

North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project



[Dr. Joan Pennell](#) (NCSU)

Principal Investigator

[Teresa Turner](#) (NCSU)

Training Coordinator

[Jennifer Hardison](#) (NCSU)

Evaluator and Trainer

[Pat Dodson](#) (NCSU)

Trainer

[Amy Coppedge](#) (NCSU)

Project Assistant

[Dr. Othelia \(Eun-Kyoung\) Lee](#) (NCSU)

Faculty Consultants

[Dr. Iris Carlton-La Ney](#) (UNC-CH)

[Dr. Karen Sandell](#) (UNC-W)

[Dr. Cheryl Waites](#) (NCSU)

[Dr. Marie Weil](#) (UNC-CH)

[Tanya Brice](#) (UNC-CH)

Research Assistants

[Stephanie Francis](#) (UNC-CH)

[Paul Bright](#) (Criminal Justice Dept.,
Hampshire Constabulary, UK)

Fulbright Research Scholar

Table of Contents

<i>PRACTICE GUIDANCE FOR PLANNING, IMPLEMENTING, TRAINING, AND EVALUATING 2002</i>	3
<i>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</i>	15
<i>MISSION AND KEY PRINCIPLES</i>	20
<i>Biographical Sketches</i>	23
<i>Publications & Presentations for the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project</i>	29
<i>MANUAL FOR COORDINATORS AND COMMUNITIES:</i>	37

PRACTICE GUIDANCE

FOR PLANNING, IMPLEMENTING, TRAINING, AND EVALUATING 2002

This practice guidance document was developed in conjunction with the North Carolina Division of Social Services.

Purpose of Family Group Conferencing

In child welfare, the purpose of family group conferencing is to develop partnerships among families, neighbors, community members and leaders, and public agencies that protect, nurture, and safeguard children and other family members by building on the strengths of the family and their community.

Description of the Model

Family group conferencing (FGC) is a decision-making process involving families, public agencies, and community participants. FGC is structured so that child welfare families can exercise a meaningful voice over their affairs. Emphasis is given to preparing family group members and professionals, weighting conference participation toward the family, respecting the culture of the family, and ensuring timely approval and implementation of plans. County Departments of Social Services designates an "independent" coordinator to organize and convene the conference. The coordinators are referred to as "independent" in the sense of not carrying the family on their caseload.

There are five basic stages to FGC: community involvement, referral, preparation, the conference itself, and implementing the family plan.

Community Involvement. At the initiation of the program, public agencies work with community partners and families to develop an implementation plan specific to the needs of the community and cultures within the community. On an ongoing basis, the program is strengthened by including a broad range of organizations in guiding, providing resources for, recommending referrals, and evaluating conferencing.

Referral. The referral stage usually involves social workers, in consultation with the family and their supervisor, making a referral to the FGC coordinator. In child welfare, cases are referred after clear concerns for the safety and well-being of children and family members are identified. Cases are not referred for the purpose of investigation or fact finding.

Preparation. During the preparation stage, the social worker, family, and FGC coordinator work together to plan for who will attend, when and where the conference will be held, lodging, travel, and a variety of other issues. Particular attention is paid to the safety of participants.

Conference. The conference itself has three basic phases: information sharing, family private time, and finalizing the plan. At the conference, the family group members identify their relationship to the children and their hopes for the session, listen to information from agency and community participants, and meet alone to discuss the options for planning. They create a plan and then present it to the social worker (and as pertinent to the situation, other mandated authorities such as juvenile justice services). There is often discussion and negotiation until a plan is created that the family members want and the child welfare worker approves.

Implementation. Implementation of the family plan is ongoing and happens with the support of family, community participants, and the public agencies. The public agency maintains its responsibility for monitoring the safety and protection of the children and family. As outlined in the plan or as needed, the coordinator may reconvene the FGC.

