



Evaluation of the ‘Supervision Resource Guide: Supervising Facilitators of Men’s Domestic Violence Perpetrator Intervention Group Programs’

QUT Centre for Justice

Prepared by:

Dr Brodie Evans and Dr Justine Hotten

December 2022

Evaluation period:

January 2021 – November 2021

Published by:

QUT Centre for Justice
Kelvin Grove Campus
149 Victoria Park Rd
Kelvin Grove QLD 4059
qutc4j@qut.edu.au
+ 61 7 3138 9348

TEQSA [PRV12079](#) | CRICOS 00213J

Contact:

Dr Brodie Evans
Email: b10.evans@qut.edu.au

Suggested Citation:

Evans, B. & Hotten, J. (2022). Evaluation of the 'Supervision resource guide: Supervising facilitators of men's domestic violence perpetrator intervention group programs'. *QUT Centre for Justice Research Report Series* (December). Brisbane, Queensland. ISSN 2652-3809

Executive Summary

Men's domestic and family violence (DFV) perpetrator intervention group programs are an integral part of the DFV sector (Chung et al., 2020). Working in men's DFV perpetrator intervention group programs can increase the safety of women and children by working with men to stop their reoffending as part of a wider, integrated systems response (Mackay et al., 2015). To be effective, however, this work requires specialist skills, experience, awareness of gendered power dynamics, and resilience (Apps & Gregory, 2011; A. Taylor et al., 2020). Facilitators of these programs must be equipped with knowledge and skills that help them manage such a demanding and challenging role. Practice principles and standards recommend that Facilitators are guided and supported in their roles through access to professional supervision provided by their organisation (see, e.g., Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women [Queensland], 2020, p. 10). Researchers have explored the role of supervision in this unique workforce (Conley, 2012; Kashkooli-Ellat, 2022; Reimer, 2020; Vlasis et al., 2017). However, little attention has been given to the importance of Supervisors' observation of facilitation practice, nor have any evidence-based resources been produced to guide Supervisors in this. The research in this report contributes to addressing this gap.

The evaluation reported here explored the experiences of supervision at two DFV perpetrator intervention group programs (the Men's Domestic Violence Offender Program provided in Brisbane by Brisbane Domestic Violence Service – Micah Projects and the Responsible Men program provided in Logan by YFS). In 2021, both services implemented the evidence-informed *Supervision Resource Guide: Supervising Facilitators of Men's Domestic Violence Perpetrator Intervention Group Programs* designed by Supervisors Dr Brodie Evans and Ms Pamela Robertson (Evans & Robertson, 2021). This guide offers a best practice model of supervision focusing on observing group facilitation. The evaluation included two online surveys with Facilitators and semi-structured interviews with Supervisors. The online surveys were conducted early in the implementation of the *Supervision Resource Guide* to collect Facilitators' experiences of supervision in this field. After 10 months of using the supervision model, another online survey was conducted to collect Facilitators' views on the new supervision structure. After a period of using the *Supervision Resource Guide*, internal and external Supervisors were interviewed to collect their impressions and insights.

Findings

The key themes in the surveys and interviews were:

1. Developing practice skills, particularly the use of critical dialogue, is a priority for Facilitators.
2. It is expected that supervision involving live observation of group facilitation will guide practice development.
3. Different-gendered Facilitators experience unique challenges that should be considered in supervision.
4. Supervision should be regular, timely and documented.
5. Supervisors should be appropriately skilled.
6. Facilitators need openness and the skills to reflect on their own practice.

The evaluation revealed that Facilitators were most satisfied with supervision by an internal Supervisor who was also an experienced Senior Facilitator able to provide consistent live observations and timely feedback. It also found that the *Supervision Resource Guide* met its aims effectively in the two DFV intervention sites investigated (as seen in Table 1).

Table 1: Summary of the Evaluation's Findings

Aims of the <i>Supervision Resource Guide</i> (Evans & Robertson, 2021)	Evaluation Findings
➤ to enhance professional practice	Met
➤ to share knowledge and skills	Met
➤ to improve job satisfaction, role and job quality	Met
➤ to support organisations in providing accountable group programs	Met
➤ to improve outcomes for adult and child victim-survivors, and group participants	Met in principle; outside of scope of evaluation
➤ to build confidence within the Integrated Service Response	Met in principle; outside of scope of evaluation

Recommendations

Based on the qualitative evaluation data, we offer service providers the following recommendations:

- Organisations should use the *Supervision Resource Guide*, implementing or adapting the proposed supervision model and using its templates to suit the needs of the program staff.
- Regular and consistent individual supervision of Facilitators should be delivered to complement the *Supervision Resource Guide*.
- Supervisors should have experience in facilitating men's DFV perpetrator intervention group programs.
- Supervisors should attend training on supervision specific to the work of Facilitators of perpetrator intervention work.
- Facilitators should attend training on critical reflective practice.

Acknowledgments

This report presents the findings of an evaluation prepared for Brisbane Domestic Violence Service – Micah Projects, YFS and WorkUP Queensland. Data were drawn from surveys and interviews collected with funding from a \$5,714.40 Practitioner Engagement Award from the QUT Centre for Justice. Supplementary transcript writing, analysis and evaluation write-up were made possible by in-kind support from YFS for Dr Brodie Evans' time, who also volunteered more of his own time, and Dr Justine Hotten volunteering her own time. Unfortunately, the limited resourcing of this evaluation affected the timeliness of its completion and the availability of the final report. We thank the participating organisations and research participants for their patience.

We would like to thank the Facilitators and Supervisors who gave their time to participate in the surveys or interviews and share their experiences throughout this project. We hope this evaluation helps to develop the capacity and delivery of supervision in the men's perpetrator intervention space, increase staff wellbeing and support their practice in keeping primarily women and children safe by addressing men's use of domestic and family violence.

We also publicly acknowledge Ms Pamela Robertson, former Program Manager of YFS and co-author of the *Supervision Resource Guide*. Thank you for your support of this evaluation and your leadership in the sector. We also thank Dr Bridget Harris, former Lecturer at QUT, for your initial guidance and support in conducting this evaluation.

Dr Brodie Evans and Dr Justine Hotten





Acknowledgement of Country

In keeping with the spirit of Reconciliation, we acknowledge and pay our respects to the Traditional Custodians of the land where we do much of our work, the Turrbal and Yuggera peoples and Yugambah-speaking peoples. We pay our respects to their Elders, lores, customs and creation spirits. We also pay our respects to the First Nations leaders in the domestic and family violence sector, who continue to shape our understanding of community justice and accountability. In our limited time on these lands, we have been privileged to see some of the rich history and culture of our First Nations people. We will continue to listen and learn, appreciating that these have always been places of teaching and learning.

About QUT Centre for Justice

QUT Centre for Justice is a think tank for social justice that aims to empower and enable citizens, consumers and communities through solutions-oriented research. Our vision is to democratise justice by improving opportunities for health and wellbeing and enhancing the inclusiveness of work and education while widening access to justice (QUT Centre for Justice, n.d.).



About the Research Team

Dr Brodie Evans is a Visiting Fellow at the QUT Centre for Justice. His research examines discourse, law and public policy, and political activism in relation to issues of social and criminal injustice. At the time of publication, Brodie is also the Practice Manager of the Responsible Men program at YFS, and he has extensive experience facilitating men's domestic and family violence perpetrator intervention programs. Dr Evans sits on various networks and committees contributing to developing the domestic and family violence sector and advocating for law and systems reforms in Australia.

Dr Justine Hotten is an academic and researcher who focuses on sexual violence and domestic and family violence. She currently works with professionals undertaking a graduate certificate on domestic and family violence responses, as well as a range of research projects on sexual consent, sexual violence perpetrator reintegration, supervision in men's domestic violence intervention programs and the connections between learning and research. Dr Hotten is well placed to help support professionals and victim-survivors across the sector through research, policy development and training.

