

Advocacy Discussion, September 1, 2016

Liberating or Dominating: Shelter Rules and Social Change Advocacy

HELLO EVERYONE MY NAME IS PATRICIA AND I AM WITH THE NCJFCJ AND I AM HOPING TO FACILITATE TODAY'S WEBINAR. BEFORE WE BEGIN OUR LIKE TO PROVIDE YOU WITH A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF HOW THE WEBINAR SERIES WORKS AND HOW YOU CAN INTERACT WITH THE CENTERS. THE BOTTOM OF THE SCREEN THERE IS A BOX THAT CONTAINS A PDF OF THE PRESENTATION TO DOWNLOAD THE FILE AND CLICK DOWNLOAD. A NEW BROWSER WINDOW WILL OPEN AND YOU CONFIRM THAT AND IT WILL BEGIN. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE WEBINAR YOU BE YOU YOU WILL BE REDIRECTED TO A SURVEY. THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION AS I EXPLAINED YOUR WEBINAR SYSTEM. Grown-ups and

>> To the presenters and we can get started.

>> Thank you, Patricia. Will come all of you welcomed well of you are joining in the efficacy discussion. Good morning to the people from Guam, it is really early morning over there and good afternoon and good day.

>> Thank you for joining us today. We have four classes that are joining in L. M. N. and O this is a wonderful opportunity for us to get together especially after the immersion we have talked about liberation and domestication and how do we move towards liberation.

>> Today's discussion is on liberating or dominating and what that means and how it relates to this particularly when we are thinking about our shelters and rules and regulations that are related to women who are fleeing abuse in their homes and are coming to our shelter.

>> If you have any questions about the link that may not be working or other technical problems you may be having please send an email to Genesis at Praxis to Genesis@Praxisinternational.org. If the webinar connection breaks off please feel free to rejoin it and I think you have to go to the original link or email Jen so that she can connect to. If you are connecting through phones please dial back if you get cut off.

>> We have four wonderful women working in this field and working in this movement for a while and I will introduce you to them we have Joanna and she is the program director of housemate in Asheville North Carolina we have Annette Scott She is the community development and education director with safe house in Henderson Nevada we have Laura Baxter of Springfield Ohio and Rachel is with us from Child and family services in Northwestern Michigan and that is in Benton Harbor Michigan. Welcome to all four of you presenters. We are looking forward to listening to your experience and your thinking in this area.

>> You want to say something at this point or shall we move on? Anything?

>> All right. Let's start with the basic idea of what liberating is versus dominating.

>> Sorry, this is kind of getting a little crazy. I think multiple people may have been moving it so it was skipping around a little bit. What does it mean to be liberating versus dominating. Particularly when we

are in a shared living space, as we know when we share something it is quite difficult to manage. So, how do we do that. Annette would you like to speak about that?

>> Sure. How I see it is liberating versus dominating is simple as liberating for people who are in the safe shelters or safe homes is the exact opposite of what they are used to. The idea of it being liberating his freedom versus dominating and I think where we are going with this is that basically the role that we instill in a lot of our shelters across the country can be extremely dominating and controlling. When we talk about liberating versus dominating, we have to actually look at are we doing exactly what we, as advocates, denounce with this. Are we enforcing control and are we controlling and managing humans

>> Anyone else? Joanna?

>> Yes. I think what and that said is right on. It's keeping the context of what is happening here and making sure that we are not replicating and oppressive environment. Working hard and being conscious and aware of the pie or -- power dynamic that is already there just by the fact that we have keys to the shelter and doing everything you can to neutralize that. I think it is about empowerment and staying grounded and being willing to question ourselves all of the time about what is necessary.

>> Laura or Rachel do you want to add to this?

>> I agree with everything said, I think that as we bring staff into a home where survivors are living, it is important to check our own issues as advocates in relation to power and control so that we are not making assumptions and inadvertently pushing that out into the safe home environment.

