

Family group conferences and child safeguarding

| Authors | Title | Journal/Publisher / Organisation | Date | Available free at: | Summary/Abstract | Country |
|--|---|--|------|---|---|----------------------|
| Marsh P | Kent family group conference financial analysis | | 2013 | http://www.frg.org.uk/images/FGC_research/kent-fgc-outcomes-report.pdf | The study was designed to undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the placement outcomes and the potential cost implications for all children in Kent deemed to be at risk of entering care over a year. In summary if there was no FGC service, then increased costs for Kent annually of at least 160 care years and potentially up to 260 care years are likely. | England |
| Rauktis ME, Bishop-Fitzpatrick L, Jung N & Pennell J | Family group decision making: Measuring fidelity to practice principles in public child welfare | Children and Youth Services Review 35 (2013) 287–295 | 2013 | no | Report examining fidelity of FGDM processes and different perspectives on this. The report concludes with advice to child welfare practitioners. | US and international |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|-------------|--|---|--|
| <p>NEY Tara, STOLTZ J, MALONEY M</p> | <p>Voice, power and discourse: experiences of participants in family group conferences in the context of child protection</p> | <p>Journal of Social Work, 13(2), 2013, pp.184-202</p> | <p>2013</p> | <p>http://www.uk.sagepub.com/journalsProdDesc.nav?prodId=Journal201477</p> | <p>The authors explore the tensions that emerge when two very different discourses; the 'democratic', participatory discourse of family group conferencing (FGC) and the legalistic, bureaucratized discourse of conventional child welfare practice, attempt to integrate. A total of 74 interviews were carried out in British Columbia, involving 26 adult family members/caregivers (three youth); six child protection workers; and three FGC coordinators. The findings reveal how participants' voices were co-opted by the more forceful child protection discourse. The authors describe how in each case participants' experience of power was subjugated, even though, in each instance, the case was perceived to have had a successful outcome by the social worker and FGC coordinator. They conclude that if those involved in administering and delivering family group conferencing continue to at least be aware of how power operates in this context, then the possibility exists to realise FGC's broader social justice and transformative goals.</p> | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|-------------|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------|---|---|-----------|
| Department of human services, States of Hawaii | Family Connections Hawaii | www.familyfind.org | 2012 | http://familyfind.org/uploaded_files/fck/files/Family%20Connections%20Hawaii%20Final%20Report%2012-31-2012.pdf | Examination of culturally sensitive FGC model incorporating 'family finding' methodologies and its use with indigenous population in Hawaii. Outcomes show fewer children removed to state care or reduced time in care. | US Hawaii |
| PILCHER D, ARNILL M | 'Allowed to be there': the wider family and child protection | Practice: Social Work in Action, 22(1), February 2010, pp.17-31 | 2010 | http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cpra20#.VARP9-Z0yM8 | The authors worked with a multidisciplinary group of practitioners and other professionals and a group of grandparents and other family members who had already experienced child protection intervention in their own families to test recent thinking and emerging practices of kinship care. | UK |
| DARLINGTON Y, et al | Parents' perceptions of their participation in mandated family group meetings | Children and Youth Services Review, 34(2), February 2012, pp.331-337 | 2012 | http://www.journals.elsevier.com/children-and-youth-services-review/ | In Queensland, Australia, Family Group Meetings (FGMs), were legislated in 2005. This article reports findings from semi-structured interviews with 10 parents (5 mothers and 5 fathers) who participated in FGMs. The interviews focused on the parents' experiences of the meetings, including factors that promote or inhibit participation. The findings showed that positive experiences of participation were associated with: feeling respected by professionals; feeling that one's opinions were heard; and being supported at the | Australia |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|------|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | meeting. Conversely, parents who reported overall negative experiences spoke of: not feeling respected; not having their opinions heard; and not being supported during the meeting. | |
| Ottolini D | The family conferencing: a groundbreaking practise for community based child protection in Kenya | Save the children | 2011 | http://resourcecentre.savethechildren.se/sites/default/files/documents/the_family_conferencing_-_diego_ottolini1.pdf | Very detailed and longitudinal study of FGCs in Kenya, East Africa working with children in youth justice facilities usually as a result of being 'on the street' engaging in crime or at risk. | Kenya |
| Family Rights Group | What is a family group conferences? A guide for Families: Film | Family Rights Group, London | 2010 | http://www.frg.org.uk/what-is-a-family-group-conference-a-guide-for-families | | England and Wales |
| Family Rights Group | Developing a Family Group Conference Service: film | Family Rights Group, London | 2010 | no | | England and Wales |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------|---|--|---------|