Definition of Terms

Family Group. The family group includes the immediate family, relatives, and other close supports who feel "like family." The family group members are the FGC participants who remain during the family private time.

FGC Coordinator. The FGC coordinator is responsible for organizing and convening the conference. The FGC coordinator does not carry other responsibilities in regards to the referred family.

Family Private Time. The family private time is the FGC period when the service providers, including the FGC coordinator, leave the room and the family group makes a plan on its own.

Family Group Plan. The plan is the agreement reached among family group members and authorized by the referring agency or agencies.

Support Person. The support person is an adult selected by a family group member to stay by them during the conference and provide emotional support. This person may be a relative, friend, or community member but is not the FGC coordinator or the referring worker.

Family Group Conference. A family group conference is a planning forum that places the family group at the center of the deliberations.

Community Panel. The community panel is a group of consultants to whom the FGC coordinator can turn for information about how best to work with the family.

POLICIES

I. Objective

1. The objective of FGC is to provide a forum for families, kin, friends, service providers, and agency representatives to create plans that promote the health, safety, and protection of children and other family members.
2. FGC does not remove or reduce the mandate of child welfare to protect children. FGC enriches the planning by encouraging input by family group members and community organizations.
3. The FGC plan is integrated into the family services case plan.
4. FGC is not a substitution for investigation or assessment and is not to be used as a fact-finding tool in the investigative process.

II. Planning

1. County Departments of Social Services work with community partners to design a county plan for carrying out FGC.
2. County Departments of Social Services and community partners establish a county advisory council to guide planning, implementation, and evaluation of the FGC program. These include children and women's advocates.
3. The county plan includes the following:
 - A. Membership on the county advisory council;
 - B. Membership on the county community panel;
 - C. Location and selection of FGC coordinators;
 - D. Training of FGC coordinators, social workers, and other participating community groups;
 - E. Funding for FGC coordinators, conferences, and plans;
 - F. System of FGC referrals,
 - G. Integration of FGC plans in service delivery;
 - H. System for authorization of FGC referrals; and
 - I. Evaluation of the FGC program.

III. Referrals

1. County Social Services Departments determine the eligibility processes for families to receive FGC with the following guidelines:
 - A. Any family is potentially eligible.
 - B. FGC may happen at any time in the life of the child welfare case, but particularly at times when plans need to be made on critical issues such as those regarding:
 - i. Family preservation,
 - ii. Child placement,
 - iii. Family reunification,
 - iv. Adoption,
 - v. Development of service plans, and
 - vi. Case closures.
2. County Social Services Departments determine the referral processes for families to receive FGC within the following guidelines:
3. Participation in FGCs is voluntary. Primary caregivers and other family group members agree to take part in the FGC and agree to its primary purpose.
4. If individual family members choose not to participate, the FGC coordinator may hold the conference in their absence or decide not to hold the

conference. The FGC coordinator's decision is made in consultation with the referring worker and the family group members.

5. If a FGC is not held, the Department of Social Services continues to provide its regular services to the family and does not penalize the family members for deciding not to have a conference.
6. County Social Services Departments are to assess referrals for FGC on a case-by-case basis to decide whether families are best served by FGC or other interventions. Considerations are to include:
 - A. Sufficient number of family members,
 - B. Family situation, including safety of participants,
 - C. Willingness of the family to participate, and
 - D. Openness of the agency to consider the family plan.
7. In crisis situations where an immediate response is required for the protection of children, the Department of Social Services takes action but may also refer the family for a FGC in order to resolve longer-term issues.
8. In cases before the court, judges may offer the option of a FGC taking place prior to disposition. The child welfare worker makes the referral, with the family group members taking part on a voluntary basis. The family group plan is provided to the judge to consider in making the disposition.

