

A FACILITATED PEER GROUP SUPERVISION MODEL FOR PRACTITIONERS

By Mark Tisdall and Kieran O'Donoghue.

(Published Citation: Tisdall, M., and O'Donoghue, K. (2003) A Facilitated Peer Group Supervision Model for Practitioners. In McMaster, K. and Wells, A. (eds). *Innovative Approaches to Stopping Family Violence*, Wellington: Steele Roberts, pp. 221-232.)

This chapter will discuss a facilitated peer group supervision model for practitioners working in the family violence field. This model was developed and implemented successfully over the last four years in three offices in the Community Probation Service. In discussing this model we will firstly overview the practice setting and the nature and purpose of supervision in this setting. This will be followed by the issues and challenges experienced in implementing the model and a thorough discussion of the model itself. The chapter concludes with an evaluation of the model's effectiveness and a discussion of its future application.

Probation Practice, Family Violence and Supervision

Dale (1997) asserts that family violence is a key practice area in the Community Probation field. He describes probation officers as frontline workers in the family violence field involved in the assessment and case management of people convicted by the courts of family violence offences. Probation officers draw their mandate from the State and are expected to reduce reoffending and ensure that offenders comply with the conditions of their sentence (Campbell et al., 2001; Dale, 1997; O'Donoghue, 1999). This mandate involves probation officers in the monitoring of the offender's risk of reoffending; their attendance at programmes as well as supporting the offender's progress towards a non-violent lifestyle. The challenging nature of the probation officers work with family violence offenders along with the expectations of the State, public, the service and victims of family violence highlight the need for their practice to be supervised.

Traditionally, supervision in the probation service has been described in functional terms with the managerial and professional aspects being combined and the supervisor's role being undertaken by a line-manager (O'Donoghue, 1999). In 1997,

the Community Probation Service introduced a new supervision policy. This policy changed the traditional supervision arrangements, moving from the combination of managerial and professional supervision in one role to the separation of managerial and professional supervision. Managerial supervision was to be provided by the service manager and professional supervision would be provided by either probation officers in a peer arrangement or externally contracted supervisors. Professional supervision was defined in this policy as (Community Corrections Service, 1998: 3):

Synonymous with Clinical Supervision. It encompasses accountable practice, professional development, personal support, and mediation and advocacy.

The General Manager of the Community Probation Service introduced the policy by stating that, "Professional Supervision is crucial to effective interaction with offenders to achieve the reduction in re-offending" (Community Corrections Service, 1997: 2).

Essentially, professional supervision provides process accountability for practitioners through the creation of a forum, which facilitates critical reflective conversations concerning practitioners' knowing, decision-making and action in the course of their practice with offenders and significant others (O'Donoghue, 1999). The purpose and *raison d'être* for supervision is to facilitate the best possible practice and the best possible practice outcomes (O'Donoghue, 2001). Dale (1997: 48) illustrates what this means in practice through the following six practice principles, which he argues should guide both practice and supervision with family violence offenders:

1. A clear philosophical framework which guides intervention.
2. Written policy guidelines for practice consistency.
3. Standardised intervention actions
4. Regular monitoring of practice to ensure the practitioner avoids collusion
5. Protection of the victim is central any intervention.
6. On going evaluation regarding victim safety and the achievement of the goals of the intervention.

ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

There are two intertwined themes that recur through this chapter as a sub-text and which create a dynamic particular to probation work, which is also relevant to the field of family violence. These themes emerge from the social care and social control

dilemma and become evident in the duality of role and purpose in probation work. This duality is based in the tension between the legalistic and surveillance role and the helping, therapeutic and problem solver role (Trotter, 1999). The first theme relates to the nature of the client group, whilst the second theme relates to a professional social work culture.

In relation to the first theme, the clients of the community probation service are involuntary and mandated to be clients by virtue of a court sentence or parole conditions (Dale, 1997; Campbell et al., 2001). Arguably, their motivation for change in a lot of cases falls between precontemplation and contemplation stages in Prochaska et al. (1984), stage model of change. This means that clients either do not desire to change but their circumstances (i.e. being on a court order) cause them to consider it or they are engaged in actively weighing up the pros and cons of changing or not changing as a result of their circumstances. In other words the clients have a degree of resistance to change. In the case of family violence offenders there is the further challenge of them being immersed in a culture of violence and being stuck with patterns that they have learned over a lengthy period (Dale, 1997; McMaster, 1992). This theme creates issues and challenges for probation officers concerning community and victim safety, the reduction of reoffending and their focus of sentence and behavioural compliance by the client. The context in which these challenges are framed is one of social and political pressure based in societal expectation and attitudes to perpetrators of violence (Newbold, 1992). The effect of this theme is that the probation officers emphasise their legalistic or surveillance role and take the stance that the clients are resistant and unwilling to change and that the probation officers role is purely one of ensuring compliance (Trotter, 1993).