Author Contributions

Funding proposal – Dr Brodie Evans
Evaluation design – Dr Brodie Evans, Dr Justine Hotten
Ethics approval – Dr Justine Hotten
Data collection – Dr Justine Hotten
Data analysis – Dr Justine Hotten, Dr Brodie Evans
Report writing – Dr Brodie Evans, Dr Justine Hotten

List of Abbreviations

BDVS	Brisbane Domestic Violence Service – Micah Projects
DFV	domestic and family violence
DJAG	Department of Justice and Attorney-General
QUT	Queensland University of Technology

Note on Terminology

The terminology used in the domestic violence sector’s internal and external communication continues to evolve. In this report, we use the terminology ‘**men’s domestic and family violence (DFV) perpetrator intervention programs**’ for specificity. These programs are referred to as ‘perpetrator intervention programs’ in government policy documents and are also commonly known as ‘men’s behaviour change programs’. We acknowledge that some may not prefer to refer to persons using violence in relationships as ‘perpetrators’, though we recognise that this report’s intended audience, which works within the sector, is familiar with that terminology. ‘Behaviour change’ is also understood by many within the sector as problematic, given that attitudes and beliefs are at the core of abusive behaviour and are the focus of change in many programs.

‘**Supervision**’ as a concept is understood in various ways in a variety of different professional contexts. The *Supervision Resource Guide* under evaluation (Evans & Robertson, 2021) explains the unique context of observational practice supervision that is relevant to this project, and this will further be expanded on in this report.

Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Acknowledgments	v
Acknowledgement of Country	vi
About the QUT Centre for Justice	vii
About the Research Team	vii
List of Abbreviations	viii
Note on Terminology	viii
List of Tables	x
Background to the Evaluation	1
Evaluation Approach	3
Evaluation Framework—Participatory Action Research	3
Research Design	5
Sampling and Participant Recruitment	5
Surveys	6
Interviews	8
Limitations	9
Qualitative Interviews and Survey Findings	10
Discussion and Recommendations	16
Recommendations for the Sector	19
Recommendations for Researchers	19
References	20

List of Tables

Table 1: Summary of the Evaluation's Findings.....iv	iv
Table 2: Time Working in the Domestic Violence Sector and as a Facilitator 8	8
Table 3: Summary of the Evaluation's Findings..... 16	16

Background to the Evaluation

Men's domestic and family violence (DFV) perpetrator intervention group programs are recognised as key stakeholders in identifying and responding to perpetrators of DFV (Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration, 2022; Chung et al., 2020). These programs and their Facilitators are responsible for holding perpetrators accountable, increasing the safety of women and children affected by men's use of violence, and working with violent men to reduce and stop their use of abusive and controlling behaviours (Chung et al., 2020). The Facilitators of men's DFV perpetrator intervention group programs must demonstrate competency in their role by ensuring their groups operate in alignment with an evidence-based, best practice framework. To ensure Facilitators adhere to this framework, and to provide access to professional development, it is imperative that Facilitators receive regular and documented supervision. In the unique space of men's DFV perpetrator intervention, however, supervision has largely been developed by individual organisations. This has meant that supervision varies across the DFV sector, and little training and direction is given to provide the necessary level of support to Supervisors.

It is well established that vicarious trauma and burnout are significant challenges to domestic violence frontline workers supporting victims of abuse (see, e.g., A. K. Taylor et al., 2019). Working with men who use violence in their intimate partner relationships also poses safety risks to workers for organisations to consider (Heward-Belle et al., 2019, p. 378; Morran, 2008). Recent research in the United Kingdom highlights the need for organisations to ensure adequate support mechanisms are in place for Facilitators of domestic violence perpetrator intervention group programs (Renahan, 2021). The evaluation reported here aimed to contribute to the small but growing body of literature providing empirical research on the experiences of supervision in the unique workforce of DFV perpetrator intervention group Facilitators (see, e.g., Conley, 2012; Kashkooli-Ellat, 2022; Reimer, 2020).

As providers of men's DFV perpetrator intervention group programs in South East Queensland, Brisbane Domestic Violence Service (BDVS) and YFS (formerly Youth and Family Services) are committed to building the evidence base to support best practices and the continued sustainability of their work to address gender-based violence. With this objective in mind, towards the end of 2020, Dr Brodie Evans (with BDVS¹) and Ms Pamela Robertson (with YFS²) sought to address the gap in organisational resources around the supervision of group Facilitators of men's DFV perpetrator intervention group programs. Partial funding for this supervision project was received from WorkUP Queensland, which supports the development of specialist services and practices responding to domestic, family and sexual violence and women's health. The project involved the development and delivery of the *Supervision Resource Guide*, which was implemented in January 2021 by BDVS and YFS. The project represents the first tailored model of supervision specific to the field of men's DFV perpetrator intervention.

Dr Evans and Ms Robertson (2021) published a resource guide aimed specifically at assisting Supervisors in the live observation of group programs as a practical tool to shape reflective practice. This *Supervision Resource Guide: Supervising Facilitators of Men's Domestic Violence Perpetrator Intervention Group Programs* was developed to comply with the recommendations included in the Queensland Government's *Domestic and Family Violence Services Practice Principles, Standards and Guidance* (Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women [Queensland], 2020) and *Perpetrator Intervention Services Requirements*

¹ In the data collection period of the evaluation, Dr Evans was the Program Manager of BDVS's Men's Domestic Violence Offender Program. From March 2022, and at the time of publication, Dr Evans is now the Practice Manager of YFS's Responsible Men program.

² In the data collection period of the evaluation, Ms Robertson was the Program Manager of YFS's Responsible Men program. At the time of publication, Ms Robertson now provides consultancy and training to the DFV sector.

(Department of Justice and Attorney-General [Queensland; DJAG], 2022). The *Supervision Resource Guide* is a best practice model of supervision that is regular, documented and builds on Facilitators' competencies as they work to improve outcomes for men who use violence against their intimate partners, and for all victim-survivors of men's domestic violence. It is aimed to provide a supervision tool to be implemented across Australia's national DFV sectors and adapted as needed.

Alongside its development and delivery in 2021, Dr Evans sought funding through a Practitioner Engagement Award with the QUT Centre For Justice, where he is also a Visiting Fellow, to support an evaluation component. The QUT Centre for Justice prioritises working collaboratively with practitioners to produce research that develops and benefits systems of justice. This evaluation was prepared by Dr Evans and research assistant Dr Justine Hotten. As Koens and Ninnes (2020, p. 1) note, organisations already observe which practices and processes are effective in meeting program objectives. The purpose of an evaluation is to document these observations and, in this case, assess the implementation of the *Supervision Resource Guide* against its aims.

In addition to BDVS and YFS specifically, this report's intended audience is those who deliver DJAG-funded men's domestic violence intervention group programs. It aims to support their practice and compliance with regulatory requirements including the *Domestic and Family Violence Services Practice Principles, Standards and Guidance* (Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women [Queensland], 2020). It is intended for use by organisations in supervising Facilitators, supporting and retaining them in this challenging work. This resource may also assist those providing external supervision to individual practitioners or facilitation teams. Beyond the practice of supervision, we hope that this evaluation provides the necessary evidence to support advocacy for supervision to be a funded component of men's domestic violence intervention program contracts and to demonstrate the importance of supervision and practice development to ensuring sustainable and safe programs and interventions.

Evaluation Approach

There is an emerging field of literature on the challenging work of facilitating men's DFV perpetrator intervention group programs (Morran, 2008), the role supervision needs to play to ensure best practice, and the wellbeing and retention of Facilitators (Conley, 2012; Reimer, 2020; A. Taylor et al., 2020, p. 43). However, there is little evidence on effective supervision models or evidence-based resources to specifically guide this supervision and meet its specific challenges. The evidence-informed *Supervision Resource Guide* was developed to address this need, and the evaluation reported here aimed to provide evidence for its effectiveness in meeting its aims (see, Evans & Robertson, 2021, p. 5):

- to enhance professional practice
- to share knowledge and skills
- to improve job satisfaction, role and job quality
- to support organisations in providing accountable group programs
- to improve outcomes for adult and child victims-survivors, and group participants
- to build confidence within the Integrated Service Response

The evaluation set out to contribute to the emerging understanding of the experiences of Supervisors and the group Facilitators being supervised in the men's DFV perpetrator intervention space (see, e.g., Conley, 2012; Reimer, 2020) and to investigate the effectiveness of the *Supervision Resource Guide* in shaping these experiences.