IV. Preparation

1. Thorough preparation is essential to successful FGC. Preparation activities by the FGC coordinator and family group members should address the following:
 - A. Safety for all participants - before, during, and after the FGC.
 - B. Invitations - who shall come to the conference.
 - C. Identification of sensitive issues and how to discuss them at the conference.
 - D. Where and when the conference will be held:
 - i. A comfortable and neutral setting (usually not DSS offices),
 - ii. A time that works for the family, and
 - iii. A time that is not so late in the day that it hinders the FGC successful completion.
 - E. Adult support persons for all members feeling threatened, particularly:
 - i. Children and young people,
 - ii. Victims/survivors, and
 - iii. Perpetrators.

- F. Role clarification - planning so that all participants understand what their roles are and what is expected of them at the FGC.
- G. Food - what will be served at the FGC according to the family's wishes.
- H. Travel/lodging - particularly for family members who will come from far away.
- I. Traditions and ritual - opening, closing, and conducting the FGC in a way that fits with the family's culture.
- J. Interpreters - for families and service providers who speak different languages or who are hearing impaired.
- K. Special needs - wheelchair access, food allergies, developmental delays, etc.
- L. Guest speakers - from groups or agencies who might have some services or information to offer the family, but usually with whom the family is not already connected.
- M. Community panel - a body of consultants to whom the FGC coordinator can turn for information about how best to work with the family.
- N. Childcare - as needed.
- O. Anything else to help the conference go smoothly.

V. Roles in Family Group Conferencing

- 1. Children:
 - A. Children participate in the planning for the conference and attend the conference whenever possible.
 - B. Children may attend on a full or partial basis.
 - C. The social worker, FGC coordinator, and key family members make the decision as to how the children can best participate in the process.
 - D. The plan for the children's participation is based on an assessment of their physical and emotional safety, their own expressed preferences, and their levels of maturity.
- 2. Family group members:
 - A. Family group members participate in the planning of the FGC and work with the coordinator on who should be invited, time and space of the meeting, and all of the other preparation issues.

- B. Family group members who feel threatened are encouraged to have supports at the conference. Children, who are victims/survivors and attend the FGC, must have a support person.
 - C. Family group members have private time at the conference to consider the information shared and to make decisions about the family plan.
3. FGC coordinator:
- A. The FGC coordinator's function is to organize and lead the FGC.
 - B. The FGC coordinator works closely with the family in planning the FGC.
 - C. The FGC coordinator consults with the community panel members to ensure attention to crucial preparatory steps and to become informed of available services and resources.
 - D. The FGC coordinator invites the FGC participants and prepares them for taking part in the conference.
 - E. The FGC coordinator attends the entire conference and waits in a nearby area during family private time.
 - F. The FGC coordinator promotes decision-making but does not take part in the decision-making and has no stake in the final plan.
 - G. The FGC coordinator provides each FGC participant with a written copy of the plan.
 - H. The FGC coordinator's role is limited to the FGC itself; the FGC coordinator does not have any other role with the family (e.g., service provider).
 - I. The FGC coordinator will organize and reconvene FGCs as requested by the social worker or by family members, or as stated in the plan.
4. Social workers:
- A. The social worker participates in the planning of the FGC.
 - B. The social worker attends the entire conference and waits in a nearby area during family private time or is available by pager or phone for a quick return.
 - C. The social worker articulates concerns and provides information to the FGC participants relevant to the agency's involvement with the family.
 - D. The social worker provides feedback to the family group members about their plan at the conference and is charged with:
 - i. Authorization of the plan,
 - ii. Disapproval of the plan, or
 - iii. Negotiation until an agreed-up plan is reached.