The second theme, that of a professional social work culture is:

- concerned with ethical and professional practice standards;
- based in an informed, intentional and integrated knowledge and skill base;
- committed to the personal and professional development of the worker; and
- the rehabilitation of the offender through their participation in appropriate treatment.


This theme creates challenges for probation officers in relation to their professional identity, role, practice philosophy and use of power and authority. The effect of this

theme is that probation officers emphasise their helping, therapeutic or problem solving role.

At an organisational level the dynamic between the two themes is borne by the one the one hand by the organisations structures, procedures and practices which promote accountability to through the department to society and have their origin in the managerial model rather than the professional model. Whereas on the other hand, the practice expectations amongst the field staff are derived from a social work history and carry with them a concern for social as well as individual transformation (O'Donoghue, 1999; Leibrich, 1993).

The concept of parallel process is helpful in explaining the affect of these dynamics and their presence in supervision. Parallel process refers to the idea that patterns of interaction or dynamics can be replicated at different levels of system (Kadushin, 1992). Generally, in the supervision literature it has been discussed in terms of the dynamic between client and worker being replicated in the supervisor/supervisee interaction (Shulman, 1993). An example to illustrate this in the family violence setting would be a client that behaves in a session with a probation officer by blaming others, evading responsibility, denying and minimising their actions and that this leads to the probation officer replicating those dynamics in supervision. This traditional conceptualisation of parallel process has been based in linear causality, i.e. that what happens in the client/worker relationship influences what happens in the worker/supervisor relationship. It is our experience and argument that parallel process is better understood a reflexive process based in circular causality (Dallos et al., 2000). Figure 1, below is a diagrammatic representation of transmission of parallel process through the work system.

Figure 1. Parallel Process through the work system



The above diagram shows that the parallel process influence in the system is shaped by a wide range of relationships and processes and that the replication of the dynamics in any particular dyad relationship may be representative of social, organisational, and managerial dynamics as well as those from direct practice. The following comment attributed to Griff Page, a former manager of the Children and Young Persons Service by the *Manawatu Evening Standard* (24 November 1995) summarises the effect of parallel process in an organisation:

[He] described morale as variable and said the service mirrored the dysfunctional nature of its clients to an alarming extent.

Concerning the supervision of probation officers in New Zealand two studies have found that the societal and organisational context influences and shapes the practice of supervision (Bracey, 1981; O'Donoghue, 1999). Both these studies also found that the probation service did not have a strong supervision culture and that it replicated its individualist case-management model as a dominant supervision model. The effective of this was that the managerial model predominated over social work professional practice and resulted in the development of the new supervision policy in 1997 (O'Donoghue, 1999). The facilitated peer group model was piloted in one of the sixteen probation areas with the aim of developing the professional practice and supervision culture. It was also an innovative way of meeting a lack of internal peer supervisors in that area and to implement of the Service's supervision policy. Initially the main purpose of the programme was to:

1. establish a culture of professional supervision,
2. develop trust and mutual respect between team members,
3. establish group ground rules,
4. assist individuals identify areas for professional development,
5. identify probation officers who would be suitable peer supervisors.

The Initial Setting

A further challenge was posed by the initial setting into which the group supervision was introduced. The Community Probation Service was in 1998, an organisation with a low trust culture in the midst of considerable change (O'Donoghue, 1999). This setting was characterised by:

- fiscal restraint and budget dominance;

- constant change;
- high stress for both staff and managers;
- low staff turnover;
- low staff morale;
- with experienced and competent staff showing signs of burnout.

This setting meant that the supervision programme needed to address the immediate needs of participants by allowing for their expression of feelings concerning working conditions, changes and experiences of stress. The expression of these feelings together with a constructive problem-solving approach, which emphasised proactivity and responsibility, assisted them through the changes with minimal disruption to their professional practice. This response of providing a forum for ventilation of personal and professional stress to the participants whilst an initial focus was not the sole purpose of the supervision program. It was rather, an innovative response to the requirement for professional supervision within the confines of a limited budget and at a time when the teams are unable to adequately resource themselves for professional supervision. The group program at a systemic level promoted change towards collective team responsibility for the service provision as well as preparing individuals within the teams for the future role of peer supervisor. In fact the process allowed all group members to benefit from the practice wisdom of other staff and “coat tail” on learning through issues raised by other team members.