| Pennell J, Edwards M & Burford G | Expedited family group engagement and child permanency. | Children and Youth Services Review, 32(7), 1012-1019. | 2010 | No | This study in Washington, D.C., evaluated the impact of family team meetings on children's permanency. The meetings were convened within 72 hours after an emergency removal to give the family group the opportunity for input into the plan. The study compares outcomes for three groups: the FTM group, similar families who reviewed normal services before the instigation of the FTM service and families who had similar problems but who received other services. The results showed those receiving FTMs were more likely to be placed with family/relative carers and have shorter times in care. | US |
| Aron S, Schumaker K, Cook C, Crampton D, Saini M, Backe- Hansen E & Kowalski K | Family group decision making for children at risk of abuse and neglect | Cochrane Library | 2009 | | | |
| Heino T | Family Group Conference from a Child Perspective Nordic Research Report | National Institute for Health and Welfare | 2009 | http://www.thl.fi/thl-client/pdfs/da905b95-70f6-4db8-9d82-91b74fe55ed0 | | Finland |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|--|------|---|---|----|
| Lorentzen B L | Effects of family group decision making in a voluntary family maintenance program. | Dissertation Abstracts International A. Humanities and Social Sciences, 69 (09), 3743. (UMI No. 3331701) | 2009 | No | A study in California looking at outcome differences between families who receive FGDM and other mainstream services. The study found no significant outcome differences. | US |
| Marsh P | Family group conferences. | Highlight 248 | 2009 | | Examines FGC practice in UK and wider legal and practice issues. | UK |
| Olson K B | Family group conferencing and child protection mediation: essential tools for prioritizing family engagement in child welfare cases. | Family Court Review 47(1), 2009: 53-68. | 2009 | http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2009.00239.x/abstract | Considers FGCs in context of child protection and statutory decision making and the added value brought by the model to these forums. | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------|----|---|----|
| Schmid J E & Pollack S | Developing Shared Knowledge: Family Group Conferencing as a Means of Negotiating Power in the Child Welfare System | Practice: Social Work in Action | 2009 | No | | |
| Weigensberg E C, Barth R P & Guo S | Family group decision making: A propensity score analysis to evaluate child and family services at baseline and after 36-months. | Children and Youth Services Review. | 2009 | No | American study looks at impact of family meetings (encompassing all family led decision making models) on engagement with services compared with other mainstream interventions. Study found significantly higher connection with services immediately after the family meeting. Differences had reduced 3 years later. | US |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|---|--|------|---|---|-----------|
| Brodie K A | Family group conference: An exploratory study describing the relationship between an internal agency environment and the process. | Doctoral dissertation, Howard University, Washington, D.C. | 2008 | No | Californian study examining aspects of how welfare services are operated and their impact on the use, take up and the continuation of FGC services. Found that factors that influenced this were supervisor and social work expectations, the degree of crisis management in services, costs and external funding and state and federal mandates. | US |
| Falck S | Do family group conferences lead to a better situation for the children involved? | Oslo, Norway: NOVA (Norwegian Social Research), Ministry of Education and Research. | 2008 | No | Study in Norway of outcomes for children subject to child protection concerns experiencing either FGCs or other services. Cases were followed up for 3 years. Outcomes demonstrated greater family mobilisation and greater care and support for children subject to FGCs. | Norway |
| Harris N | Family group conferencing in Australia 15 years on | Child Abuse Prevention Issue, No. 27 Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Australian Institute of Family Studies. | 2008 | http://www.aifs.gov.au/nch/pubs/issues/issues27/issues27.pdf | | Australia |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------|----|---|--------|
| Holland S & Rivett M | Everyone Started Shouting': Making Connections between the Process of Family Group Conferences and Family Therapy Practice | British Journal of Social Work;Jan2008, Vol. 38 Issue 1, p21 | 2008 | No | Qualitative study examining FGCs in Wales looking at how FGCs and family therapy manage aspects of emotional communication within families and the learning that each process can offer to the other. | Wales |
| Horwitz M | Family conferencing as core child protection practice. | Unpublished manuscript. | 2008 | no | American study that examines the value of FGCs within a child protection arena. Very high number of FGC outcomes examined which showed higher engagement of kin support to parents across a range of areas. Emphasises the importance of proper planning and preparation in order to achieve positive outcomes. | US |
| Ministry of Children and Family Development, Vancouver Coastal Region, Collaborative Practice Team | Family case planning conferencing: Pilot project evaluation. | Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: Ministry of Children and Family Development. | 2008 | no | A Canadian qualitative analysis of the use of family case planning conferences 'a useful option between the more professionally driven integrated case management meetings and the more family-led family group conferences.' Model seen as useful in relation to situations requiring tight timescales. | Canada |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|------|---|---|----|