- E. The social worker generally accepts the plan when it is assessed to meet the child's needs and be all of the following:
 - i. Safe for all family members,
 - ii. Legal, and
 - iii. Possible given available resources.
 - F. If uncertain about the plan meeting the above conditions, the social worker consults with the supervisor and other relevant service providers (e.g., schools, domestic violence).
 - G. The social worker integrates the FGC plan into the Family Services Case Plan as documented in the DSS case record.
 - H. The social worker helps with the resourcing of the plan and works to integrate supports from the public agencies, other community organizations, and the family's community.
 - I. The social worker supports the efforts of the family and other service providers to carry out the plan.
 - J. The social worker monitors the plan as it is carried out and continues with usual duties and responsibilities.
5. Community participants:
- A. Community participants present information about resources in the community that may be helpful to the family and answer questions accordingly.
 - B. Community participants attend the conference by invitation of the family and social worker.
 - C. Community participants attend the first phase of the conference and are generally encouraged to return after family private time. Their attendance during the final phase is not mandatory.
 - D. Community participants do not take part in the decision-making at the conference.

VI. Confidentiality/Privacy

- 1. County Departments of Social Services determine any privacy policies within the following guidelines:
 - A. Counties which use FGC coordinators external to County DSS agencies will develop a standing agreement, such as a memorandum of understanding, between the external coordinator and his/her agency and the Department of Social Services. This agreement will cover confidentiality issues for all conferences on which the external FGC coordinator may work.

- B. FGC coordinators get agreement from all FGC participants that the information shared at FGC will remain confidential except for:
 - i. Threats by participants to harm themselves or others,
 - ii. Anything that would require a new report of child abuse/neglect or abuse, neglect, or exploitation of disabled adult, or
 - iii. General information that may be included in the written family plan that all participants receive after the FGC.
- C. Service providers, including social workers and agency representatives, respect families' privacy by sharing only information relevant to the purpose of the FGC.
- D. Service providers working for other agencies are bound by the confidentiality rules of those agencies. Potential barriers related to this need to be worked out on an individual basis (e.g., on substance abuse treatment).
- E. Evaluation activities respect the confidentiality/privacy of family group members.

VII. Safety

1. The safety of children, family members, and all participants is of utmost importance at FGC. Therefore:
 - A. The FGC coordinator undertakes a safety assessment of the referred family during the referral as well as at later stages in the FGC process. This safety assessment takes place separately with individual family members and includes but is not limited to the following:
 - i. What violence has occurred and is occurring in the family? What is its nature, extent, severity, frequency, lethality, and impact?
 - ii. Do the victims/survivors want the perpetrators to be present at the FGC?
 - iii. What likely impact would participation in the FGC have on family group members with serious health and/or mental health issues?
 - iv. What other services (e.g., domestic violence, police, substance abuse) are involved with the family? Are these services aware of the situation and what interventions are they providing?
 - v. The FGC coordinator helps the family plan for safety by: (a) having participants think through in advance how to present

their views, (b) encouraging participants who feel threatened to select a support person and checking that the support person can fulfill this role, (c) strategizing on non-survivor participants raising safety issues, (d) identifying family group members who carry the most authority in the family and are willing to exert this authority in keeping abusive family members under control, (e) developing signals for identifying that tensions are high and that the FGC coordinator needs to step in, and (f) promoting planning on other safety measures.

- B. The FGC coordinator, in consultation particularly with victims/survivors, excludes or limits participation of some family group members. No victims/survivors are to be present together with perpetrators if the victims/survivors do not want the perpetrator present or if the involved service providers advise against the perpetrators being present.
- C. No FGC takes place in a way that violates restraining orders or other orders of the court. In cases where some family members cannot be present at the conference, the FGC coordinator makes arrangements for their input through letters, conference calls, or other means of non-present participation.
- D. The FGC coordinator consults with knowledgeable community panel members (e.g., child sexual abuse counselors, domestic violence advocates) on safety issues in organizing the conference.
- E. The FGC coordinator prepares the social worker to share the relevant family history and identify concerns, including safety issues, to be addressed in the plan. The history is shared with the family group but not with guest speakers who do not need to be made aware of the family's particular situation.
- F. The FGC coordinator and social worker make sure that the family plan addresses all safety issues raised at the FGC and that there is a mechanism in place for monitoring ongoing safety concerns.
- G. If the FGC coordinator, social worker, or family has concerns about violence at the FGC, then special arrangements are made, including but not limited to the following:
 - i. Arrange for security at the conference,
 - ii. Call for a break at the conference,
 - iii. Postpone the conference,
 - iv. Cancel the conference, or
 - v. End the conference.

