conditions that are important to the welfare of everyone. This may be a system of laws, effective police and fire departments, health care, a public educational system, or even public recreational areas.

The Virtue Approach

A very ancient approach to ethics is that ethical actions ought to be consistent with certain ideal virtues that provide for the full development of our humanity. These virtues are dispositions and habits that enable us to act according to the highest potential of our character and on behalf of values like truth and beauty. Honesty, courage, compassion, generosity, tolerance, love, fidelity, integrity, fairness, self-control, and prudence are all examples of virtues. Virtue ethics asks of any action, "What kind of person will I become if I do this?" or "Is this action consistent with my acting at my best?"

Putting the Approaches Together

Each of the approaches helps us determine what standards of behavior can be considered ethical. There are still problems to be solved, however. The first problem is that we may not

agree on the content of some of these specific approaches. We may not all agree to the same set of human and civil rights. We may not agree on what constitutes the common good. We may not even agree on what is a good and what is a harm.

The second problem is that the different approaches may not all answer the question "What is ethical?" in the same way. Nonetheless, each approach gives us important information with which to determine what is ethical in a particular circumstance. And much more often than not, the different approaches do lead to similar answers.

Making Decisions

Making good ethical decisions requires a trained sensitivity to ethical issues and a practiced method for exploring the ethical aspects of a decision and weighing the considerations that should impact our choice of a course of action. Having a method for ethical decision making is absolutely essential. When practiced regularly, the method becomes so familiar that we work through it automatically without consulting the specific steps.

The more novel and difficult the ethical choice we face, the more we need to rely on discussion and dialogue with others about the dilemma. Only by careful exploration of the problem, aided by the insights and different perspectives of others, can we make good ethical choices in such situations.

We have found the following framework for ethical decision making a useful method for exploring ethical dilemmas and identifying ethical courses of action.

A Framework for Ethical Decision Making

Recognize an Ethical Issue

1. Could this decision or situation be damaging to someone or to some group? Does this decision involve a choice between a good and bad alternative, or perhaps between two "goods" or between two "bads"?
2. Is this issue about more than what is legal or what is most efficient? If so, how?

Get the Facts
3. What are the relevant facts of the case? What facts are not known? Can I learn more about the situation? Do I know enough to make a decision?

4. What individuals and groups have an important stake in the outcome? Are some concerns more important? Why?
5. What are the options for acting? Have all the relevant persons and groups been consulted? Have I identified creative options?

Evaluate Alternative Actions

6. Evaluate the options by asking the following questions:
   - Which option will produce the most good and do the least harm? (The Utilitarian Approach)
   - Which option best respects the rights of all who have a stake? (The Rights Approach)
   - Which option treats people equally or proportionately? (The Justice Approach)
   - Which option best serves the community as a whole, not just some members? (The Common Good Approach)
   - Which option leads me to act as the sort of person I want to be? (The Virtue Approach)

Decision and Test It

7. Considering all these approaches, which option best addresses the situation?
8. If I told someone I respect-or told a television audience-which option I have chosen, what would they say?

Act and Reflect on the Outcome

9. How can my decision be implemented with the greatest care and attention to the concerns of all stakeholders?
10. How did my decision turn out and what have I learned from this specific situation?