The evaluation process was an outcome and effectiveness evaluation (Kumar, 2011) used to measure the *Supervision Resource Guide's* effect on the Facilitators and Supervisors in two organisations working in men's DFV intervention group programs. In particular, the evaluation was designed to answer the following questions:

For Facilitators:

- What supervision has been provided for Facilitators of men's DFV intervention group programs?
- What do Facilitators want from supervision?
- How has using the *Supervision Resource Guide* impacted the roles of Facilitators?
- How has the *Supervision Resource Guide* worked for the specific field of men's DFV intervention?

For Supervisors and Services:

- How was using the *Supervision Resource Guide* important for Facilitators of men's DFV intervention group programs?
- How has using the *Supervision Resource Guide* impacted the roles of Supervisors and Facilitators?
- How has the *Supervision Resource Guide* worked for the specific field of men's DFV intervention?

Evaluation Framework—Participatory Action Research

Given Dr Evans' unique multiple roles as a manager, DFV practitioner and academic researcher and lead on this project, a participatory action research methodology was the most appropriate evaluation framework. A participatory evaluation sees the evaluator and stakeholders partnering and working collaboratively throughout the evaluation (Koens & Ninnes, 2020, p. 8). This approach is common in the violence against women sector, as sector practitioners have practice wisdom on the unique context and experiences of the work

(Campbell et al., 2004; Levin, 1999). This approach also provides greater ownership of the findings to stakeholders and helps to increase research-to-practice translation (Levin, 1999).

Initial conversations with stakeholders ensured the evaluation objectives met the needs of the organisations, BDVS and YFS, and preliminary interview and survey questions were co-designed to enhance 'process shaping outcomes' (Houston, 2010, p. 73). However, the fact that the evaluation investigated staff experiences of supervision by Dr Evans and Ms Robertson limited which findings the external research assistant, Dr Hotten, could share along the way to ensure any unintentional risks were mitigated. Although anonymised, survey responses could only be viewed by Dr Hotten in the data collection and topical coding stages (Richards, 2009, p. 100), as participants had consented. This data collection and coding protocol also reduced the likelihood of bias and influence on the data (Cruz, 2015). While no researcher is ever entirely free of preconceptions or assumptions about a subject matter, Dr Hotten had no prior experience with DFV perpetrator intervention group programs, the domestic violence sector or Supervisor–Facilitator relationships.

As with other participatory evaluations of YFS programs,³ this mutually beneficial partnership between evaluators and stakeholders was established and maintained through reciprocity and a feedback loop (Davidson & Bowen, 2011, p. 314) as follows:

- The *Supervision Resource Guide* was shared with Dr Justine Hotten before its publication.
- The themes in the findings of the first survey were shared with both BDVS and YFS, and feedback was accepted to shape the co-design of the final survey.
- Findings and recommendations were made clear and accessible to improve organisational capacity.
- BDVS and YFS were supported to present on the development of the *Supervision Resource Guide* and their experience of its evaluation at a Queensland-based sector-led conference.
- Future opportunities to partner with BDVS and YFS were welcomed, with a focus on continuous improvement and capacity building.

³ For example, in 2020–2021, YFS also evaluated their online delivery of men's DFV perpetrator intervention group programs in partnership with Central Queensland University. The final report (Sullivan et al., 2021) was made available to the stakeholders and evaluators to enhance the outcomes of this evaluation.

Research Design

The evaluation collected and analysed primary source material in two stages:

- Two surveys each of BDVS and YFS program Facilitators of men's DFV intervention group programs before and after the use of the *Supervision Resource Guide*.
- Semi-structured interviews with three internal Supervisors and one external Supervisor delivering supervision in 2021 for BDVS and YFS using the *Supervision Resource Guide*.

Ethics approval for the surveys and interviews was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of Queensland University of Technology (Ethics Number: 2021000179). The required category of ethical approval was 'low-risk research'. Participants were invited to speak on their professional experience and expertise, including reflections on their practice. Therefore, their participation was deemed 'low-risk', posing no risks beyond their normal day-to-day living.

The surveys provided initial demographic and quantitative data with predetermined categories from survey questions. A thematic analysis of the data was then conducted, detailing the key themes in the surveys and interviews. This first involved topical coding (Richards, 2009, p. 100) to organise data around the research questions. Analytical coding then allowed 'interpretation and reflection on meaning' (Richards, 2009, p. 102), looking for key concepts and patterns linked to broader themes found in the literature (Ayres, 2008, p. 868). This took the shape of insights into participants' expectations and experiences of supervision. Six key themes emerged and are presented here in the Findings section. We then considered the meanings in the context of the aims of the *Supervision Resource Guide*. We present our analysis in the Discussion section of this report.

Sampling and Participant Recruitment

Initially, Dr Evans sought consent from both participating organisations—BDVS and YFS—for the evaluation. BDVS (an activity of Micah Projects) provides services, support, and advocacy for DFV in the Brisbane region aligned with creating justice and responding to injustice (Micah Projects, n.d.). YFS works with vulnerable populations and leads community action to end DFV in Logan and surrounding areas (YFS, n.d.a.). For the duration of the evaluation in 2021, BDVS and YFS were delivering men's DFV perpetrator intervention group programs in Brisbane and Logan, respectively, funded by the Queensland DJAG. BDVS's program, the Men's Domestic Violence Offender Program, is an open-ended mandated 25-week program of 90-minute sessions with three groups per week (BDVS, n.d.).⁴ The Responsible Men program at YFS runs two-hour sessions with five groups per week over 16 weeks (YFS, n.d.b.). Both perpetrator intervention group programs run groups that are managed by two Facilitators of different genders; some Facilitators facilitate groups for both services.

While these programs are structured differently, both are aligned with the national standards and state requirements for perpetrator intervention services. Both programs' operations are underpinned by the Duluth Coordinated Community Response model (Domestic Abuse Intervention Programs, n.d.-a), which ensures that risk assessment is ongoing and collaborates with statutory and non-statutory agencies and services within the parameters of the Queensland Government's *Domestic and Family Violence: Information Sharing Guidelines* (Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services [Queensland], 2017). In addition, both programs' curriculums are developed from the Duluth model's power and control curriculum (Pence & Paymar, 1993), recognising the Power and Control Wheel and Equality

⁴ In 2022, BDVS transitioned the Men's Domestic Violence Offender Program from a 25-week, 37.5-hour intervention to a 16-week, 32-hour intervention, in accordance with funding contracts.

Wheel (see, Domestic Abuse Intervention Programs, n.d.-b) are key theoretical tools in understanding and responding to gender-based violence in intimate partner relationships. Given BDVS' and YFS' shared purpose, theoretical frameworks and close locality, they are ideal collaborators, and this also enabled an achievable scope for the evaluation.

A key difference between the programs is how they are coordinated with respect to who processes referrals, conducts assessments, manages noncompliance and exits, and prepares client engagement/exit summaries. At the time of the evaluation in 2021, BDVS's Facilitators were contracted to deliver the perpetrator intervention group sessions; referring agencies conducted assessments; and a full-time Program Coordinator/Manager coordinated the referrals, conducted individual phone-based inductions and managed noncompliance and exits from the program, including preparing engagement/exit summaries. This was a dual Coordinator/Manager position that provided supervision to the Facilitators. Conversely, YFS's Facilitators held part-time positions (working mostly four days per week), conducted the assessments with men and coordinated the delivery of the groups, which included managing noncompliance and preparing engagement/exit summaries. The YFS Program Manager led the practice and provided supervision to the team. This is relevant to note, as line management supervision differed between the teams. The *Supervision Resource Guide* focused on live group observations; therefore, line management and any individual practice supervision in addition to these observations were outside the scope of the evaluation. Program Managers in both BDVS and YFS also facilitated group sessions where needed, and they were supervised by their line managers. Their line management supervision was also outside the scope of the evaluation.

