

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Casey Family Services Compilation

Family Team Meetings as a Permanency Strategy



A GROWING BODY OF LITERATURE DESCRIBES FAMILY TEAM MEETINGS AS A STRATEGY FOR GETTING YOUNG PEOPLE OUT OF FOSTER CARE AND CONNECTED TO FAMILY.

While there are many family teaming models, each brings together young people, families, other significant adults, and child welfare and other professionals as collaborative case planners and decision makers. Each team's goal is to safeguard and plan for a young person's safety, well-being, and family relationships. The models reflect a belief that young people should grow up in families, not in foster care or institutional settings.

As a child welfare strategy, family teaming is increasingly popular. To date, evaluations have involved small sample sizes and lacked the rigor necessary to meet the highest standards of evidence-based research. Clearly, for family

teaming to take hold, development of rigorous evaluation standards and replicable practices is crucial.

This bibliography presents selected family teaming research and resources, including information on:

- General family teaming resources
- Teaming models:
 - Family Group Decision Making (FGDM)/Family Group Conferences (FGC)
 - Family Team Conferencing (FTC)
 - Permanency Teaming Process
 - Team Decision Making
 - Other family teaming approaches
- Teaming evaluation
- Tools

This is a developing bibliography. Please send suggested additions to Iglasheen@caseyfamilyservices.org. All Internet documents were retrieved in February 2009.

GENERAL FAMILY TEAMING RESOURCES

American Humane (2009). *A compilation of state and provincial laws, policies, rules and regulations on Family Group Decision Making and other family engagement approaches in child welfare decision making.* <http://www.americanhumane.org/assets/docs/protecting-children/PC-fgdm-leg-chart.pdf>

A collection of state and provincial legislation on FGDM and family engagement approaches.

Annie E. Casey Foundation/Casey Family Services. (2008). *Family teaming: Comparing approaches.* Available at <http://www.caseyfamilyservices.org/index.php/ourwork/permanence/>

Uses a grid format to explain similarities and differences among four family teaming methods: Family Group Decision Making/ Family Group Conferences, Family Team Conferencing, Permanency Team Meetings, and Team Decision Making.

Christenson, B., Curran, S., DeCook, K., Maloney, S., & Merkel-Holguin, L. (2008). *The intersection between differential response and family involvement approaches.* *Protecting Children, 23*(1-2), 88-95.

Explores the connection between differential response and family involvement approaches by analyzing their shared values. Discusses practical and philosophical connections between the two approaches and profiles Olmstead County, Minnesota's work.

Crampton, D., & Natarajan, A. (2005). *Connections between group work and family meetings in child welfare practice: What can we learn from each other?* *Social Work with Groups, 28*(1), 65-79.

Describes how theories of group work and small group research can improve the effectiveness of family meeting interventions. Focuses on group work concepts related to therapeutic benefits, facilitation skills, and group decision making.

Dalrymple, J. (2002). *Family Group Conferences and youth advocacy: The participation of children and young people in family decision making.* *European Journal of Social Work, 5*(3), 287-299.

Looks at using advocates for children in family decision making. Explores the pros and cons of advocates and whether to identify advocates from the youth's natural resources or use an independent advocate.

GlenMaye, L., & Lewandowski, C. (2002). *Teams in child welfare settings: Interprofessional and collaborative processes.* *The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 83*, 245-256.

Describes the dynamics of collaborative team-based efforts in child welfare. Identifies factors that contribute to team effectiveness and perceptions of family participation with a particular focus on respect and unity of purpose.

Holland, S., & O'Neill, S. (2006). "We had to be there to make sure it was what we wanted": *Enabling children's participation in family decision making through the Family Group Conference.* *Childhood: A Global Journal of Child Research, 13*(1), 91-110.

Explores both the risks and benefits children face in family decision making. Focuses on helping children feel they have a place in the process and that their views are heard.