| Sawyer R Q & Lohrbach S | Creating a constructive practice: family and professional partnership in high risk child protection case conferences | Protecting Children | 2008 | http://www.co.lmsted.mn.us/cspublications/Documents/CFS/Publications/creatingaconstructivepractice.pdf | This is an interesting article on engaging with families on edge or in legal proceedings using 3 models. Very detailed and positive re outcomes over nearly 10 years. Relevant to considerations of how FGCs are being used as part of pre proceedings. | US |
| Ashley C & Nixon P (Ed) | Family Group Conferences – where next? Policies and Practices for the Future | Family Rights Group, London | 2007 | No | This book combines a series of essays from policy, research and practice perspectives, with ideas on how best to deliver and develop family group conference practices | UK |
| Merkel-Holguin L | Questions about implementation and practice: patterns in the United States | In Ashley C & Nixon P (Ed.) Family Group Conferences – Where Next? Policies & Practices for the Future, Family Rights Group, London | 2007 | No | | US |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|------|----|---|-------------------|
| Quinn Aziz, Abyd | Understanding the evidence – what does empirical research and evaluation say about family group conferences in England and Wales? | In Ashley C & Nixon P (Ed.) Family Group Conferences – Where Next? Policies & Practices for the Future, Family Rights Group, London | 2007 | No | | England and Wales |
| Couldrick A and Nixon P | Changing organisational culture and practice to build on families' strengths: a leadership and management perspective | In Ashley C & Nixon P (Ed.) Family Group Conferences – Where Next? Policies & Practices for the Future, Family Rights Group, London | 2007 | No | | England |
| American Humane Association | FGDM: Increasing the Knowledge Base . | Protecting children | 2007 | No | American journal presenting three articles concerning specific areas of FGC practice and developments. Examines agency engagement with the model, FGCs and father engagement, and use of FGCs alongside other crisis conferencing models around pre birth planning. | US |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|------|----|--|----|
| Brown L | The adoption and implementation of a service innovation in a social work setting – A case study of family group conferencing in the UK. | Social Policy and Society, 6(3), 321-332. | 2007 | No | Drawing on previous work the author examines barriers to the use and development of FGCs in the UK and makes recommendations as to how the model can be mainstreamed and referrer concern for its use addressed. | UK |
| Crampton D | Research Review: Family group decision-making: a promising practice in need of more programme theory and research | Child and Family Social Work 12, pp 202–209 | 2007 | No | An overview of the research on the use of FGCs between 1996 and 2005 proposing future development in order to further embed the model including how to move towards the model being 'evidence based'. | US |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|------|---|--|--------------|
| Edwards L & Sagatun-Edwards I | The transition to group decision making in child protection cases: Obtaining better results for children and families. | Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 58(1), 1-16. | 2007 | http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1755-6988.2007.tb00132.x/abstract | Examines use of different family led decision making models within child protection system in California and drawing on strengths of these models makes recommendations for use within child protection practice. | US |
| Glode J & Wien F | Evaluating the family group conferencing approach in a First Nations context. | In C. Chamberland, S. Léveillé, & N. Trocmé (Eds.), <i>Enfants à protéger, parents à aider, des univers à rapprocher</i> (pp. 264-276). Quebec City, Canada: Presses de l'Université de Québec. | 2007 | No | Comparative study of use of FGCs with indigenous communities in Canada. Control group study found positive outcomes for FGC group including better familiarity with concerns and more culturally sensitive engagement. | Canada |
| Harris N | Mapping the adoption of family group conferencing in Australian states and territories. | Adelaide, Australia: Australian Centre for Child Protection | 2007 | | Examination of the development of FGCs in Australia and comparison with the use of the approach in New Zealand. | Australia/NZ |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------|---|---|---------|
| Holland S, Aziz Q & Robinson A | The development of an all-Wales evaluation tool for family group conferences: Final research report. | Cardiff, Wales: Cardiff University. | 2007 | No | Examines the development and use of FGCs in Wales and pioneers the comprehensive use of a measurement tool across Welsh projects. | Wales |
| Laws S & Kirby P | Under the table or at the table: Supporting children and families in family group conferences – a summary of the Daybreak research. | | 2007 | http://www.pkrc.co.uk/lib/doc/publication_und_erthtable.pdf | A report on the use of advocacy by Daybreak and the relative merits of different approaches to advocacy. Makes recommendations for practice. | England |
| Merkel-Holguin L, Tinworth K, Horner A & Wilmot L | Using family group conferencing to achieve permanency for youth. | Protecting Children, 22(1), 38-49. | 2007 | http://site.americahumane.org/site/DocServer/P_Carticle.pdf?docID=6041?docID=6041 | This American article examines the needs of young people exiting the care system and their need for permanency and stability and the potential that FGCs offer to achieve this. | US |