In addition to the Program Managers, BDVS and YFS decided to contract an external Supervisor in 2021 with funding support from a WorkUP Queensland Collaborative Workforce Grant. The Collaborative Grants program support eligible organisations to partner to develop service and workforce capacity (Healing Foundation, 2019). This supervision included live observations and debriefs with each co-Facilitator pairing across two cycles of the curriculum and team supervision in each organisation held partway through the year. This decision was made to contribute to a more robust evaluation. It allowed for investigations into the experiences of using the *Supervision Resource Guide* by a Supervisor who did not author the guide.

In summary, across the two services, a total of 12 Facilitators were initially contacted to complete the two surveys. The Supervisors invited to participate in individual interviews consisted of the following:

- two internal Program Managers
- one internal Supervisor external to both programs sitting within a different team at BDVS, delivering woman-only supervision of female Facilitators once per cycle due to the Program Manager being male, as was the case with BDVS in 2021
- one external Supervisor delivering supervision for both organisations.

Dr Evans and Ms Robertson provided the contact details of the Facilitators and Supervisors to Dr Justine Hotten, who invited participation in the surveys and interviews directly.

Surveys

Two surveys were conducted for the evaluation, Survey A and Survey B, to provide an evidence base for understanding the needs of supervision and outcomes of the *Supervision Resource Guide* for Facilitators of men's DFV perpetrator intervention group programs. As noted previously, both surveys were co-designed with BDVS and YFS in line with the participatory action research methodology. Both surveys were conducted in Key Survey, an online survey tool provided by QUT. In accordance with the ethical approval, survey participants were advised that participation was completely voluntary and that they could

withdraw at any time during the survey prior to submission. A decision not to participate in the research would not in any way affect their role or relationship with QUT researchers, BDVS or YFS. Participants were also informed that they could skip any questions they did not want to answer. Participants were advised that data would be de-identified at the point of collection and every effort would be made to ensure that the data could not be traced back to participants in reports, publications or other forms of presentation. The online survey displayed a consent form digitally, and completion of the online survey was understood as consenting to participation.

Survey A ran in January 2021, before the *Supervision Resource Guide* began to be used. Survey A gathered demographic details, key Facilitator skills, information about experiences of supervision in participants' roles as Facilitators and what participants needed from supervision. Facilitators were asked to consider the role of supervision as it specifically related to their roles of co-facilitating men's DFV intervention group programs. Facilitators were asked to provide details of any challenges, impacts, barriers or successes related to their experiences of supervision in their Facilitator roles.

Survey B occurred after the *Supervision Resource Guide* had been used for 11 months in facilitating men's DFV intervention group programs. Survey B asked Facilitators to reflect on the use of the *Supervision Resource Guide* throughout the year and on how it shaped their experiences of supervision and their engagement with the work. This included questions such as whether the use of the observation templates assisted in providing meaningful feedback and whether the *Supervision Resource Guide* supported the development of facilitation skills through supervision.

Survey Respondents

Of the 12 Facilitators contacted, seven Facilitators responded to survey A and two Facilitators responded to survey B. Those who responded to survey B responded to both surveys; one was from BDVS and one was from YFS. Of the total number of survey respondents ($n = 7$), three were men and four were women. Among the seven respondents, there was a mixture of professional backgrounds, including counselling ($n = 3$), social work ($n = 1$), human services ($n = 2$) and nil response ($n = 1$). At the time of the first survey, experience in the domestic violence sector ranged from 4 months to 23.5 years. Facilitators had worked specifically in men's domestic violence perpetrator intervention anywhere between 4 months to 8.5 years. Of the seven responses, two were Emerging Facilitators and five were Senior Facilitators.

Table 2: Time Working in the Domestic Violence Sector and as a Facilitator

Survey Respondent	Time in the Domestic Violence Sector	Time as a Facilitator of Perpetrator Intervention Groups
Respondent 1	10 years	8 years and 6 months
Respondent 2	3 years and 10 months	3 years and 10 months
Respondent 3	>10 years	3 years and 6 months
Respondent 4	23 years and 6 months	7 years and 5 months
Respondent 5	15 years	6 months
Respondent 6	5 years	5 years
Respondent 7	4 months	4 months

Interviews

In keeping with the evaluation grant and scope of the project, we conducted four semi-structured interviews of participants supervising BDVS and/or YFS men’s DFV perpetrator intervention group Facilitators. Interviews were suitable for generating data as they produced narrative accounts that allowed greater insight into Supervisors’ realities’ (Miller & Glassner, 2004, p. 126). These interviews provided an evidence base for understanding the processes and outcomes of the *Supervision Resource Guide* for Supervisors—the target audience of the resource. All interviews were carried out online via Zoom, audio recorded and ranged between 40 and 90 minutes. The interviews were transcribed by Dr Hotten.

As per the ethics approval, interview participants were fully informed that their participation was voluntary and that they were required to provide their written consent prior to the interview. They were informed that interview data was identifiable by the researchers but that every effort would be made to de-identify participants in any published material or presentations.

Interview Participants

Of the interview participants ($n = 4$), demographically, there were two women and two men (one of whom also identified as non-binary). All four were white, and they were of various ages. Three had tertiary qualifications. All interview participants had professional experience in facilitating men’s DFV perpetrator intervention group programs. Two currently practised as Facilitators, and a third did so on an ad hoc fill-in basis. Similar to Facilitators, this experience came through a pro-feminist framework underpinned by the Duluth model. Two participants also had experience working with victim-survivors. All had experience as line managers for Facilitators of men’s DFV perpetrator intervention group programs, with two being the current line managers of the Facilitators involved in this evaluation. Two of the interview participants were also academics with current experience in lecturing in the DFV prevention and response space. All four participants provided consultancy and training relevant to perpetrator intervention work.

Limitations

While there was a 100 per cent response rate in interview participation, a clear limitation of the research was the low number of survey responses we received. Survey B had particularly low responses, with anecdotal information suggesting an organisational impact of COVID-19 at the time. Further, as per the ethics approval, Dr Evans and Ms Robertson were unable to recruit participants in their roles as Supervisors or make responding to the survey mandatory for their teams. Due to funding limitations, there was also no incentive to provide survey responses beyond contributing to the objectives of the evaluation. Additional funding for the evaluator could have enabled individual interviews or focus groups to be conducted as an alternative to surveys with Facilitators, which might have been a more engaging process, provided stakeholders were also paid to attend. With similar findings from past research with group Facilitators yielding low response rates and small sample sizes (see, e.g., Conley, 2012, p. 48), future research in this space needs to consider the efforts made to recruit research participants, particularly part-time frontline workers, and set out by asking participants what they need to participate in the evaluation (Koens & Ninnnes, 2020, p. 17).

Qualitative Interviews and Survey Findings

The following findings reflect the central themes in the surveys and interviews.