Holland, S., & Rivett, M. (2008). "Everyone started shouting": *Making connections between the process of Family Group Conferences and family therapy practice.* *British Journal of Social Work, 38*(1), 21-38.

Discusses the similarities between the two pursuits and suggests the potential value of cross-fertilization.

Iowa Department of Human Services. (2007). *Commonalities of family team meeting models.* http://www.dhs.state.ia.us/cppc/family_team/commonalities.html

Reviews shared beliefs and values of different family teaming models and approaches.

Munson, S., & Freundlich, M. (2008). *Families gaining their seat at the table: Family engagement strategies in the first round of Child and Family Service Reviews and Program Improvement Plans.* <http://www.americanhumane.org/assets/docs/PC-fgdm-CFSR-PIP-review.pdf>

Describes states' use of various family teaming approaches as reported in the first round final reports of the Child and Family Service Reviews and the states' Program Improvement Plans.

Nixon, P. (2007). *Seen but not heard? Children and young people's participation in Family Group Decision Making: Concepts and practice issues.* *Protecting Children, 22*(1), 20-36.

A look at the state of youth participation in the child welfare system and how to improve involvement with Family Group Decision Making.

Pennell, J., & Buford, G. (2000). *Family Group Decision Making: Protecting children and women.* *Child Welfare*, 79(2), 131-158.

Looks at a Canadian study that uses FGDM to eliminate or reduce violence in the home.

Waitess, C., Macgowan, M.J., Pennell, J., Carlton-LaNey, I., & Weil, M. (2004). *Increasing the cultural responsiveness of Family Group Conferencing.* *Social Work*, 49(2), 291-300.

Describes adapting the FGC model to fit into different ethnic communities' social welfare traditions.

TEAMING MODELS

Family Group Decision Making (FGDM) / Family Group Conferencing (FGC)

A number of studies have been published about FGDM/FGC. Most studies suggest that these family teaming processes yield positive results for children and families, yet the research findings are not consistent. There has been a consistent call for more rigorous assessment of FGDM/FGC outcomes.

See American Humane's searchable, annotated bibliography of this model at http://www.americanhumane.org/protecting-children/programs/family-group-decision-making/re_annotated_bibliography/

Berzin, S.C., Cohen, E., Thomas, K., & Dawson, W.C. (2008). *Does Family Group Decision Making affect child welfare outcomes? Findings from a randomized control study.* *Child Welfare*, 87(4), 35-54.

An evaluation of two Family Group Decision Making programs using random assignment did not indicate more positive outcomes (safety, placement stability, and permanence) for children receiving the FGDM intervention but did indicate that children were not worse than those receiving traditional services.

Burford, G. (2000). *Advancing innovations: Family Group Decision Making as community-centered child and family work.* *Protecting Children*, 16(3), 4-20.

Summarizes research and evaluation findings on the use of FGDM as community-centered child and family practice.

Crampton, D. (2003). *Family Group Decision Making in Kent County, Michigan: The family and community compact.* *Protecting Children*, 18(1-2), 81-83.

Examines 257 referrals to the state's FGDM program, 96 of which ultimately used the FGDM model. Children placed through FGDM were less likely to return to care, experienced fewer moves during placement, were less likely to be in institutional settings, and were more likely to be placed with family.

Crampton, D. (2007). *Research review: Family Group Decision Making: A promising practice in need of more programme theory and research.* *Child and Family Social Work*, 12(2), 202-209.

Describes what is known about FGDM outcomes, research on which families are offered FGDM, and which FGDM processes appear to be important. Offers specific suggestions for developing and testing FGDM approaches using rigorous trials.

Lohrbach, S. (2003). *Family Group Decision Making: A process reflecting partnership-based practice.* *Protecting Children*, 18(1-2), 12-15.

Discusses the concepts of clients' rights, partnership, and participatory practice in FGDM implementation.

Merkel-Holguin, L., Nixon, P., & Burford, G. (2003). *Learning with families: A synopsis of FGDM research and evaluation in child welfare.* *Protecting Children*, 18(1-2), 2-11.