| Seattle, WA | Finding our roots: Family group conferencing in Washington. | Northwest Institute for Children and Families, & Catalyst for Kids. | 2007 | No | American study that examines the use of FGCs with children 'of colour' and effectiveness of the model in engaging wider family and community supports. | US |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|------|---|---|-------------------|
| Staples J | Knowle West Family Group Conference Project: Evaluation report. | Bristol, England: Barnardo's/Knowle West Neighbourhood Renewal | 2007 | No | A Barnardos review of an FGC service delivered within a deprived community in Bristol. A high number of participants were contacted. Reports positive views expressed by families and professionals of the process with specific outcomes reported. | England |
| Ashley C, Holton L, Horan H, Wiffin J | The Family Group Conference Toolkit – a practical guide for setting up and running an FGC service | Family Rights Group, London | 2006 | no | | England and Wales |
| Bell M and Wilson K | Children's views of family group conferences. | British Journal of Social Work 36(4), June 2006: 671-81. | 2006 | http://www.scie-socialcareonline.org.uk/childrens-views-of-family-group-conferences/r/a1CG000000GMtvMAG | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|------|---|--|---------|
| Berzin S C | Using sibling data to understand the impact of family group decision-making on child welfare outcomes. | Children and Youth Services Review, 28, 1449-1458 | 2006 | No | American study which examines outcomes for children and siblings experiencing FGCs or other mainstream interventions. No significant differences reported. | US |
| Brady B | Facilitating Family Decision Making: A Study of the Family Welfare Conference Service in the HSE Western Area | HSE / NUI, Galway Child & Family Research and Policy Unit | 2006 | http://www.childandfamilyresearch.ie/sites/www.childandfamilyresearch.ie/files/facilitating_family_decision_making_a_study_of_the_family_welfare_conference_service_in_the_hse_western_area.pdf | Three stage report on the implementation of FGCs in the Republic of Ireland where the Children Act 2001 made provision for their use in child welfare and youth justice cases. Reports examine implementation and views of participants. | Ireland |
| Barnardo's | The Wexford Family Welfare Conference Project Evaluation Report Synopsis | Barnardo's | 2006 | http://www.barnardos.ie/assets/files/pdf/Wexford-FWC-Executive-Summary.pdf | Evaluation of FGC service in Republic of Ireland | Ireland |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|--|---|------|----|--|----|
| Connolly M | Up front and personal: Confronting dynamics in the family group conference. | Family Process, 45(3), 345-357. | 2006 | No | This article examines the development of FGCs in New Zealand and the views specifically of FGC coordinators in managing the process. Using three coordinator focus groups it looks at their views concerning effective FGC practice. | NZ |
| Connolly M | Fifteen years of family group conferencing: Coordinators talk about their experiences in Aotearoa New Zealand. | British Journal of Social Work, 36(4), 523-540. | 2006 | No | This small qualitative study from New Zealand explores the views of FGC coordinators concerning the development of the model, the drivers influencing change and the challenge of managing child protection and family support functions within the process. | NZ |
| Crampton D | When do social workers and family members try family group decision making? A process evaluation. | International Journal of Child & Family Welfare, 9(3), 131-143. | 2006 | No | This American study examines the characteristics of families referred for FGCs and those of the families that then go on to successfully have a meeting. It found high levels of agreement between professionals as to which families would benefit. | US |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------|---|--|-------|
| Dawson A & Yancey B | Youth Participants Speak About Their Family Group Conference | American Humane FGDM Issues in Brief | 2006 | http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/medicalschoo/departments/pediatrics/subs/can/FGDM/Documents/FGDM%20Web%20Pages/Resources/Issue%20Briefs/pc-fgdm-ib-youth-participants.pdf | This American study examines the views of young people who are exiting care concerning what worked for them in their FGC. The study also reports very positive outcomes in the numbers of young people who moved to less restrictive placements following their FGC. | US |
| Holland S & O'Neill S | '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, 13(1), 91-111. | 2006 | No | A small scale study of young people's participation in FGCs in Wales examining the risks and benefits of their involvement with indications for good practice. | Wales |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|------|---|--|------------|
| Koch M, Hilt L, Jenkins L, & Dunn T | Family group conferencing: 45 children a 12 month study. | Presentation at the World Forum: Future Directions in Child Welfare, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. | 2006 | No | PowerPoint report to a conference in Canada reporting on the outcomes for families engaged in FGCs in Australia. Reports post conference increase in number of children creed for in families and more culturally sensitive decisions for Aboriginal families. | Australian |
| Pennell J | Restorative practices and child welfare: Toward an inclusive civil society. | In B. Morrison & E. Ahmed (Eds.), Restorative justice and civil society [Special issue]. Journal of Social Issues, 62(2), 257-277. | 2006 | http://repository.lib.ncsu.edu/publications/bitstream/1840.2/53/1/Restorative%2BPractices%2Band%2BChild%2BWelfare.pdf | American study which looked at the potential for FGCs to increase participatory decision making for children. Benefits were less when the process was not properly followed. | US |