>> Any other thoughts? I have a question for all of you. It is a sharing space and we do have to take care of others, even if I am living with my closest people who understand me and love me, I cannot really do whatever I feel. Freedom is curtailed and freedom is limited. How do you manage that? How do you think about that in terms of living in a shelter and also trying to encourage and develop a condition or environment that is liberating? Laura?

>> For me I think that is the crux of the issue, it is hard to be empowering for one person when that person's issue may be very different from someone else's. That is the crux of the challenge, it is always about trying to see where you can meet each person individually and try to get to the root of what their needs and desires are and do your best to meet both without letting one's -- one person's right step on another's.

>> Anyone else? May I ask when all four of you speak that you say your name first so I will participants know who is speaking.

>> This is Rachel. One thing that I wanted to add is that I think that what Annette said and also what Joanna said is that there is a complication with there being shared spaces, at the way that we facilitate that and make it work is that we make it a safe place central to that and one that is healing. When those things guide the parameters that we put in place, there are not other arbitrary rules in place to hating their lives, those things are central and so that is how we go about making it less dominating and more liberating.

>> This is a net. I also want to -- might have somebody mention the keys, we hold the keys to the shelter door and one of the things to keep in mind is whose house is this anyway?

>> I'm sorry?

>> I think that is one of the things that you keep in the back of your mind when you are reviewing rules or when you are looking at how to bring balance in a living space that is about liberation and freedom and empowerment and growing.

>> If you keep that in the back of your head and you move forward with that it helps to keep staff in check on their power and control issues. For a long time it seems what was once a grassroots movement has turned very institutional and probably the 90s and how we get back to the grassroots portion of the movements. We look at what changes will benefit the people that do stay in these homes.

>> This is really interesting and it starts a lot of thinking around this.

>> I also want to offer all of the participants, please feel free to chat your comments and and they will be brought in and all of the speakers can try to answer those. So, feel free to type your questions in.

>> One of the things that I was thinking is how do we start? Where do we begin with these rules and when we say something like rules does that automatically bring in a dominating concept and dominating conditions on the people living in a shelter or who have no other recourse than to come into a shelter. Where should we begin? How do we do this?

>> Any of you?

>> This is Annette again, I think we have to look at the language first and in terms of the word rules.

>> How, can you tell me more about that.

>> I think the term rules and itself implies a lot, when I hear rules I think of kindergarten. I once worked in a shelter where they thought it was important to put the rules on the wall.

>> That alone put you in a place where you are no longer in control of your own existence within those walls because of those rules.

>> Any of the other speakers have a comment?

>> This is Laura. When I first started working as the director at project women we had exactly what Annette said when I walked into the shelter for the first time, there were papers taped up to the wall everywhere you turned around and it said do this and do not do that and it was overwhelming to me to see all of it not to mention that it looked very littered. I felt like the environment had taken on an alignment with whoever was aligned with hide it because it is very rule-based just to handle the masses and that kind of setting. So, one of the first things that I did this make the staff take all of the posters and notes and papers and get rid of them off of the walls.

>> It was a little uncomfortable for everybody, the people who had worked there because they reference them. Instead of speaking and having dialogue and conversation, the staff would point to the list of rules. That was even more of a disconnect Just go look at the rules, I don't have to talk to you just

go look at the rules. So we just ripped them all up and got rid of them. It was a little bit uncomfortable but it was certainly liberating.

>> That is really powerful. What you said was intended of talking -- instead of talking all they had to do was point at the rules on the wall. I'm sorry who was speaking customer

>> This is Joanna. Our shelter went through a process of getting rid of rules also and it was pretty radical. Where we started was with asking a lot of questions. We started calling other shelters and we started asking people to share their policies or rules or guidelines or whatever they call them. We went and visited other places to get a sense of what other people were doing. We had a very small staff would been in the same place for a long time and we were so used to this is right and that is wrong. It was mind blowing at first to hear shelter say yes they can use they just cannot use substances on the premises. That was radical for us. We asked around to see what people were doing and found out that these places without rules were having the same places -- problems we were having they were not having more problems than we were with rules. We also looked at individual cases and the people we had had to ask to leave. Where we sending people back to an abusive home because they refuse to wash dishes? With that individual with people and survivors and looking at the big picture and what others were doing.