Provides an overview of research and evaluation findings on FGDM as reported in detail in this volume of *Protecting Children*.

Northwest Institute for Children and Families. (2005). *Evaluation of the "Connected and Cared For" project.* Final report to the Stuart Foundation. Seattle, WA: University of Washington School of Social Work.

Looks at whether FGDM improves outcomes for children in group care. Among the findings: FGDM focused families, youth, and professionals on permanence, with 87 percent of plans addressing permanence.

Sieppert, J., Hudson, J., & Unrau, Y. (2000). *Family Group Conferencing in child welfare: Lessons from a demonstration project.* *Families in Society*, 81(4), 382-391.

Describes a child welfare family group conferencing (FGC) project that serves families referred for child abuse, neglect, and/or abandonment. Findings indicate FGC is inherently a resource-intensive process, but one that successfully achieves broad participation in child welfare decisions.

Stevens, M. (2003). *Reconstruction works? Constructing family perspectives of the outcomes of family group conferences.* *Protecting Children, 18*(1-2), 30-41.

Describes family members' perceptions of the outcomes achieved through Family Group Decision Making.

Sundell, K., & Vinnerljung, B. (2004). *Outcomes of Family Group Conferencing in Sweden: A 3-year follow-up.* *Child Abuse and Neglect, 28*(3), 257-287.

Reports on longer term client outcomes following implementation of FGC in Sweden. Reports FGC children experienced higher rates of re-referral to child protective services than those who received traditional services.

Family Team Conferencing (FTC)

The research on Family Team Conferencing is only beginning to emerge. Currently, the literature on FTC is primarily descriptive in nature.

Chahine, Z., & Higgins, S. (2005). *Engaging families and communities: The use of Family Team Conferences to promote safety, permanency, and well-being in child welfare services.* In G. Mallon & P. Hess (Eds.), *Child welfare for the twenty-first century: A handbook of practices, policies, and programs* (pp. 118-128). New York: Columbia University Press.

Discusses the development and implementation of Family Team Conferences in New York City's Administration for Children's Services to formulate safety, visiting, education, and permanency plans that ensure positive outcomes for children and families. Provides information on the different types of conferences, conference facilitation, engaging families and communities, and individualized services and permanency plans.

Child Welfare Policy and Practice Group (2007). *Family Team Conferencing.* http://www.childwelfaregroup.org/documents/FTC_History.pdf

Explains the purpose and activities of Family Team Conferences in child welfare, the benefits of such conferences, and principles, steps, evolution, and characteristics of FTC.

New York City Administration for Children's Services (n.d.). *Improved outcomes for children: Frequently asked questions: Family Team Conferencing.* http://www.nyc.gov/html/acs/html/about/ioc_initiative_conferences.shtml

Describes New York City's Family Team Conferences, a family/community engagement practice model in which critical

decisions and service plans are made by a group. Discusses how, through this model, the agency is establishing standards of practice based on basic principles and outcomes.

Permanency Teaming Process

As one of the newer family teaming approaches, the Permanency Teaming Process has not been the subject of descriptive or research literature to any great extent. As this approach is implemented more broadly, the body of research literature can be expected to grow.

Annie E. Casey Foundation/Casey Family Services. (2008). *Building family relationships: Using the Permanency Teaming Process to connect young people with family.* <http://www.caseyfamilyservices.org/index.php/ourwork/permanencyteaming/>

Provides a general overview of this direct service agency's family meeting approach.

Annie E. Casey Foundation/Casey Family Services. (2008). *Agency outcomes, 2005-2008.* <http://www.caseyfamilyservices.org/index.php/ourwork/permanencyteaming/>

Describes initial effects of Casey's Permanency Teaming Process on agency and child outcomes.