| Weisz V, Korpas A & Wingrove T | Nebraska family group conferencing: Evaluation report. | Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska, UN-L Center on Children, Families, and the Law, Nebraska Court Improvement Project. | 2006 | No | American study which examines the use of 'expedited' (quicker) FGC meetings following removal of a child alongside regular FGCs. Study reports that children who had an FGC within 30 days of removal were more likely to be placed with wider family/parents that those who didn't get the service. | US |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|---|---|-----------|
| Kiely P | A longitudinal evaluation of family group conferencing | 9th Australian Institute of Family Studies Conference | 2005 | http://www.aifs.gov.au/conferences/aifs9/kiely.pdf | An Australian longitudinal study of the impact of FGCs for children in the child protection process. Reports higher rates of kin placements and reduction in child protection referrals for FGC families. | Australia |
| Connolly M | Consulting with care and protection resource panels: Coordinators' perspectives. | Te Awatea Review, 3(1), 9-11. | 2005 | No | Report on the use of care and protection resource panels as set up within the New Zealand legislation to advise FGC coordinators on practice. | NZ |
| Holland S, Scourfield J O'Neill S, & Pithouse A | Democratising the family and the state? The case of family group conferences in child welfare. | Journal of Social Policy, 34(1), 59-77. | 2005 | No | A Welsh study which examines the potential of the FGC to promote participatory decision making and to truly empower families. | Wales |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|------|----|---|-----------|
| Thomas K L, Berzin S C & Cohen E | Fidelity of family group decision making: A content analysis of family conference and case plans in a randomized treatment study. | Protecting Children, 19(4), 4-15. | 2005 | no | An examination of the differences between FGC plans and plans made through traditional case conference approaches. The results report the idiosyncratic nature of FGC plans as opposed to the more uniform nature of traditional plans. | US |
| Titcomb A & LeCroy C | Outcomes of Arizona's family group decision making program. | Protecting Children, 19(4), 47-53. | 2005 | No | A longitudinal study of outcomes for families engaged in FGCs in Arizona. The study reports lower rates of re-referral for safeguarding concerns and higher involvement and satisfaction amongst family involved in the FGC. | US |
| Walker L | A cohort study of 'ohana conferencing in child abuse and neglect cases. | Protecting Children, 19(4), 36-46. | 2005 | No | Comparative study of families who experience culturally sensitive 'Ohana' conferences in Hawaii. Positive outcomes reported for families who had this approach as opposed to families subject to traditional approaches. | US Hawaii |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|------|---|---|----------|
| Walton E, McKenzie M & Connolly M | Private family time: The heart of family group conferencing. | Protecting Children, 19(4), 17-24. | 2005 | No | A study of the views of New Zealand coordinators to the value and use of private family time. Reports positively on the value of PFT but that there is also some professional discretion as to its use. | NZ |
| Carson G | Family conferences bid for mainstream. | Children Now, 6 October 2004: p.8. | 2004 | No | Discusses moves by Children 1st to set up a unit promoting the use of FGCs as a means of keeping children out of public care. | Scotland |
| Connolly M | Convening family group conferences: Coordinators talk about professional issues. | Social Work Review, 16, 8-10. | 2004 | No | Report on a small scale study of New Zealand coordinators' views of FGCs and the factors influencing their practice. | NZ |
| Connolly M | A Perspective on the Origins of Family Group Conferencing. | | 2004 | http://www.americanhumane.org/assets/pdfs/children/fgdm/pc-fgdm-ib-fgc-origins.pdf | This article considers the multitudinous factors that led to the emergence of the FGC approach in New Zealand and considers them in relation to contemporary developments. | NZ |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|------|---|---|--------|
| Sundell K., Vinnerljun B | Outcomes of family group conferencing in Sweden: A 3-year follow-up | Child Abuse & Neglect 28 (2004) 267–287 | 2004 | | A longitudinal Swedish study of the outcomes for families in FGCs compared to traditional interventions. The report found higher rates of re-referral for abuse for those families who had experienced the FGC and concludes that the evidence does not support claims that the process is effective in preventing future maltreatment. | Sweden |
| Brown L | Mainstream or margin? The current use of family group conferences in child welfare practice in the UK. | Child and Family Social Work 8(4), November 2003: 331-40. | 2003 | No | An examination of the use of FGCs in the UK and the constraints on their developing use. | UK |
| Desmeules G H | Family group conferencing: A decolonization journey for aboriginal children and families in child protection services. | Unpublished master's thesis, Royal Roads University, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. | 2003 | http://www.actionscanada.gc.ca/obj/s4/f2/dsk4/etd/MQ77758.pdf | A small Canadian study to consider adaptations to the FGC model to fit the cultural needs of the aboriginal community. | Canada |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|------|---|--|---------|