>> Okay.

>> What is important for me and I come from a culture and a family where many people live together, extended families, there are always unwritten ways that we live together in harmony. So, basically you kind of respect what others want to do and you assume that they respect you. Families have a long time to melt together whereas in a shelter, when women come in, they are coming from various back rounds and they have very little time that they are just thrown together. It has always been my thinking, how do we do that well?

>> One of the things, I think it was Laura that said, dialogue. That is a basic thing that you have a conversation and you talk to each other. You figure out your rights and your duties if you are living together. But, should the staff be involved in all of this or not, it is the home of the women. Are there any thoughts on that?

>> This is Laura. I think it is a risk that we take that we think at the organization and this that make up the organization that it is our shelter. But, we are really somewhat custodians to that environment on behalf of the people there, it is their home and were somewhat gas in their home and there to support them. It that all by itself is awkward because the staff and the survivors coming into the shelter all bring varying parts of discomfort with that. The best thing, going back to die long as to be able to talk about that very thing so when we welcome someone into the shelter, part of what we have to do when we welcome them is to talk to them about their freedom to's week and the freedom -- to speak and ask about the rules. I think if we never bring that up in the very beginning that it is something that everyone is afraid to discuss until there is a conflict.

>> That space is there space, if it were not for them we would not have the space. We cannot exhibit ownership over it even though the nonprofit organization operates it cut it is not -- it is not ours and an ownership dynamics.

>> Hi. This is an net -- Annette, I totally agree were like host in the sense that when someone comes into a home were there to guide them through and let them know what is available and to advocate.

>> We have to start -- stop looking at it as ownership, this is our project, if you don't participate, if you don't follow the rules, we will punish you. Everything is restricted and it ends up hurting our clients.

>> What I want to say is one of the things that we are recently starting at safe house is an advisory board and that will include the input of staff and the board is come prized -- comprised of survivors. Survivors from anywhere who want to participate. They will take the information and they will be the ones who look at it. It is an opportunity for people to get involved in the structure of the shelter. I am really excited to see how it turns out.

>> Oh. Yes. That is so exciting. Any others?

>> This is Joanna. I think it is really, really important to get feedback from folks in a shelter. We have had our eyes open and so many times. The ways that we have listened, to start we did a regular feedback form, think we all have to get those and we have to report, we started a database to record the soft data that we were hearing over and over, it being bullied by a roommate was an issue, things like that so we could really look at it on a pie chart and see what is going on and then address the issues.

>> We also bring up rules, we don't call them rules, we call them guidelines, we bring up guidelines on a regular basis in a house meeting. We talk about why we have the guidelines and we ask for feedback on it. If they have ideas about something that is a barrier then we can adapt that.

>> It sounds like you have the participation of the women who are living there.

>> Yes.

>> That is important. Any other comments?

>> This is Rachel. I wanted to echo what Joanna had to say. When we initially made the transition to know rules, what we call them is community living standards. When we made that transition I do not think that there were actively client or survivor voices involved in the process. I think through surveys that can be something that is really eye-opening. This is especially tool of people who were exited -- true of someone who were exited because they didn't follow a quote rule.

>> This was something that was really eye-opening to see, what is at stake and how these things fit into the bigger experience that they are bringing to the table. Now that we are actively operating under community living standards and no rules we hear about them in house meetings as well. It is interesting, we hear so much from clients, we need a chore list, make us do chores, then we explain the philosophy of why that contributes to the power and control that they may have experienced before and that can sometimes be an eye-opening conversation that they can get behind.

>> Right. that is so important. What I want to do is go to the next topic and come back to how can we determine what needs to be changed.