FACILITATED PEER GROUP SUPERVISION MODEL

The idea of a facilitated peer group supervision model evolved from ideas drawn from strengths-based supervision, group supervision theory, change theory and family systems theory. The literature on strengths model of practice emphasises the importance of group supervision in supporting direct service delivery (Rapp, 1998). According to Rapp, (1998: 181) the strengths-based form of group supervision is designed to accomplish three purposes:

1. Support and affirmation
2. Ideas
3. Learning

This approach to supervision is also positive, optimistic about clients and views the community as an oasis of resources. It also focuses the supervision on the best outcomes for the client.

Group supervision theory informed the model through the recognition of mutual aid processes of sharing information, engaging in debate and discussion from differing perspectives, providing a forum for conversation about sensitive issues, sharing experiences and feelings and supporting for each other in staff groups (Shulman, 1993). It also informed the role of the supervisor, which was one of facilitative leadership and mediation. Change theory informed the model through recognition that the process of group supervision was seeking change in the individuals in the group through systemic change. Family systems theory was used as a framework for conceptualising casework and to ensure that both persons and their environments were considered.

Establishing the Group Supervision

The first priority of the program was to establish strong relationships with the individuals in the groups and build trust. In the initial sessions time was spent developing an understanding of the process and purpose of supervision and the role of the group supervisor. The aim at this stage was to develop the group identity and purpose based on trust and mutual respect. At this stage, the facilitator validated the participant's specialist knowledge of the field of practice that is Community Probation whilst also establishing his expertise in social work group process, dynamics and professional practice. This put many of the more experienced probation officers at ease as they were still regarded as the experts in their field of practice and became a resource for the rest of the group. Many of these people had been working together for a considerable time, sometimes in excess of twenty years. This is very unusual in public social service departments and testifies to the stability and depth of experience within this service. This history also carried within it the potential for discord and animosity based on previous events and relationships and required sensitivity and awareness on the part of the facilitator. The mutual establishment of an agreement between the group and the facilitator also assisted this. This agreement included the group's guidelines and the facilitator's expectations of the group.

Typically the group guidelines would include the following:

- Confidentiality. What is said in the group remains in the group especially in regard to personal issues and contributions
- Punctuality and keeping to time
- Commitment. Keeping the supervision time clear of other appointments and being prepared for supervision
- Every member of the group deserves to be listened to properly
- Be sensitive and respectful of others feelings and cultural needs
- Begin each session with a positive round/ reflection on our own work and achievement

Alongside the group agreement, the group would also develop its own group supervision goals. Likewise, each participant developed their own individual goals. Some typical group goals were:

- To develop group rapport and emotional safety.
- Identify and discuss common problems in our professional practice.
- Support and guide each other in managing office politics.
- Create a forum to discuss professional and practice ethical dilemmas and develop strategies.
- Bring positive outcomes of our work as well as problems.
- To develop and update knowledge and skill in working with particular client groups e.g. sexual offenders.
- To enjoy the sessions and be empowered by them.

The Development of the Group

Within the sessions the group found in each other a source of personal and professional support that had clear boundaries and focus. The work of the group and the process itself can be seen to parallel the work and processes engaged by workers and clients dealing with domestic violence offending. Namely, the open nature of the group programme encouraged the sharing of experience and opinions in a forum that allowed these to be discussed and challenged in a supportive way. Alternative ways of dealing with issues and problems emerged from the group and used the strengths, experience and personal attributes present in the group. The resources that present in the group ranged from extensive probation practice experience from senior workers through to specific knowledge of particular client issues from newer workers who

came from fields of practice having a relevance to this work e.g. mental health, addictions and clinical psychology.

The Facilitator's role and the work of the group

The facilitator's role was one of facilitating group process, ensuring that the group met its own goals and observed its own guidelines rather than one of practice expert. The facilitator's own area of expertise, namely, family systems therapy and mental health practice was relevant and provided a differing and often useful perspective in the discussion and resolution of some issues. The external nature of the role meant that some of the knowledge and experience of the facilitator was different to that usually available in the probation service this was beneficial to the participants as it exposed them to concepts and ideas they would not have otherwise considered. There were also advantages in the external nature of the facilitator's role in that it was not part of the management or organisation hierarchy of the service. One particular advantage of this was that it enabled the free expression of feeling. Another was that it opened the way for constructive action in regard to some of the organisational challenges that the teams were facing. Sometimes this involved the group making representation to management about these issues and offering their own solutions.