<p>1. Developing practice skills, particularly the use of critical dialogue, is a priority for Facilitators.</p>	<p>Facilitators recognised the top five skills needed as a Facilitator were (in order of priority): the ability to invite critical dialogue, modelling equality and respect as a co-Facilitator, good use of tools (e.g., logging, group activities), risk assessment skills and the ability to appropriately challenge men.</p> <p>Of the seven survey responses, six noted that inviting critical dialogue was the skill in which they most needed further development.</p> <p>It's always about the question, so learning more about critical dialogue is a huge priority for me. [Facilitator, Survey A]</p> <p>The purpose for providing information or asking questions to clients should be about inviting them to think about their own beliefs and why they use the behaviours they use. Similarly, the practitioner needs to be aware of why they are providing information or asking the questions they ask. The reflective practitioner is aware of their own positioning in the room. [Facilitator, Survey A]</p> <p>The second-highest skill selected by Facilitators was modelling equality and respect as co-Facilitators. In Survey B, one of the Facilitators noted their supervision provided a key focus on both these top skills, and another Facilitator requested that supervision addressing the skills for modelling equality and respect as co-Facilitators should be provided in group or co-Facilitator supervision and individual supervision.</p> <p>Supervisors interviewed recognised the ongoing skill development needed for new practitioners in this work.</p> <p>It's pretty easy to see the difference between a newbie and someone who's been doing the work for a substantial period of time. There's the ability to read the room, to know how to respond, to ask better questions, to pick up on minimisation, denial, blame, excuse-making ... You tend to be more in tune [when you're more experienced]. I'm not criticising the newer people, but it's really an area that they have to grow and develop in. You can't expect someone starting to have it all together. [Supervisor, Interview 3]</p> <p>[New Facilitators might] want to step into a teaching role or that they have an answer they want the men to get, and somehow fishing for it. It can be a trap sometimes for a new Facilitator, that you want to fix the men ... If they can take on the feedback then they can enter that room with curiosity. [Supervisor, Interview 4]</p>
--	---

2.
It is expected that supervision involving live observation of group facilitation will guide practice development.

Participants agreed that supervision should assist in developing the practice skills of Facilitators specific to the perpetrator intervention/behaviour change space. Staff should feel supported and challenged to reflect on their frameworks and practice and be guided in critical self-reflection and self-directed learning.

I would like information about what I am doing well and to be told of things/questions I missed in group so I can work on them in the future. How to frame questions better. [Facilitator, Survey A]

Guidance on missed opportunities, ways in which I could better support my co-Facilitator, different ways to pose a question, etc. [Facilitator, Survey A]

Types of feedback that are important: Framing questions; Interaction with the men in group (good/bad/appropriate/collusion); Opportunities missed; Opportunities taken; Feedback on interaction with co-Facilitator; ideas on different activities that may work well in similar situations. [Facilitator, Survey A]

Support-wise, we're supporting them around a bunch of things. About their personal development, their own professional regulation in that room, any of the trauma that they get from hearing the stories from the men. That's the other thing that we need to support them with. Also, with just being able to help them sit in their own discomfort. [Supervisor, Interview 2]

[The *Supervision Resource Guide*] highlights areas of facilitation that may need some training, for example, coercive control, or some other issue dealing with offenders. It gives you the immediate area that's important to address, but it will also give you a clue in terms of what further training or professional development a person may need. [Supervisor, Interview 3]

However, there are challenges in guiding this work as an external supervisor.

I don't have the whole context to what you're doing. I don't know the history with the way you've been working with these men previously. I'm here for one night, I see one session. It might be a great session; it might be an awful session, but it may not be typical of every session you've had with what you do. [Supervisor, Interview 3]

3.
Different-gendered Facilitators experience unique challenges that should be

Participants described the unique challenges of working in a different gender co-facilitation pairing in this space and suggested that supervising co-Facilitator pairings should be responsive to this. Reflecting on this dynamic prompted concerns around modelling equality and centring women's voices in the room.

considered in supervision.

I would like to know if my interaction with my co-Facilitator is working. Whether I am supporting them properly. Am I modelling good behaviour? Should I be doing more? [Facilitator, Survey A]

That in all areas of co-facilitation that it should be shared and equal. That a woman's voice is important in the room. [Facilitator, Survey A]

How female Facilitators are treated in the room by male participants and their co-Facilitator; Awareness of how isolating that position can feel and ensure there is space for this to be heard. [Facilitator, Survey A]

There's a lot of this trust building and getting to know each other's mannerisms and what they need in the space. For the female Facilitator, she doesn't want to be rescued by a man or be mansplained though she needs to be able to say that, and when we have the debriefs, we can talk about that really safely. It's really helpful in that sense as well. It builds that trust in the room. [Supervisor, Interview 2]

We're all looking for the same thing, whether that pairing is showing equality and respect and how are they supporting each other. Those skills should be there no matter what's happening in the room. [Supervisor, Interview 4]

4. Supervision should be regular, timely and documented.

Participants clearly described effective supervision as regular, timely and consistent. Facilitators spoke of potential barriers to this, such as **'time and availability'** and **'distance and locality'** [multiple Facilitators, Survey A] and **'funding'** [Facilitator, Survey B]. This occurred in particular when a Facilitator only worked part-time and supervision was not held in person due to other employment commitments.

[A challenge is] delayed feedback and not enough supervision early. The first few weeks I would have liked supervision after every session then as I get more comfortable, once per month. [Facilitator, Survey A]

Even in house there was up to two weeks delay and the external supervision was over four weeks. It needs to be timely and the restrictions placed on the organisation are largely around funding. [Facilitator, Survey B]

When delivering supervision internally, you're strapped for resources and time. [Supervisor, Interview 4]

Supervision should also be documented to assist in ongoing development and reflection and to ensure accountability. Great to be recorded sometimes for review. [Facilitator, Survey A]

The SRG [Supervision Resource Guide] improves that accountability. It includes record keeping that must be undertaken not just about what the men say and how the

	<p>group was, but about how engagement happened, how co-Facilitators went with one another. It encourages those conversations. It encourages thoughtfulness. There's not this 'I just go to group and then I leave'. That minimal preparation or that minimal critical analysis about what happened. The <i>SRG</i> is good that it creates a record and explores the power dynamics and co-work dynamics in male and female facilitated groups. It makes sure that equity, or even just strategies around that are a focal point. I do like that this more structure supervision. And I like the record keeping. [Supervisor, Interview 1]</p> <p>We also need to have checks and balances to ensure what we're doing is great work. How do we know it's great work if we aren't observed and given feedback. I want to be told if I'm doing something dangerous and not okay. [Supervisor, Interview 2]</p> <p>It's important work and you want that work to be done well, and there be accountability in the room, and there's improvement. [Supervisor, Interview 4]</p>
--	--

<p>5. Supervisors should be appropriately skilled.</p>	<p>Participants reported a challenge in supervision is when the Supervisor is not adequately skilled in facilitating men's perpetrator intervention group programs.</p> <p>Finding a supervisor that is specifically trained in the DV [domestic violence] sector. I don't want to go to a supervisor who I am educating. [Facilitator, Survey A]</p> <p>[Prior to 2021,] I paid for monthly external supervision, which was very valuable. The supervisor was experienced in the Duluth model and an experienced Facilitator. Both together are extremely rare to find in one person. [Facilitator, Survey A]</p> <p>In some organisations there is an expectation that more experienced [Facilitators] provide supervision to new [Facilitators], which is unsatisfactory. [Facilitator, Survey A]</p> <p>I'd only be concerned if people are using it [the <i>Supervision Resource Guide</i>] who aren't skilled or who don't have the best practice model. As long as it's used in conjunction with or by, for and with skilled practitioners who have a really good framework, then I think it's great the way it is. [Supervisor, Interview 1]</p> <p>I think if we're going to break down the <i>Supervision Resource Guide</i> and say, "Well, these are the areas we're looking at and we're looking for ...", an example, critical dialogue, then you'd [need] training and talking about critical dialogue and what you're seeing. [Supervisor, Interview 2]</p>
---	--

	<p>External Supervisors need to be knowledgeable and have skills in the specific program logic and curriculum.</p> <p>Internal supervision was the most helpful, as external supervision didn't have a lot of knowledge of the way in which the program was structured, so feedback was limited in its value. [Facilitator, Survey B]</p> <p>Supervisors also need to be trained in supervision and the supervision of DFV perpetrator intervention group Facilitators, specifically.</p> <p>[Prior to using the <i>Supervision Resource Guide</i>:] My worst experience is when the supervision becomes a chat. The supervision appeared to have no direction or purpose. I left feeling I had gained nothing that was transferable into the group space. [Facilitator, Survey A]</p> <p>To me, it's quite different to ordinary counselling supervision because you're dealing with risk and accountability here in almost life-and-death situations sometimes. You need to be very acutely aware of and be able to manage. Having that pre-training of supervision of Facilitators before you use the guide would be a useful addition. [Supervisor, Interview 3]</p> <p>I also did training within supervision as well, which may have also helped me reflect a lot on my values and my frameworks for supervision ... I don't step in there and say, "This is how the group should've been run". It's not like that. It's an opportunity for critical reflection and guiding that critical reflection. [The <i>Supervision Resource Guide</i>] sat well with my frameworks. [Supervisor, Interview 4]</p>
--	--

<p>6. Facilitators need openness and the skills to reflect on their own practice</p>	<p>In order to meet the aims of supervision, Supervisors described the need for Facilitators to be able to engage in critical reflective practice and be open to constructive feedback on their own practice.</p> <p>Facilitators need to be able to do the work on themselves to be able to work with the men. [Supervisor, Interview 2]</p> <p>Sometimes, some people who have been doing it for a long time might think they know it all and that they've got this all sorted. They may not be as teachable or open to new learning, compared to someone who is just starting out. [Supervisor, Interview 3]</p> <p>If you can critically reflect as a Facilitator on the work you do, you can create a critical thinking space for the men that can create the process for change. [Supervisor, Interview 4]</p>
---	---

Facilitators also discussed the need for openness and approachability in Supervisors to create a positive Supervisor–supervisee relationship and the space needed for their own reflections.