>> One of the things that comes up when you are living together and you have no rules, most of the people will first say that is risky. How do you then eliminate conflict. Even if you are not going a person

out because she doesn't wash dishes, but then the dishes have to be washed so who does it, does it fall unfairly on one person who seems to be more amiable to community living? How do we do this and what risk are involved. If you could think about it and include in that one other issue, the issue of liability.

>> Our community, our country is such a litigious country in so many ways in this culture. So, if something happens, let's assume that somebody is not cleaning up and another woman's child falls and breaks her leg or something, what about liability in this case. Many of the rules came about because people felt they were liable. For example, giving rights, family wise we give rights to each other, but can we do that what whisks are there and what liabilities. If you could respond to that that would be really great.

>> This is Annette and I think one of the biggest liabilities of a lot of shelters is to hand out medication. A lot of shelters feel that they need to control medications so that clients don't overtake medications and so children don't get a hold of medication that even though they came from a home with medication and the children did not get a hold of them then. Or, so other clients don't deal medication. I think that is one of the most dangerous things that a shelter can do because they put themselves in danger, and the clients in danger. They could be given the wrong medication, they may not get their medication on time, and simply we worry that clients are going to steal that why would we not worry that staff would steal medication. I think the way we're thinking is all us against them so I think that is one of the biggest liabilities.

>> This is Joanna. I was going to say that what eased some of that for us is that the laws that fund us require us to be a lot looser than a lot of people think. When we look at who provides our funds, all of the guidelines say that you cannot control medication and you cannot require people to do certain things and you cannot discriminate because someone is an addict. That eased up some of our liability because the law was requiring us to not have imposed rules in the shelter.

>> Again, one of the questions that came up is the issue of liability. How do you deal with that in that case? Any idea or thought about it?

>> Did I get cut off? Are you all here?

>> I think a lot of times we can be very reactive to one-time situations. I will use an example from years ago. We had ice in the refrigerator, we live in southern Nevada and it is very hot here, ice is a need. And ice cube fell on the floor and somebody slipped and fell. The person was okay but the idea that that could shut down the whole agency if someone were to sue as it is of the ice cube meant that from a six or seven years to we went without ice in the shelter. There was no ice allowed in the shout there. -- In the shelter. You could not bring in a cup from a convenience store that had ice in it, you could not get ice out of the refrigerator. Imagine going out in hundred 20° weather with warm water. It is preposterous. That is an example of reactive decisions based on a one-time event. It was not until we got a new executive director and she said what, there's no ice? I'm not going there, that's for sure. She actually said that is ridiculous. Now we have ice. But for six years we had no ice.

>> Oh my goodness. You are absolutely correct in thinking that a lot of times we are reacting from fear. Were not reacting from a position of faith and trust in a lot of times we feel like oh my God what is going

to happen and that is where we end up. It's really important. There can be a rule about everything in life and some of these things will be risky, it comes with the territory of how we work and engaged with women. Are there any thoughts about that?

>> This is Joanna, I think what you just said about fear is so important. I think that is something, I also want to make sure that we are being very kind and compassionate to advocate to work in shelters you may have created these rules from a desire to do the right thing. We don't want people to fall and break their heads on ice, but there is a combination of wanting to do the right thing and then letting it build up to fear. I think that is key.

>> It's checking it within ourselves and within our organization and checking all of the assumptions that we have, is it just the way we do things, do we does not have ice, we need to get down to the root of the rule and address it, is it just fear. We want to empower staff to work through the fear and to feel secure and in turn to empower survivors.

>> There are a number of participants writing about having lockboxes for women in the shelters. These are for medication or anything else, I assume. They can be provided with a lockbox to use for themselves.

>> I do not believe we are helping women if they leave one controlling home to move into a shelter that is also controlling with rules cut just like her better her has ruled at home how do we empower them with disbelief #--? This is an excellent point in exactly what we're talking about.

>> I would suggest, if there are other questions coming up, interrupt us and ask the questions.