The work discussed in the group sessions generally included the discussion of client problems, practice and ethical dilemmas, and the management of organisational and administrative requirements. In the discussion of any topic the focus was on empowering the group members to support each other and to be proactive in resolving these issues. By working in this way the group was modelling empowering practice with clients who view themselves as powerless victims. In the discussion of client related problems not only was the combined expertise and experience of group members invaluable but also it was frequently the case that the client had been on another worker's caseload previously. As a result much informal history and information was able to be exchanged often aiding the resolution of the issue.

As stated earlier probation officers often have on their caseloads persistent and violent offenders who are at great risk of reoffending. The group process offered a forum not only for support and advice but also for a sharing of the sense of responsibility that comes from working with these clients. Furthermore, the courses of action that emerged from group supervision carried a sense of shared accountability for the outcome that was a source of support for the worker concerned. It would sometimes

happen that a worker was tending towards collusion with a violent offender and such is the subtlety of such collusion that it occurs at a seeming innocent level in the early stages before becoming an impediment to effective practice later (Dale, 1997). In group supervision these subtle collusions were often picked up in the early stages or were brought to the group by the worker concerned as something that worried them because it didn't feel quite right. The equality of the peer relationships in the group and the external facilitation made these issues easy to raise. A representative example would be the worker who was being persuaded by a young client not to reveal what he had told her in confidence about a gun that he had hidden. In the supervision the group was able to let her explore and deal with her concerns not only about the gun but also about the effects of her actions on her relationship with the client. In the end she came to the decision that she would work with the client to encourage him to report the gun to the police himself. In working towards this she would also specify the consequences of not reporting the gun to the police for both of them and a timeframe. In this outcome, the probation officer both preserved her relationship with the client and took appropriate action. The airing of this issue in the group setting confronted the secrecy and hidden agendas so typical of violent offending and enabled the worker not to become entangled in this web.

EVALUATION

An evaluation of the external supervision was recently conducted with 14 of the 18 staff involved responding. Table 1, below summaries the findings:

Table 1. Participants Evaluation of Group Supervision

| <i>Aspect</i> | <i>Finding</i> | <i>Participant's Comments</i> |
|---------------|--|--|
| Attendance | 10 staff rated their attendance at 90% or better and 4 staff rated themselves in the 50 – 70% range. | Comments on low attendance referred to court servicing, crisis management, secondment and PD duties as being the reasons for absence. |
| Goals | Ten staff thought that they had achieved or partly achieved their supervision goals as detailed in their contracts. Four staff identified goals set that they had not achieved. Two of these responses related to CRIMPS. Examples of the goals met through supervision are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed and improved my knowledge base. • Discussed and resolved ethical | Examples of comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have found the supervision /mentoring process invaluable • Group supervision has raised awareness of ethical/practice issues, which may otherwise have been glossed over. It has created an open safe environment for discussion • The need for team support in a small office is very important |

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| | <p>issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported through change • Developed casework practice skills. • Fostered team co-operation and communication | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision sessions have given me insight into the importance of supporting colleagues in all areas. |
| Contribution | <p>All staff with the exception of a very new staff member saw themselves as actively contributing to the supervision sessions. Some staff acknowledged that they do not always bring their own issues and cases and for one person this was because of not wanting to share in the group setting.</p> | |
| Professional Benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high number of staff (13) believed that supervision had helped them with casework issues or problems. • 13 staff had an increased awareness of themselves in the work role. • 9 staff had a better understanding of professional issues in the service and had new learning about practice methods. • 8 staff felt better able to address interpersonal issues with clients, believed supervision had improved team work and relationships and felt able to express themselves freely in regard to service and Organisational issues. • 4 staff had learnt about procedure and practice in the department. | <p>Comments in this section included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have found the benefits of supervision to be totally positive for myself and the department • In group supervision it is good to hear/know that others have similar issues and problems, I am not on my own! • It is the only forum for free expression of thought and to be positively challenged about that thinking. • While we have not covered all the gaps in my knowledge, I am more aware that there are gaps! • Have been able to have some issues resolved where the manuals have not been clear. |
| Facilitation | <p>Comments were elicited on the facilitation and since this was an open question a range of typical comments follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An opportunity for everyone to express their views • Differing opinions are valued • Importance is given to non interruption when speaking • Team work in forming solutions • Input from supervisor in solving problems • Safe non-judgmental atmosphere. | <p>A selection of comments follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It gave me a forum to ask questions and see how experienced staff handled different situations • Supervision has always been stimulating, challenging, occasionally tough, and always fun! • I enjoy your style and the skills you bring. After all the years of poor, non-existent supervision that I have experienced this is refreshing. • (Supervision sessions) develop increased team awareness and provide solutions where |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>sometimes I thought there were none</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have found the professional supervision to be very positive and supportive. I have personally grown in all areas of my life through the assistance of group supervision. |
|--|--|---|