I also need a space to reflect on how the work can impact my abilities and focus. [Facilitator, Survey A]

[I want an] approachable manner to discuss personal concerns related to work and any team conflict. [Facilitator, Survey A]

[Prior to this new supervision model,] I have felt constrained with no one to hear my concerns ... I have paid for external supervision. [Facilitator, Survey A]

Discussion and Recommendations

The evaluation found that the *Supervision Resource Guide* was effective in meeting its aims (as detailed in Table 3) when implemented at the two evaluated sites—BDVS and YFS.

Table 3: Summary of the Evaluation’s Findings

Aims of the <i>Supervision Resource Guide</i> (Evans & Robertson, 2021)	Evaluation Findings
➤ to enhance professional practice	Met
➤ to share knowledge and skills	Met
➤ to improve job satisfaction, role and job quality	Met
➤ to support organisations in providing accountable group programs	Met
➤ to improve outcomes for adult and child victim-survivors, and group participants	Met in principle; outside of scope of evaluation
➤ to build confidence within the Integrated Service Response	Met in principle; outside of scope of evaluation

Enhancing Professional Practice

The findings from this evaluation support the evidence in the literature. Supervision has been shown to benefit the development of practitioner skills (Day et al., 2019, p. 90; Reimer, 2020), and the *Supervision Resource Guide* provided a template to guide observations and debrief conversations in ways that targeted and progressed key facilitation skills. ‘Critical dialogue’ emerged as the skill that Facilitators most wanted assistance in developing. The literature has noted that critical dialogue skills are essential to enabling group participants to reflect on their own behaviours and attitudes towards their violence and its effects (Vlais, 2014; Wendt et al., 2019). Facilitators use critical dialogue to help group participants engage with accountability and responsibility (Wendt et al., 2019).

Importantly, while there was a write-in option, the surveys provided a list of suggested skills for Facilitators to choose from. These were chosen in consultation with BDVS and YFS in line with the participatory action research methodology, assisting the organisations with understanding the key priorities of their own Facilitators. One Facilitator observed this, noting the skills listed reflected the programs’ Duluth frameworks [Survey B]. One of the Supervisors recommended that organisations may wish to survey their own facilitation teams and adapt the templates in the *Supervision Resource Guide* to include additional or different skills that suit the specific practice needs of their workers [Interview 4].

The template in the *Supervision Resource Guide* brings structure to supervision, and we can see how it could take the form of ‘contracting’, where Supervisors and supervisees are both clear on the expectations of the work and priorities of supervision (Kaiser, 1997). However, the effectiveness is contingent on the model being implemented as designed, with supervision being consistent, timely following observations and documented. The findings of this evaluation show that Facilitators were less satisfied with supervision when feedback was not timely, which often was a result of limited funding and resources affecting the availability of both Facilitators and Supervisors, consistent with previous research (A. Taylor et al., 2020,

p. 5). However, Supervisors did notice a shift and increased competency in skills in some Facilitators during the evaluation period [Supervisor, Interview 3] and spoke of the usefulness of the *Supervision Resource Guide* in guiding Supervisors in conversations around practice concerns [Supervisor, Interview 2; Supervisor, Interview 4].

We also note that the *Supervision Resource Guide* appears to be designed with the motivated and reflective Facilitator in mind. Dixon and O'Connor (2010), building on the work of others such as Jenkins (1996, 2009) and Haggis et al. (1999), note the need for Facilitators to engage in 'reflexive' practice that evaluates their own selves and the broader contexts in which they work. This can include reflexivity about their own gender, cultural identity and experiences of privilege from 'structured power differences in society' (Dixon & O'Connor, 2010, p. 66). Casement (1985) refers to this self-analysis as 'internal supervision'. We conclude, therefore, that skill training in reflective and reflexive practice for both Supervisors and Facilitators needs to sit alongside the implementation of the *Supervision Resource Guide* to support the enhancement of professional practice.

Sharing of Knowledge and Skills

Using the *Supervision Resource Guide* facilitates sharing of knowledge and skills; however, this report notes the importance of the Supervisor being a skilled Senior Facilitator with knowledge of the specific program logic and frameworks that the Facilitators are working within. Facilitators spoke of wanting Supervisors to be alert for dangerous practice in the room, which echoes Reimer's (2020, p. 58) finding: 'Supervisors supported Facilitators to avoid and manage collusion through maintaining an honest, open, trusting, respectful and caring professional relationship with their staff'. While the *Supervision Resource Guide* notes the usefulness of the guide to line managers who may not be Senior Facilitators or have facilitation experience, it is important that the Facilitators still benefit from observations by a Senior Facilitator in accordance with the *Perpetrator Intervention Services Requirements* (DJAG, 2022). This guide provides an additional template to assist in the sharing of knowledge and skills by observers who are observing in a non-supervisory capacity.

With this facilitation knowledge, the Supervisor is able to assess and identify practice development needs, including managing collusion, and communicate this in a way that invites critical reflection by the Facilitator. This requires training of Supervisors to be able to create a trusting relationship and encourage self-reflective skills and openness to critical feedback (Conley, 2012, p. 54; Reimer, 2020, p. 71). Conley (2012, p. 53) notes how this collaborative process is much like the client-Facilitator relationship in perpetrator intervention work, drawing on Shulman's (2010, p. 14) 'parallel process' concept of supervision. This implies that Supervisors have a responsibility to set the agenda of supervision by bringing their observations and their own knowledge and skill in the work to supervision to support the Facilitator's reflective practice.

Improving Job Satisfaction, Role and Job Quality

Due to the limited number of Survey B responses, the evaluation relied heavily on the feedback from Supervisors (including feedback from Facilitators shared directly with Supervisors) and staff retention information provided in interviews relevant to the two participating organisations. At the time of the interviews with the direct line managers participating in the evaluation (October 2021), one organisation fully retained a consistent Facilitation team, which had never occurred in any previous year since the program began [Interview 4]. The other organisation had a similar retention of permanent staff members at the time of the interview [Interview 2]. Despite our small sample, we know from the literature that adequate and effective supervision leads to increased job satisfaction, wellbeing and staff retention (Cortis et al., 2021; Kashkooli-Ellat, 2022, p. 73; Kurtz, 2019; Taylor et al., 2020, p. 43; Vlasis et al., 2017, p. 101), which the *Supervision Resource Guide* supports. BDVS and YFS also provided women-only supervision in line with the *Supervision Resource Guide*, delivered by a Supervisor external to both teams, which Apps and Gregory (2011, p. 38)

recommend as necessary for women Facilitators to have a forum to discuss their unique experiences and effects of their work.

