

Statewide

Family Group Decision Making Conference Survey Report

July 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014

This information is from the Family Group Decision Making (FGDM) Fidelity survey that was implemented in 2009. Results are calculated from the responses to the scannable surveys received from participating counties. Results are not based on the number of conferences, but the total number of surveys returned by each participant. These numbers may differ from personal counts because some surveys can not be scanned.

The surveys contain nineteen (19) questions about the conference. Seventeen (17) questions measure practice fidelity, specifically; cultural safety, community partnerships and family leadership. Further explanation of these subscales is on the second page of this report. The remaining two (2) questions focus on safety and satisfaction with the family group process. Respondents indicate how strongly that they agree with the survey statements and their answers correspond to a numeric score. For example, a selection of strongly agree is given a score of four (4); a selection of strongly disagree is given a score of one (1). Additionally, the survey includes several demographic items including; relationship to the child, gender race and ethnicity. This report contains information from the 19 items but does not include demographic information.

Children are Safer: 89% Agree
Total Number of Surveys¹: 9,343

Recommend Family Group: 93% Agree
Total Number of Conferences²: 1,557

Respondent	Respondent Count	Cultural Safety			Community Partnerships			Family Leadership		
		Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode
Child/Youth ³	565	3.63	4.0	4.0	3.63	3.84	4.0	3.55	3.60	4.0
Parents ⁴	1728	3.64	4.0	4.0	3.61	3.83	4.0	3.55	3.67	4.0
Relatives ⁵	2883	3.62	3.75	4.0	3.58	3.67	4.0	3.56	3.67	4.0
Friends ⁶	584	3.66	4.0	4.0	3.59	3.67	4.0	3.56	3.57	4.0
Others ⁷	1251	3.62	3.75	4.0	3.60	3.83	4.0	3.55	3.67	4.0
Professionals ⁸	2249	3.60	3.75	4.0	3.62	3.83	4.0	3.56	3.71	4.0
Clergy	76	3.67	4.0	4.0	3.63	3.83	4.0	3.64	3.71	4.0

Survey scores range from 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (agree) and 4 (strongly agree).

Mean- the average.

Median- the mid-point of a distribution: half the scores are above the median and half are below.

Mode- the most frequently occurring value. Multiple modes may exist, the smallest value is shown.

Keep in mind that low respondent counts should be considered when making decisions.

¹ Total number of surveys received by CWRC. County counts may differ since not all surveys are scannable.

² Total number of conferences that submitted surveys to CWRC. County counts may differ since not all surveys are scannable.

³ Respondents that selected the relationship child/youth & the focus of the meeting.

⁴ Respondents that selected the relationship mother, father, stepfather, or stepmother.

⁵ Respondents that selected the relationship sibling, maternal or paternal aunt/uncle/cousin, maternal/paternal grandparent, mother's/father's significant other or godmother/godfather.

⁶ Respondents that selected the relationship family friends, neighbors

⁷ Respondents that selected the relationship legal guardian or other.

⁸ Respondents that selected the relationship foster parent, CYS caseworker/supervisor, legal, Juvenile/Adult probation, , Mental health/drug & alcohol professional, School professional, Community support resource, provider of therapeutic services, Domestic violence professional, Housing shelter professional, Early Intervention/early head start/head start professional.

Statewide
Family Group Decision Making Conference Survey Report
July 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014

Survey Domains

Cultural safety: The conference was held in the right way for the family group. The 4 items in this construct all point to the conference being held in a way that felt right to the family group and is an indicator of the cultural safety pathways. Three of the items relate to the family culture: where and how the conference was held and who was in attendance. When achieved, these objectives heighten the family members' sense that the proceedings are appropriate and set them at ease. The 4th item about enough supports and protections is about ensuring that the family feels the physical and emotional safety required to participate.

- 5. The conference was held in a place that felt right to the family group*
- 6. The conference was held in a way that felt right to the family group*
- 9. People at the conference were relatives and also people who feel like family.*
- 12. The conference had enough supports and protections*

Community Partnerships—providers and families are clear about what they are doing This subscale relates to the community partnerships pathway. These items emphasize that service providers must be clear about their role at the conference, the family group must understand why the conference has been convened and both providers and family group must be prepared to take part and to work to make it happen and reconvene if needed.

- 1. Each service provider was clear about their role*
- 4. The family group understood the reasons for holding the conference*
- 10. The family group was prepared for the conference*
- 11. The service providers were prepared for the conference*
- 17. CYF approved the plan without delays*
- 16. The plan included steps to evaluate if it was working and to get the group back together...*

Family leadership—empowering the family to make a plan This is the family leadership pathway. These items are about the relationship of the coordinator/facilitator to the family group, the relationship of the providers to the family group and the relationships among family group members. These items are about how the facilitator and coordinator support the family members as competent decision makers; about balancing the power between providers and families and placing the family at the center for the search for solution.

- 2. The FGDM facilitator was respectful of the family group*
- 3. The FGDM facilitator/coordinator did not have other jobs to do with the family beside organizing and/or facilitating the group.*
- 7. More family group than service providers were invited to the conference*
- 8. Different sides of the family were invited to the conferences*
- 13. Service providers shared their knowledge but didn't tell them what to do*
- 14. The family had private time to make their plan*
- 15. The plan included ways that the family group will help out.*

From.

Widening the Circle, The practice and evaluation of family group conferencing with children, youths and their families, Eds Pennell, J. & Anderson, G. (2005). Joan Pennell: Checking for Model Fidelity. Pp-107-121.