Generally the evaluation indicated an enthusiasm, for the style of supervision and an improvement in staff morale, relationships and professionalism. It also appears that the staff that responded feel empowered to deal with the challenges they faced from organisation changes in a proactive and productive manner that to some extent met their concerns about the dangers of compromising professional standards.

FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

The facilitated peer supervision model provides a range of future possibilities in terms of its application in the supervision of family violence practitioners both with agencies and across agencies. Within larger agencies it has the potential to:

- Foster a team approach to client issues that is strengths based
- Develop a culture of supervision within an organisation that takes account of the dynamic and conflicting demands between the organisation and professional practice in a way that does not put participants at risk and allows greater participation by staff in the organisation's development
- Challenge the one to one norm for supervision practice in a way that empowers workers, enhances team identity and cohesion, improves accountability and avoids collusion and focuses on the work rather than the worker
- Promotes an awareness of a wider range of participants in the work with violent offenders than just the convicted client.
- Provides a process by which those involved in the family violence field might consider an interagency form of supervision that co-operatively and collaboratively supports and challenges them through their interaction with others in the field.

References

- Bracey, O. 1981, Casework Supervision In the New Zealand Probation Service, Auckland, University of Auckland, MA Thesis.
- Campbell, L. and Marra, B. 2001, 'History and Practice of Probation in Aotearoa New Zealand' New Zealand Social Work: Contexts and Practice, ed. M. Connolly, Oxford University Press, Auckland.
- Community Corrections Service 1998, Update Staff Newsletter 6 May 1998 Issue 9, Head Office, Department of Corrections.
- Community Corrections Service 1997, Professional Supervision Communication Kit, Wellington, Head Office, Department of Corrections.
- Dale, M. 1997, Case Management Intervention with Violent Offenders: An Action Research Approach to the Development of a Practice Model, Palmerston North, Massey University, MSW Thesis.
- Dallos, R., and Draper, R. 2000, An Introduction to Family Therapy, Basingstoke, Open University Press.
- Kadushin, A. 1992, Supervision in Social Work, 3rd Edition, New York, University of Columbia Press.
- Leibrich, J. 1993, Straight to the Point: Angles on Giving up Crime, Dunedin, University of Otago Press.
- Manawatu Evening Standard. 1995, "Gresham Supports Page's Comment". 24 November 1995, p.7.
- McMaster, K. 1992, Feeling Angry Playing Fair: A Guide to Change, Auckland, Reed.
- Newbold, G. 1992, Crime and Deviance, Auckland, Oxford University Press.
- O'Donoghue, K. 1999, Professional Supervision Practice Under New Public Management: A Study of the Perspective of Probation Officers and Service Managers In the Community Probation Service, Palmerston North: Massey University, MPhil Thesis.
- O'Donoghue, K. 2001, 'The future of social work supervision within Aotearoa/New Zealand', Supervision Conference 7-8 July 2000 from rhetoric to reality: Keynote Address and Selected Papers, eds. L. Beddoe and J Worrall, ACE, Auckland.
- Prochaska, J. and Diclemente, C. 1984, The Transtheoretical Approach: Crossing Traditional Boundaries of Therapy, Homewood, Dow Jones/Irwin.

Rapp, C. 1998, The Strengths Model: Case Management with People Suffering from Severe and Persistent Mental Illness, New York, Oxford University Press.

Shulman, L. 1993, Interactional Supervision, Washington DC, NASW Press.

Trotter, C. 1999, Working with Involuntary Clients: A Guide to Practice, St Leonards, NSW, Allen and Unwin.