| Garcia J A Sivak P & Tibrewal S | Transforming relationships in practice and research: what is the Stanislaus model? | Protecting Children 18(1&2) 2003: 22-29. | 2003 | No | An evaluation of the FGC approach in a region of California. | US |
| Gunderson K, Cahn K & Wirth J | The Washington State long-term outcome study. | Protecting Children, 18(1 & 2), 42-47. | 2003 | no | Summary of a long term outcome evaluation of FGCs in Washington. | US |
| Heino T | Using family group conferencing to protect children in Finland. | Protecting Children 18(1&2) 2003: 121-123. | 2003 | No | A detailed examination of the involvement of children in their FGCs in Finland. | Finland |
| Horan H & Dalrymple J | Promoting the participation rights of children and young people in family group conferences. | Practice 15(2), 2003: 5-14. | 2003 | http://www.americanhumane.org/assets/pdfs/children/fgdm/pc-fgdm-horan-dalrymple.pdf | A report on the involvement of children in the Barnardos FGC service in Wiltshire which promotes the benefits of advocacy. | England |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|------|----|--|-------------------|
| Marsh P and Crow G | Family group conferencing: a national process and outcome study in England and Wales - 1997. | Protecting Children 18(1&2) 2003: 129-130. | 2003 | No | Report on the outcomes of a large scale study of the use of FGCs in England and Wales. | England and Wales |
| Nyberg E | Family group conferencing in Sweden | Protecting Children, 18(1&2) 2003: 119-120. | 2003 | No | Report on the development of FGCs in Sweden. | Sweden |
| Rasmussen B M | Vulnerability and energy: the study of the Danish experiment with family group conferencing. | Protecting Children 18(1&2) 2003: 124-126 | 2003 | No | Summary of a trial of FGCs in Denmark in 1999 | Denmark |
| Stevens M | Reconstruction works? Constructing family perspectives of the outcomes of FGCs. | Protecting Children 18(1&2) 2003: 30-41. | 2003 | No | A study of family members views of the outcomes of FGCs. | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|------|----|--|--------|
| Sundell K | Family group conferences in Sweden -- continuing social services programs for children and parents [English Summary]. | http://www.sos.se/socialtj/cus/cuse/empstude/famrad99sum.htm | 2003 | No | Reports on a detailed 3 year evaluation of FGCs in Sweden. Families who experienced FGCs and those who had traditional interventions were followed up 3 years subsequent to the intervention. Those who had FGCs were found to have higher rates of referral for child protection concerns. Some questions regarding the limitations of the methodology of the research. | Sweden |
|-----------|---|---|------|----|--|--------|

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|---|--|----|
| Tapsfield R | FGCs: family-led decision making. | Childright, 195, 2003: 16-17. | 2003 | http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=tapsfield%20fgcs%3A%20family-led%20decision%20making.%20&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CC8QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww2.essex.ac.uk%2Fclc%2Fhi%2Fchildright%2Farticle%2F195%2FcR195_16.doc&ei=-N8MUu-uC4XH7AaL5YC4Aw&usg=AFQjCNEKyulJOHtrqvCRyXH9gWjjiJAD9A&bvm=bv.50723672,d.ZGU&cad=rja | Examination of the development of FGCs in UK by FRG. | UK |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|---|--|----|

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------|----|--|------------------|
| Titcomb A & LeCroy C | Evaluation of Arizona's family group decision making program. | Protecting Children, 18(1 & 2), 58-64. | 2003 | no | Report of a 3 year outcome based study of FGCs in Arizona. Findings demonstrated reduction in stranger placements, higher satisfaction amongst family members and significant reduction in re-referrals for abuse or neglect. | US |
| Wheeler C E & Johnson S | Evaluating family group decision making: The Santa Clara example. | Protecting Children, 18(1 & 2), 65-69. | 2003 | no | A study of cost benefits and outcomes from FGCs and Family Unity meetings in Santa Clara, America. Children who had family group conferences had better stability of placements and shorter periods in care. FGCs found to be cost neutral. | US |
| O'Sullivan B, McKinney A & Gallagher S | Family group conference pilot project. | Belfast, Northern Ireland: North Western Health Board. | 2002 | No | An initial study of the introduction of FGCs in the Republic of Ireland looking at outcomes from the first 6 FGCs. Participants report high level of satisfaction with process and outcomes. | Northern Ireland |
| Kiely P & Bussey K | Family group conferencing: A longitudinal evaluation. | Sydney, Australia: Macquarie University. | 2001 | No | Detailed outcome based longitudinal study in Australia using control groups. Study found FGCs generated additional kinship foster care for children and respite for children reported for abuse and neglect. Benefits were more pronounced for younger children. | Australia |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------|---|--|----------------|
| Knut S, Vinnerljung B and Ryburn M | Social workers' attitudes towards family group conferences in Sweden and the UK. | Child and Family Social Work 6(4), 2001: 327-36. | 2001 | | Examination of attitudes from referring social workers in Sweden and England to FGCs and the relationship between attitudes and referral rates. Study shows high regard for the model but this isn't reflected in referral rates. | England/Sweden |