>> I want to bring up another issue, there are cultural differences and there are various other differences. I have been involved with immigrants recently, and when I say immigrants that does not necessarily mean that they all papers, they may be undocumented and many of them do not speak English and many of them have no way that they can work. I remember working with a woman and she was so controlled, their dynamics of abuse are such that she was never given any money, she had never seen U. S. currency, so when she first came to the shelter she did not know what money looked like. She did not speak English. There are many women who have no idea how to take public transportation. There needs to be a lot of handholding at that point. This in itself becomes quite a difficult issue, not only going outside but living in the shelter with other people. Have you lived with people of other cultures in your shelters?

>> Hello?

>> Any of you?

>> Yes. Of course.

>> How does that work out?

>> This is Laura. I was going to say that we have an interesting collision of culture, in relation to music at the shelter. You would not think that it would come up, music is such a wonderful thing but people like different kinds of music at different volumes and at different times of day. It was somewhat dramatic and pretty exciting because the women in the shelter were very verbal. They found their voices around

what they did or did not like around each other's music. The unfortunate part was that staff felt that the way to calm the whole dynamic was to take everyone's music away, telling them to take away the radios and turn off their phones. Instead they could have come up with a way to work through it because this is a way that people identify themselves and express themselves.

>> I feel like our staff missed an opportunity to talk about the sharing of the different cultures that occurred and maybe even helping each other to understand the differences in the cultures. It was a really simple thing, but very cultures a very steeped in music and food in addition to language and we tend to think about all of that, our menus and entertainment through a one-size-fits-all because it needs to be simple and that is very challenging.

>> Yes. Any others?

>> I agree. It is a learning opportunity when something like that does,. It's a learning opportunity for everybody for staff and residents. That is a great point. The one thing we have always been super good at since I have been at Statehouse, is recognizing cultural differences and the needs involved with them. We have had clients throughout the years come to ask asking for specific things.

>> One will has always been you cannot burn candles in the house. Certain religious practices require that. So, what we will do is make accommodations for that or any other kinds of needs that require our advocates to rise to the occasion. We use these two -- as an opportunity for people to discuss their own background with others at the house so they will understand why someone might be doing something that they thought was not allowed in the shelter, like a candle burning.

>> I think that is a very critical point. If you have people of different religions, their practices are very different in terms of everything, food, bathing, the way bathrooms are used, everything. This need a lot of accommodation and understanding and knowledge to be built up around not, would you agree?

>> Yes. I would also say that I have, speaking for myself, it's given me an opportunity to learn so much about people and the differences and enhance my own life and it has been terrific.

>> That is good to hear. That is lovely.

>> The second question that you see on the screen, I think it is extraordinarily critical, are there disparities and how rules are applied or who experiences consequences? I would eat -- even add to it even if you are developing the regulations or guidelines with the majority community of women that come to you. That my actually be quite difficult for the minority women that are coming to you. Any thoughts on that?

>> Throughout the years we have had situations, not only at Statehouse but even -- safe house but working at another shelter where rules workforce more strictly at one group that had another. The rules would be bent in regards to favoritism. So along with rules those issues come as well.

>> Yes.

>> This is Joanna, yes, this is actually what triggered us to start looking at the rules, the people not succeeding in shelters were minorities. This is the catalyst for us to start to get rid of them and to make them as limited as we could. We all know that the more barriers there are in the more cultural

differences, the people that fit within the culture are the ones that will be the most successful and it. That is what we were seeing. It was really hard to see that we looked at it and that is where we meet the changes.

>> The guidelines that are developed have to be constantly checked and modified to fit who is in the shelter, right? Yes.

>> Any questions, the something interesting that Anna wrote, explaining the shelter rules to a deaf victim -- deaf victim, can be a challenge because the language ability to understand. Trauma, communication accessibility, and so forth. It is a very important to make sure that there is a strong bridge between the Deaf and Hearing so the victim can thrive.