Annie E. Casey Foundation/Casey Family Services & Casey Family Programs. (2008). *Young people need families: Practice strategies to make permanence a priority.* http://www.youthpermanence.org/_pdf/materials/mat_2008/youth_need_families.pdf

Describes several teaming approaches used by Casey, including Casey Family Services' Permanency Teaming Meetings, on pages 9-11.

Greenblatt, S., & LeBeau, M. (2006). *Renewing our commitment to permanence for children and youth.* *Common Ground, 11*(1), 13. http://www.caseyfamilyservices.org/pdfs/o6_cgspring_center.pdf

Describes Casey Family Services' Permanency Teaming Process and teaming practice strategies.

LeBeau, M., & Greenblatt, S. (2007). *Encompass natural networks.* *Focus, 13*(1), 12-13. http://www.caseyfamilyservices.org/index.php/resources/article_detail/299

Describes Families For Life (an earlier name for the Permanency Teaming Process) and the effect of the approach on foster parent recruitment efforts.

Team Decision Making (TDM)

Much of the literature on these models is descriptive, yet research findings are gradually beginning to emerge.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2007). *KIDS COUNT essay: Life long connections: supporting children in foster care.* <http://www.aecf.org/KnowledgeCenter/Publications.aspx?pubguid={692F975E-E96C-4A7F-87B4-2D1A84CB7D32}>

Cites the example of Linn County, Iowa, which conducted two pilot studies using community partnership strategies and family team decision-making. Successful reunification was achieved for 50 percent of young people residing in residential treatment facilities. For those in shelter care, nearly 75 percent were able to return to their parents or be placed with close relatives.

Crea, T.M., Crampton, D., Abramson-Madden, A., & Usher, C.L. (2008). *Variability in the implementation of team decision-making: Scope and compliance with the Family to Family practice model.* *Children and Youth Services Review, 30*(11), 1221-1232.

Compares three communities with different TDM implementation experiences and highlights the importance of using multiple perspectives to improve implementation effectiveness.

Family to Family California. (n.d.). *Team Decision Making.* <http://www.f2f.ca.gov/team.htm>

Describes Team Decision Making, including its values, core planning, and its use of assessment, community representatives, and external partners, and indicators and outcomes.

Other family teaming approaches

A number of other family teaming approaches are currently being used; these models often combine and elaborate on features of other approaches. The literature on these models is primarily descriptive. These references are not meant to definitively describe all other family teaming approaches; rather these are selected examples. As indicated at the outset, we actively solicit research on these or other family teaming models for an updated version of this developing bibliography.

Adams, P., & Chandler, S. (2002). *Building partnerships to protect children: A blended model of Family Group Conferencing.* *Family Court Review, 40*(4), 503-517.

Describes Hawaii's 'Ohana Conferencing, a family group conferencing program that combines features of the New

Zealand model of family group conferencing, Oregon's family unity model, and mediation in a system that respects cultural diversity, focuses on family strengths, and results in a plan agreeable to all parties.

Iowa Department of Human Services. (2007). *Family Team Decision-Making evaluation handbook.* http://www.dhs.state.ia.us/policyanalysis/policymanualpages/manual_documents/forms/comm283.pdf

Explains the benefits of Family Team Decision Making in Iowa's child welfare system, the context of FTDM in child and family practice, and FTDM practice standards.

Lohrbach, S., & Sawyer, R. (2004). *Creating a constructive practice: Family and professional partnership in high-risk child protection case conferences.* *Protecting Children, 19*(2), 26-35. http://www.co.olmsted.mn.us/upload_dir/cs/creatingaconstructivepractice.pdf

Describes the Parallel Protection Process (P3), a family case conferencing approach in the juvenile court system that involves children determined to be at high risk of maltreatment and which uses a family case planning conference to achieve a settlement agreement in the initial child protection matter before the court.

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services. (2006). *Family team decision-making meetings: Frequently asked questions by social workers.* <http://www1.dshs.wa.gov/pdf/Publications/22-1171.pdf>

Describes Washington State's FTDM meetings, used for placement decisions.