One interview participant spoke of how supervision provided an opportunity for 'connectedness' between a Facilitator's role and their wider organisation and its clear agenda around practice development and client outcomes:

If you don't have the connection to an organisation, you don't feel valued ... I think it probably is that feeling that this work matters and that what they're doing really matters. I think you need to know that that's being seen. Unless you have a supervision structure that is able to see that work and actually make staff feel valued, then I think it's part of the reason why staff leave.
[Supervisor, Interview 4]

However, the organisations offered differing levels of individual supervision to Facilitators, and the role and effect of individual supervision sat outside the scope of the *Supervision Resource Guide* and the evaluation. The external Supervisor interviewed noted, 'there were times I thought having individual supervision would have been useful. In terms of improving relationships with co-Facilitators and dealing with issues that might not be comfortable to raise in the pairing' [Interview 3]. The literature supports the process of individual supervision. Individual supervision can provide a forum where Supervisors can see how Facilitators are personally 'handling the work' (Conley, 2012, p. 52) and recognise when a Facilitator is having difficulties, including the burden of vicarious trauma (Richardson, 2001, pp. 23, 78). Therefore, there are possibly different experiences of supervision, and differences in job satisfaction, role and job quality, between employees who are contracted for only group facilitation hours and employees who work full-time and can experience more effective line management and individual supervision. We argue this should be considered in program structures, supervision models and funding contracts.

Another noteworthy finding was the importance of skilled Supervisors as Facilitators in improving job quality and meeting the needs of supervision for Facilitators to increase job satisfaction. Reimer (2020, p. 59) noted in her research that Facilitators identified the importance of Supervisors in understanding the context of client–Facilitator relationships such that Facilitators can feel safe to speak openly about close client–Facilitator relationships. Jenkins (2009) describes an effective client–Facilitator relationship as grounded in 'generous love' and 'respect for difference'. With both BDVS and YFS having Supervisors also facilitating groups and actively building client–worker relationships with the participants in the program, this arguably provided more effective supervision. It also speaks to Facilitators' contrasting experiences of receiving supervision from an external Supervisor without that organisational knowledge or investment in the program and its participants.

Supporting Organisations to Provide Accountable Group Programs

The *Supervision Resource Guide* facilitates more robust oversight of the quality of intervention for clients, focusing on facilitation practice skills and continuous improvement. By directing Supervisors to observe and encourage reflections on things that have gone wrong, collusion and how women's voices need to be more central in the room, the supervision becomes 'accountability-based', which is especially important for male Facilitators (Machen & Eva, 2013). Facilitators must maintain their accountability to perpetrators of violence and victim-survivors and to contribute to the DFV sectors' effort to prevent violence against women and children (Pease, 2003). The observer feedback template also creates the opportunity for external review of practice and a clear feedback mechanism to assist in practice development and performance management where needed. Successful implementation of the supervision model detailed in the *Supervision Resource Guide* supports a service's ability to speak to its compliance with the relevant standards and regulatory frameworks governing this work.

Improving Outcomes for Adult and Child Victim-Survivors and Group Participants

DFV perpetrator intervention group programs have been identified as vital stakeholders in the safety outcomes for adult and child victim-survivors (Chung et al., 2020). While evaluating outcomes for victim-survivors and group participants was outside the scope of the evaluation, we know from the literature that quality supervision supports improved outcomes for clients. No to Violence (2020, p. 10) and Chung et al. (2020) have recognised the importance of supervision in perpetrator intervention group work, especially in reflecting on the invitations to collude with participants. The enhancement of Facilitators' practice skills and knowledge, improvements to job satisfaction and the retention of staff arguably increase the likelihood of a positive and consistent experience of service for clients, which the use of the *Supervision Resource Guide* supports. As one Supervisor plainly stated, 'if you've got supervision and oversight, and professional development, then you're getting better practice. It means better quality work with the men, which has flow-on effects with safety of women and children' [Supervisor, Interview 4].

Building Confidence Within the Integrated Service Response

The evaluation provided evidence of the *Supervision Resource Guide's* compliance with the *Services Practice Principles, Standards and Guidance* (Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women [Queensland], 2020) and *Perpetrator Intervention Services Requirements* (DJAG, 2022), ensuring best practice in service delivery in the men's DFV intervention program space. We conclude that services using the *Supervision Resource Guide* could speak more confidently to external agencies and partners regarding their accountability-based supervision and oversight of the delivery of their group programs, ensuring effective and safe work. There is an opportunity for future research to examine the experiences of external stakeholders, particularly those that observe a group and provide feedback using the observer feedback template in the *Supervision Resource Guide*.

Recommendations for the Sector

We offer these considerations for continuous improvement:

- Organisations should use the *Supervision Resource Guide*, implementing or adapting the proposed supervision model and using its templates to suit the needs of the program staff.
- Regular and consistent individual supervision of Facilitators should be delivered to complement the *Supervision Resource Guide*.
- Supervisors should have experience in facilitating men's DFV perpetrator intervention group programs.
- Supervisors should attend training on supervision specific to the work of Facilitators of perpetrator intervention work.
- Facilitators should attend training on critical reflective practice.

Recommendations for Researchers

The roles of observers were outside the scope of this evaluation. As such, there is an opportunity for further research to investigate the experiences of observers of men's DFV perpetrator intervention group programs and to examine the effectiveness of the observer feedback template provided in the *Supervision Resource Guide* in helping services effectively use this resource to meet their aims and build confidence within the Integrated Service Response.

References

- Apps, J. & Gregory, R. (2011). 'You're only there cos you're a woman': A study of the experiences of women who co-facilitate men's behaviour change group programs. *Violence Against Women: An Australian Feminist Journal*, 23, 29–39.
- Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration. (2022). Perpetrator interventions. In *National domestic and family violence bench book*. <https://dfvbenchbook.aija.org.au/perpetrator-intervention-programs/>
- Ayres, L. (2008). Thematic coding and analysis. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopaedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 868–869). SAGE Publications. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909>
- Brisbane Domestic Violence Service. (n.d.). *Our services: Working with men to keep women safe*. <https://bdvs.org.au/services#working-with-men-to-keep-women-safe>
- Campbell, R., Dorey, H., Naegeli, M., Grubstein, L. K., Bennett, K. K., Bonter, F., Smith, P. K., Grzywacz, J., Baker, P. K. & Davidson, W. S., II. (2004). An empowerment evaluation model for sexual assault programs: Empirical evidence of effectiveness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 34(3–4), 251–262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-004-7418-0>
- Casement, P. (1985). *On learning from the patient*. Tavistock.
- Chung, D., Upton-Davis, K., Cordier, R., Campbell, E., Wong, T., Salter, M., Austen, S., O'Leary, P., Breckenridge, J., Vlasis, R., Green, D., Pracilio, A., Young, A., Gore, A., Watts, L., Wilkes-Gillan, S., Speyer, R., Mahoney, N., Anderson, S. & Bisset, T. (2020). *Improved accountability: The role of perpetrator intervention systems* (Research report, 20/2020). Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety. <https://anrowsdev.wpenginepowered.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Chung-RR-Improved-Accountability.pdf>
- Conley, H. D. (2012). *Supervision and training needs of practitioners working in batterer intervention programs* [Master's clinical research paper]. St. Catherine University. https://sophia.stkate.edu/msw_papers/15/
- Cortis, N., Seymour, K., Natalier, K. & Wendt, S. (2021). Which models of supervision help retain staff? Findings from Australian's domestic and family violence and sexual violence workforces. *Australian Social Work*, 74(1), 68–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2020.1798480>
- Cruz, L. (2015). Self-reflexivity as an ethical instrument to give full play to our explicit and implicit subjectivity as qualitative researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(10), 1723–1735. <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss10/13>
- Davidson, M. M., & Bowen, N. (2011). Academia Meets Community Agency: How to Foster Positive Collaboration in Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Work. *Journal of Family Violence*, 26, 309–318. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-011-9366-4>
- Day, A., Vlasis, R., Chung, D. & Green, D.J. (2019). *Men's behaviour change programs: Measuring outcomes and improving program quality: Key findings and future directions* (Research to policy and practice, 01/2019). Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety. <https://anrowsdev.wpenginepowered.com/wp->

content/uploads/2019/04/Day-MBCPs-Measuring-outcomes-and-improving-program-quality-RtPP-01.2019.pdf

Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women [Queensland]. (2020). *Domestic and family violence services practice principles, standards and guidance*. Queensland Government. <https://www.publications.qld.gov.au/ckan-publications-attachments-prod/resources/366f94a8-1122-42ff-9c19-d968fd21c173/dfv-services-practice-principles-standards-and-guidance.pdf?ETag=8465906b55ef511a2a2db9721f74b69a>

Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services [Queensland]. (2017). *Domestic and family violence: Information sharing guidelines*. Queensland Government. <https://www.publications.qld.gov.au/dataset/f0ba187e-7206-4353-bdaa-450916c50307/resource/06796d15-6f8a-4556-b0ba-ea7a16cdbf1e/download/info-sharing-guidelines.pdf>

Department of Justice and Attorney-General [Queensland]. (2022, 1 January). *Perpetrator intervention services requirements* (Version 2). Queensland Government. <https://www.publications.qld.gov.au/dataset/16d7913c-96d6-42bd-aed2-f31f24315407/resource/a2eecdd6-8a2e-496a-9b70-20fba91aa5d7/download/perpetrator-intervention-services-requirements.pdf>

Dixon, G. & O'Connor, K. (2010). *Facilitating domestic violence programs: Listening to voices from the field*. Relationship Services Whakawhanaungatanga. <http://www.communityresearch.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/formidable/DV-Research-April2011-version-Copy.pdf>

Domestic Abuse Intervention Programs. (n.d.-a). *What is the Duluth model?* <https://www.theduluthmodel.org/what-is-the-duluth-model/>

Domestic Abuse Intervention Programs. (n.d.-b). *Wheel Information Centre*. <https://www.theduluthmodel.org/wheels/>

Evans, B. & Robertson, P. (2021). *Supervision resource guide: Supervising men's domestic violence perpetrator intervention group programs*. Brisbane Domestic Violence Services – Micah Projects. https://bdvs.org.au/assets/docs/20210915_Supervision-Resource-Guide-Final.pdf

Haggis, J., Schech, S. & Fitzgerald, G. (1999). Narrating lives, narrating whiteness: A research note. *Journal of Australian Studies*, 23(60), 168–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14443059909387464>

Healing Foundation. (2019). *Collaborative Workforce Grants*. <https://workupqld.org.au/collaborative-workforce-grants/>

Heward-Belle, S., Humphreys, C., Healey, L., Toivonen, C. & Tsantefski, M. (2019). Invisible practices: Interventions with men who use violence and control. *Affilia: Feminist Inquiry in Social Work*, 34(3), 369–382. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109919848750>

Houston, S. (2010). Prising open the black box: Critical realism, action research and social work. *Qualitative Social Work*, 9(1), 73–91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325009355622>

Jenkins, A. (1996). Moving towards respect: A quest for balance. In C. McLean, M. Carey & C. White (Eds.), *Men's ways of being* (1st ed.). Westview Press.

- Jenkins, A. (2009). *Becoming ethical: A parallel, political journey with men who have abused*. Russell House Publishing.
- Kaiser, T. L. (1997). *Supervisory relationships: Exploring the human element*. Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Kashkooli-Ellat, J. (2022). Exploring training and supervision experiences of facilitators of men's behaviour change programmes: A qualitative study. *Psychreg Journal of Psychology*, 6(4), 65–77. <https://www.pjp.psychreg.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/7-jo-lene-kashkooli-ellat-65-77.pdf>
- Koens, C. & Nines, P. (2020). *Evaluation quick guides* (ANROWS Insights, 7/2020). Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety. <https://anrowsdev.wpenginepowered.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/ANROWS-Evaluation-Quick-Guides.pdf>
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Kurtz, A. (2019). *How to run reflective practice groups: A guide for healthcare professionals*. Taylor and Francis.
- Levin, R. (1999). Participatory evaluation: Researchers and service providers as collaborators versus adversaries. *Violence Against Women*, 5(10), 1213–1227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778019922183336>
- Machen, M. & Eva, S. (2013). *Accountability in supervision of men's behaviour change: A collaboration to privilege the voices of those most harmed* [Paper presentation]. No To Violence Conference Workshop. <https://ntv.org.au/conference/wpcontent/uploads/2012-ntv-conference-workshop-9c-accountability-in-supervision-doc.pdf>
- Mackay, E., Gibson, A., Lam, H. & Beecham, D. (2015). *Perpetrator interventions in Australia: Part one – Literature review. State of knowledge paper* (ANROWS landscapes, PP01/205). Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety. <https://anrowsdev.wpenginepowered.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Landscapes-Perpetrators-Part-ONE.pdf>
- Micah Projects. (n.d.). *Who is Micah Projects?* <https://micahprojects.org.au/>
- Miller, J. & Glassner, B. (2004). The 'inside' and the 'outside': Finding realities in interviews. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 125–139). SAGE Publications.
- Morran, D. (2008). Firing up and burning out: The personal and professional impact of working in domestic violence offender programmes. *Probation Journal*, 55(2), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550508090272>
- No to Violence. (2020). *Advanced practice series: Supervision (men's family violence), participant manual* [Unpublished].
- Pease, B. (2003). Critical reflections on profeminist practice in men's groups. In M. Cohen & A. Mullender (Eds.), *Gender and groupwork* (pp. 53–65). Routledge.

- Pence, E. & Paymar, M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth model*. Springer Publishing.
- QUT Centre for Justice. (n.d.). <https://research.qut.edu.au/centre-for-justice/>
- Reimer, E. C. (2020). 'Growing to be a better person': Exploring the client–worker relationship in men's behaviour change group work programs (Research report, 15/2020). Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety. https://anrowsdev.wpenginepowered.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/PI.17.13-Reimer_Client-Worker-Relationships.pdf
- Renehan, N. (2021). Facilitators of probation-based domestic violence perpetrator programmes: 'Who's in the room?' *Probation Journal*, 68(3), 310–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02645505211025083>
- Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data: A practice guide* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Richardson, J. I. (2001). *Guidebook on vicarious trauma: Recommended solutions for anti-violence workers*. Public Health Agency of Canada. https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2008/phac-aspc/H72-21-178-2000E.pdf
- Shulman, L. (2010). *Interactional supervision* (3rd ed.). NASW Press.
- Sullivan, B., Lowik, V., Camilleri, P. & Robertson, P. (2021). YFS COVID-19 online men's behaviour change program: Providing access to accountability during lockdown [Unpublished report]. Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family Violence Research.
- Taylor, A., Carswell, S., Cheyne, N., Honorato, B. & Lowik, V. (2020). *Evaluation of UnitingCare men's behaviour change programs. Stage two report*. UnitingCare. <https://noviolence.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/590293590-UC-FS-Evaluation-of-UnitingCare-Mens-Behaviour-Change-Programs-Stage-Two-Report-v8.pdf>
- Taylor, A. K., Gregory, A., Feder, G. & Williamson, E. (2019). 'We're all wounded healers': A qualitative study to explore the well-being and needs of helpline workers supporting survivors of domestic violence and abuse. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 27(4), 856–862. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12699>
- Vlais, R. (2014). *Domestic violence perpetrator programs: Education, therapy, support, accountability 'or' struggle?* No To Violence. <https://ntv.org.au/wp-content/uploads/140409-Elements-of-DV-perpetrator-program-work.pdf>
- Vlais, R., Ridley, S., Green, D. & Chung, D. (2017). *Family and domestic violence perpetrator programs: Issues of paper of current and emerging trends, developments and expectations*. Stopping Family Violence. <https://sfv.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/FDV-perpetrator-programs-issues-paper.pdf>
- Wendt, S., Seymour, K., Buchanan, F., Dolman, C. & Greenland, N. (2019). *Engaging men who use violence: Invitational narrative approaches* (Research report, 05/2019). Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety. https://researchnow-admin.flinders.edu.au/ws/portalfiles/portal/18145304/Wendt_et_al_Invitational_Narrative_Therapies_ANROWS_Research_Report.pdf

YFS. (n.d.a.). <https://www.yfs.org.au>

YFS. (n.d.b.). *Impacted by domestic violence?* <https://www.yfs.org.au/domestic-violence/>