| Shore N, Wirth J, Cahn K, Yancey B & Gunderson K | Long Term and Immediate Outcomes of Family Group Conferencing in Washington State | Restorative Practices | 2001 | http://www.iirp.edu/iirpWebsite/web/uploads/article_pdfs/fgc_wash.pdf | Qualitative study of outcomes for families referred to FGCs in Washington demonstrated higher rates of reunification and kinship placements than traditional approaches and higher rates of paternal family engagement. Findings were sustained for over 2,5 years. | US |
| American Humane Association | Pathways to Permanency: Family Group Decision Making | National Center on Family Group Decision Making | 2000 | http://site.americanhumane.org/site/DocServer/path_vid0102.pdf?docID=195 | | US |
| Pennell J & Burford G | Family group decision making: Protecting children and women | Child Welfare, 79(2), 131-158 | 2000 | | This study of family group conferencing in Newfoundland and Labrador was conducted in 1993-1996, in three culturally diverse regions: Inuit, rural and capital city. Over an approximately one-year period, family group conferences were convened for 32 families, with | Canada |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>472 participants at their conferences, Interviewees thought the family was better off because the conference strengthened positive relationships and enhanced their sense of being family. In addition, interviewees reported that children from the project families suffered less maltreatment and had better parenting. A review of child welfare files found a reduction in indicators of child maltreatment and domestic violence for the 32 project families and a moderate increase for the 31 comparison families. After the conference, child protection workers were less likely to make emergency visits to project families than to comparison families because they knew the project families better. The number of child placements stayed relatively constant for the comparison families and fell for the project families. Small in number but nevertheless troubling, children and youth abusing mothers appeared to persist for project families and rose for comparison families.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|----|---|------------------|
| Burford G and Hudson J (eds) | Family group conferencing: new directions in community-centred child and family practice. | New York: Aldine de Gruyter, ISBN: 0202361225 | 2000 | No | | International |
| Clare M | Educating FGC co-ordinators: a 'family of origin' perspective. | Children Australia 25(2) 2000: 21-27. | 2000 | No | Examines social work training and supervision and how family based practice in particular FGCs in addressed | Australia |
| Courter Films with support from the Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption. 2000. | VIDEO: Pathways to Permanence: Introduction to Family Group Conferencing and Concurrent Planning | Dave Thomas Foundation | 2000 | | Video resource demonstrating 3 models of engagement with families regarding achieving permanency for children - FGC, Mediation and concurrent planning. | US |
| Hayes D | The use of FGCs in child protection work: an exploration of professional's views. | Child Care in Practice 6(2) 2000: 124-146. | 2000 | No | Report on a survey of the views of professionals concerning advantages of FGC in engaging families in Northern Ireland where there are safeguarding concerns. | Northern Ireland |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|------|----|---|-----------|
| Pennell J & Burford G | Family group decision making: Protecting children and women. | Child Welfare, 79(2), 131-158. | 2000 | no | Comparative study in Canada of FGC and mainstream provision made to families with one year follow up and detailed examination of files. Study reports reduced abuse re-referrals, better family relationships, fewer unannounced visits and fewer placements made for children. Plans were seen to deteriorate in chaotic families. | Canada |
| Bell M | Working in partnership in child protection: the conflicts. | British Journal of Social Work 29(3) 1999: 437-455. | 1999 | No | Exploration of child protection practice by 22 social workers. Demonstrates some of the difficulties with case conference approach. | UK |
| Bond H | Families matter. | Community Care, 1278a, 1999: 34-35. | 1999 | No | Report on the use of FGCs in Essex. | England |
| Lupton C and Nixon P | Empowering practice?: a critical appraisal of the FGC approach. | Bristol: Policy Press, 1999 ISBN: 1861341490 | 1999 | No | Report examining notion of 'empowerment' and how to realise this in practice. Draws on experience of using FGCs in UK and in New Zealand. | UK/NZ |
| Mondy L & Kiely P | Family decision making: good practice in child protection solutions. | Children Australia, 24(3), 1999: 24-27. | 1999 | No | Description of a family group decision making project in New South Wales, Australia. | Australia |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|------|---|--|-----------|
| Crow G & Marsh P | Family group conferences in Haringey | Number 4 Families and Welfare Findings Series | 1998 | http://www.petermarsh.staff.sh.ef.ac.uk/pdfs/FGCiHtxt.pdf | An evaluation of the FGC project in Haringey, London and its use of FGCs immediately following child protection conferences. Found 57% of cases were deregistered in year following FGC which was higher than recorded for other families experiencing routine services. | England |
| Marsh P and Crow G | FGCs in child welfare. | Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, ISBN: 0632049936 | 1998 | no | Historical review of child welfare since 1948 | UK |
| Sinclair R | Involving children in planning their care: research review. | Child and Family Social Work 3(2) 1998: 137-142. | 1998 | No | Looks at the involvement of children in planning for their own care in accordance with CA guidance and potential for this to be effectively achieved with different approaches. | UK |