>> Here is something that has come up. The challenge is when the deaf person is required to go to a group meeting, there is no interpreter and they must still sit through the whole meeting.

>> There was also a question from Karen asking if you can speak more on the impact of funding requirements.

>> Do you have anything more on that? I cannot find her note here pressure Mark

>> It says can you speak to the impact of funding requirement, it's not only about staff feelings some is about the pressure from funders.

>> Okay. Can any of you address that about the funding requirements, depending upon who is funding, right?

>> This is Annette. That is exactly right. On the federal level, where there is a greater understanding of victimization their rules are very few. Yet, on a local or state level we see tons of rules. Mandated case management. Mandated counseling. Everything. Once again when we talk about this before, the funder is not only oppressing the agencies but in turn it is also oppressing the people in the shelter. Every social worker and therapist will kill me, a lot of times the rules that go along with ethics involving social workers, counselors, and clinicians, are very different and very strong compared to what as advocates, we have in terms of freedom in working with others.

>> A lot of times those rules can be also very oppressive.

>> Any other comments on this one?

>> This is Joanna, maybe I am not fully understanding the question, but, for us I have not seen any impact from losing the rules at all. Were more compliant with the funders, if you go and look at the federal laws, they expect us not to be oppressive and not to exclude people. So I guess I would like to know more about that if it is local or what that question is more about.

>> If you have any questions about that, if you can put in specifics.

>> Some of the states may be different and the what the mandates are for attendance, is that right?

>> Yes. On a local level emergency services and grants that we depend on for utilities, there are things that are mandated. Case management is mandated to these programs. We try to educate them about

the services that we provide and how different they are than traditional shelters -- than traditional shelters that serve homeless individuals. There are only two shelters in Nevada, with homeless shelters operating very differently.

>> Right. that is really important. That is a beautiful piece of advocacy, this is what advocacy is about that when it does not fit the women who are asking for assistance, you are advocating for them. This is where you go in and change and talk to funders and change the understanding of what it means to live in the shelter and what the requirements are and what would be best provided. I think that is important to do. Thank you for bringing that up, that is how advocacy should work.

>> Anyone else? Laura?

>> Joanna?

>> This is Laura. I think the biggest challenge that we have with the imposition of rules on how our operations work is through anything that is connected to HUD or the local continuum of care. Emergency shelter dollars come through HUD or when we operate transitional housing, looking at exit plans or discharge plans out of the shelter, had -- HUD has a lot of rules that are not consistent with the violence against women act. Recently our local continuum of care in the whole state of Ohio is saying that we need to enter everybody into HMIS which is not going to happen because the violence against women act gives us the right not to do that. It seems futile for my perspective that they even tried to demand that we do that. I just have to say no. If we have to, if you feel that we have to, then at some point you are going to have to poll our funds because I am not going to do anything against the anonymity of the victims that we are serving. So sometimes it takes a higher level of conversation. I know it was mentioned by Annette Scott they have to do this in her area because they don't understand how what they are asking us to do is contrary to everything that we stand for. At a national and statewide level the coalitions and the MNADV need to take up for that with HUD because it would be somewhat adversarial to what we are trying to do.

>> Thank you.

>> This is something that we have talked about, this particular topic, we talked about the language around rules changes the concept and the way that we think and the change will affect our behavior and advocacy. I think, Laura, you said guidelines.

>> You used to determine guidelines and set of rules -- instead of rules.

>> Yes. We tend to use that word.

>> I think one of the things that this particular subject matter in the topic of language brings up is the use of the word you rules has concepts behind it. That is one thing that we learn a lot, how you think about it, how you frame something is that going to affect your behavior and your advocacy. I think in the beginning of today's talk we talked a little about that.

>> So, Laura uses guidelines. Annette what you use -- do you use?

>> We still use rules that we are working on that.

>> Rachel and Joanna?

>> This is Joanna and we use guidelines. And Rachel?

>> We use community living standards.

>> I like that one.