TEAMING EVALUATION

Berzin, S.C., & Thomas, K.L. (2007). *Assessing model fidelity in two Family Group Decision Making programs: Is this child welfare intervention being implemented as intended?* *Journal of Social Service Research, 34*(2), 55-71.

Uses data collected from multiple sources participating in California's Waiver Demonstration Project to provide a multidimensional look at model fidelity in FGDM programs. Reports that although basic FGDM elements were followed, certain philosophies, including community representation and mobilization of supports, were not consistently implemented. Also: Although everyone shared favorable impressions of conferences, conference participants were more positive than child welfare workers and caregivers about the conferences' effectiveness.

Berzin, S.C., Cohen, E., Thomas, K. & Dawson, W.C. (2008). *Does Family Group Decision Making affect child welfare outcomes? Findings from a randomized control study.* *Child Welfare*, 87(4), 35-54.

An evaluation of two Family Group Decision Making programs using random assignment did not indicate more positive outcomes (safety, placement stability, and permanence) for children receiving the FGDM intervention but did indicate that children were not worse than those receiving traditional services.

Burford, G. (2000). *Advancing innovations: Family Group Decision Making as community-centered child and family work.* *Protecting Children*, 16(3), 4-20.

Summarizes FGDM research and evaluation as community-centered child and family practice.

Caplick, E. (2007). *Family Group Decision Making: Using propensity score matching to assess services and safety outcomes after 36 months.* Paper presented at the Conference of the Society for Social Work and Research (SSWR), San Francisco, CA, January 11-14, 2007. Abstract: <http://sswr.confex.com/sswr/2007/techprogram/P6946.HTM>.

Uses a propensity score matching approach to evaluate FGDM. Does not find significant differences between re-entry rates of FGDM-involved youth and those receiving traditional services; FGDM's effect on permanency was not specifically evaluated.

Crampton, D. (2007). *Research review: Family Group Decision Making: A promising practice in need of more programme theory and research.* *Child and Family Social Work*, 12(2), 202-209.

Describes what is known about FGDM outcomes, research on which families are offered FGDM, and which FGDM processes appear to be important. Offers specific suggestions for improving FGDM approaches and testing them in rigorous trials.

Crea, T.M., Crampton, D., Abramson-Madden, A., & Usher, C.L. (2008). *Variability in the implementation of team decisionmaking: Scope and compliance with the Family to Family practice model.* *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30(11), 1221-1232.

Compares three communities with different TDM implementation experiences and highlights the importance of using multiple perspectives to improve implementation.

Merkel-Holguin, L., Nixon, P., & Burford, G. (2003). *Learning with families: A synopsis of FGDM research and evaluation in child welfare.* *Protecting Children*, 18(1-2), 2-11.

Provides an overview of FGDM research and evaluation as reported in detail in this volume of *Protecting Children*.

Walton, E., Roby, J., Frandsen, A., and Davidson, R. (2003). *Strengthening at-risk families by involving the extended family.* *Journal of Family Social Work*, 7(4), 1-21.

An evaluation of FGC's use of extended family to improve child outcomes.

Wheeler, C. & Johnson, S. (2003). *Evaluating Family Group Decision Making: The Santa Clara example.* *Protecting Children*, 18(1-2), 65-69.

Describes the Santa Clara County Family Conference Model (FCM) as a combination of Family Group Conferences and family unity meetings. Reports outcomes for children who participated in FCM meetings. Key findings: 90 percent of children had no further substantiated reports of child abuse or neglect; 70 percent had two or fewer court hearings; and 45 percent either never entered foster care or exited care by the end of the follow-up period.

TOOLS

Ashley, C. (Ed.) (2006). *The Family Group Conference toolkit: A practical guide for setting up and running an FGC service.* Available February 2009 from Family Rights Group web site, www.frg.org.uk/fgc_toolkit.html.

Thanks to consultant Madelyn Freundlich and interns Robert Holian and Lyndsey Glass for their contributions to this bibliography.