| Campbell L | Family involvement in decision making in child protection and care: four types of case conference. | Child and Family Social Work 2(1) 1997: 1-11. | 1997 | No | An examination of different models of family participation in decision making in Australia within the child protection system. The paper explores their distinctive contributions and the tensions inherent in protecting children and broadening participation. | Australia |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|------|-------------------------|---|-----------|
| Mitchell P and Kitson B | FGCs | Representing Children 10(1) 1997: 20-28. | 1997 | No (ceased publication) | | |
| Hamill H | FGCs in child care practice. | University of East Anglia. Social Work Development Unit Norwich: University of East Anglia, 1996 ISBN: 1857840429 | 1996 | no | Series of monographs concerning family group conferences in child protection. | UK |
| Hirst J | Family planning. | Community Care, 1119, 1996: 16-17. | 1996 | No | Report on use of FGCs in UK | UK |
| Merkel-Holguin L | Putting families back into the child protection partnership: family group decision making. | Protecting Children 12(3) 1996: 4-7. | 1996 | No | Use of FGC and other family strengths models and use in protecting children | US |
| Ryburn M and Atherton C | FGCs: partnership in practice. | Adoption and Fostering, 20(1), 1996: 8. | 1996 | No | Implications of FGC in relation to partnership working in UK | UK |
| Ban P and Swain P | FGCs: part one. Australia's first project within child | Children Australia 19(3) 1994: 19-21. | 1994 | No | Article describing the principles of FGCs as applied in early developments in Australia | Australia |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|------|----|--|---------------|
| | protection. | | | | | |
| Morris K | Families in conference. | Community Care, 1010, 1994. | 1994 | No | Description of early development and implementation of FGC in UK | UK |
| Tunnard J (ed) | FGCs: a report commissioned by the Department of Health | Family Rights Group; Department of Health (DoH) London: Family Rights Group, ISBN: 1871515262 | 1994 | No | Early developments of FGC in England and origins of the model | International |
| | FGCs: part two. Putting the family back into child protection. | Children Australia 19(4) 1994: 11-14. | 1994 | no | Follow on from earlier paper from same authors describing early developments in Australia of FGC implementation. | Australian |
| Marsh P | Family group conferences. | Highlight 248, May 2009: [1-4]. | 2009 | no | Brief examination of use of family group conferences in UK | UK |
| Morris K & Tunnard J | Family group conferences: messages from UK practice and research | London: Family Rights Group, 1996. 118p., bibliog. | 1996 | No | Early developments of FGC in England and origins of the model. Also includes early research on FGCs in the UK. | UK |
| Marsh P | Engaging children, young people and their families via Family Group Conferences | in Calder, M. (Ed) 'The Carrot or the Stick? Toward effective practice with involuntary clients in safeguarding | 2008 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|------|---|---|--|
| | | children work' Lyme Regis: Russell House Publishing. pp 165-171 | | | | |
| Walsh, D. and Marsh, P | 'Family Group Conference Plans - A study of planning and outcomes in Kent Family Group Conference Service' | No 9, A4, pp4, University of Sheffield | 2007 | | | |
| Frost | Family group conferences: context, process and ways forward | Child & Family Social Work - Wiley Online Library | 2012 | http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/cfs.12047/abstract | This is the first part of a two-part review of the literature, policy and practice relating to family group conferences (FGCs). This first paper explores the background, the global policy context, the theoretical foundations and the process of undertaking FGCs. In the subsequent review, the authors will examine the issue of outcomes, research findings and explore future challenges in implementing FGCs. | |
| Fox D | Family Group Conferencing and evidence- based practice | <i>Research, Policy and Planning</i> (2008) 26 (3), 157- | 2008 | http://ssrg.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/rpp26 | Family Group Conferencing is an established method of intervention in criminal justice and social work in the UK and abroad. Describing briefly | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|------|---|--|--|
| | | 67 | | 3/family.pdf | restorative justice, Family Group Conferencing and the evidence for effective interventions, this article examines relevant research and literature and explores disparities in the knowledge base regarding Family Group Conferencing and the 'what works' agenda. The paper highlights the limited empirical research undertaken to evaluate Family Group Conferencing, particularly where focused on vulnerable young people and especially where there are child welfare and youth justice concerns. | |
| Burns G and Fruchtel F | Family Group Conference: A Bridge between Lifeworld and System | Br J Soc Work (2012) doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcs192 | 2012 | http://bjsw.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2012/12/29/bjsw.bcs192.abstract | This article examines the hypothesis: what makes FGC necessary is not the issue of racism, but a more fundamental phenomenon of administration, law, professionalism and modern government. The authors argue that FGC is a legal and professional procedure, needed to cure the unhelpful side effects of a legal and professional welfare state system. To explain this, they follow Jürgen Habermas's Theory of Communicative Action (1987), which explains why system logic overpowers peoples' logic, even when this is not the intention of social work professionals. | |