>> Yes. That is a really good one. We are moving away from it, intentionally because we know what rules mean and what concepts the term rules carries with it. That is an interesting piece to me.

>> One of the things I was thinking is what do we think about when we bring in, particularly when we talk about communal living, what are the factors? When I set up our organizations thinking about the shelter, and communal living, we thought about all of these things, because in our community there are groups of people coming in with different religious backgrounds, class backgrounds, residency status, all of these things. We can keep on adding to this list. The only piece I think we have to think about very critically is organizational expediency. Why are we doing what we are doing, is it because it is easier for the organization or is it because it is helpful for the people living in the shelter or the safe home? Are we emphasizing self-determination and autonomy.

>> I think Jen is going to send a link to this particular shelters rules guidelines, how the Earth did not fly into the sun, I can't sit on my screen but it must be there. Is a project to reduce violence in domestic violence shelters. Would you say a couple of words about that?

>> Yes. I explained earlier, it changed everything. I don't think I was big on rules to begin with, but my question was always, if we did not do this what would the end result to be? If we don't have a curfew how do we know that somebody is safe? I had all of these questions and all of these issues. Reading the manual changed all of that for me. It was huge and it opened my eyes to so many different things.

>> This is Joanna. This is one of the first resources that we found when we started looking around for other options. I will say for me personally it was radical. It made me see the things that I was taking for granted that were really fear-based, the person before me trained that this is what you do and I did not ever question it, largely out of fear. It made me laugh at myself and how much I think that I am controlling everything with all of these rules but the end result is that nothing is done in -- any better because you have the rules. I highly recommend it.

>> This reminds me of the factors that shape a worker's work or the way that they work, that you have all talked about, thought about and learned in ALC because that is exactly what it is, right, it is the culture that is passed on from one group to the next and how that works. So, that is wonderful.

>> I think we are running out of time, at this point. I would like each of you to just say a line to wrap up. Annette?

>> Thank you for having me. This is a very important discussion. We can all learn from each other. I think the most important thing is we do need to remember that we need our own check and balance system within ourselves as advocates. We need to remember that the house was created for others not for us and we need to encourage empowerment for not only the residence but for ourselves. Forcing an

Praxis International Advocacy Learning Center

imposing rules and oppression on others is only putting us in a position where we feel that we have power and control and we have issues that we need to adjust in order to be working with people.

>> Thank you. Rachel?

>> I would also like to say thank you for allowing me to turn -- participate and if any programs are considering changing the way they do things with the rules. How the earth didn't fly into the sun is central to that knowledge and the way that it approaches that is very helpful because they look at examining the rules in the context of power and control. I think it makes it so much easier and the implementation process when you get pushback from staff, having them read that and talk to you about it can be very helpful.

>> Joanna?

>> I would like to give a shout out to everyone who works in a shelter because it is hard work and there are no absolute right answers to any of this. Encourage others to remind ourselves that it is not our job to be in control and encourage us to keep an open mind and question ourselves and to continue to be compassionate. If we are doing changes in our organizations to do them in the most empowering way to the staff as well.

>> Thank you for reminding us, it is hard work and it is an extraordinary commitment that everyone shows who works in a shelter. And, Laura?

>> I would like to say thank you. This has been a lot of fun and it is a great conversation and I hope it is one that we can continue across the ALC and each one in our organizations, because I am imagining that we will never quite get to the last word on the topic. It is an ongoing conversation and as we get new staff in we will continue to learn, hopefully from each other and be able to grow with it as we try to do this good work.

>> Thank you. I would like to thank our guest four of you, and at -- Annette, Rachel, Laura, and Rachel for thinking your experience with everyone. Thank you for all of the participants and faculty who are here today, I hope the conversation keeps rolling and that we keep thinking about various aspects.

>>

>> The next advocacy discussion is on October 19 and I hope that all of you will participate in that also.

>> Thank you very much, I hope you keep changing the rules and keep questioning and go towards no rules and see what happens. Thank you very much. Goodbye everyone.