- H. The FGC coordinator assumes responsibility for taking any of the above arrangements and does not place this responsibility upon a family group member, particularly victims/survivors, who might be blamed for the decision.
- I. The social worker is responsible for authorizing the plan. In reaching a decision, the social worker may consult on safety measures.

VIII. Training

- 1. FGC training incorporates and supports the policies in this document.
- 2. Training is delivered to County Departments of Social Services staff, community partners, FGC coordinators, and others relevant to the process.
- 3. Training is focused on the following:
 - A. Principles and practices of FGC,
 - B. Community involvement and program development,
 - C. Cultural respect,
 - D. Role of the FGC coordinator,
 - E. Role of the social worker,
 - F. Power imbalance at FGC: domestic violence and sexual abuse,
 - G. Evaluation of FGC,
 - H. Group work and facilitation skills, and
 - I. Preparation for FGC.

IX. Evaluation

- 1. The research and evaluation activities are designed with the following guiding principles:
 - A. The priority is the safety and well-being of participants.
 - B. The procedures are to be culturally respectful.
 - C. The procedures are to respect the confidentiality/privacy of participants with four exceptions: (1) the interviewee discloses information causing one to suspect the abuse, neglect, or dependency of any child under the age of 18 years which has not been previously brought to the attention of the Division of Social Services; (2) the interviewee discloses information causing one to suspect the abuse, neglect, or exploitation of a disabled adult which has not been previously brought to the attention of the Division of Social Services; (3) the interviewee is threatening to harm

him/herself or to harm someone else; and (4) the interviewee requests that the researcher assists with an urgent situation (e.g., a medical emergency).

- D. Where feasible and while maintaining confidentiality, the activities are to serve both FGC coordination and evaluation purposes.
-

**FINAL REPORT TO THE
NORTH CAROLINA DIVISION OF SOCIAL SERVICES
FISCAL YEAR 2001-2002****EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Dr. Joan Pennell
Principal Investigator & Project Director

With Teresa Turner and Jennifer Hardison
and
Assisted by Amy Coppedge

North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project
North Carolina State University
Social Work Program
Box 7639, Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-7639

The North Carolina Family Group Conferencing (NC-FGC) Project started in the fall of 1998 and ended in the summer of 2002. Over this four-year period, the project promoted the use of family group conferencing (FGC) through training, evaluation, and publication. From the outset this initiative adopted a mission statement developed by its statewide advisory committee:

to use Family Group Conferencing in order to develop partnerships among families, neighbors, community members and leaders, and public agencies that protect, nurture, and safeguard children and other family members by building on the strengths of the family and their community.

To carry out this mission, the Project followed a "Partnership-Building Framework" that places the family group, that is, the family, their relatives, friends, and other close supports, at the center of planning. The framework and principles documents have guided every aspect of the project—planning, training, policy, and evaluation.

In accordance with its partnership-building framework, the Project brought together a spectrum of key stakeholders—family, community, government, and university—to guide its development. The Project was based at North Carolina State University, Social Work Program, and supported by social work programs at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. Throughout these four years, the Project received funding from NC-DSS for training and evaluation.

Funding for FGC implementation, however, was the responsibility of the participating counties.

Over its four years of operation, the Project encouraged the partnerships necessary for mounting and sustaining FGC.

While the mission remained constant, the Project's objectives shifted over the course of the four years of operation from initiating to stabilizing the model. In the first year (1998-1999), the Project primarily focused on (a) developing its mission statement, protocols, and training plan, (b) orienting regions of the state to the model, (c) carrying out focus groups with diverse cultural communities in order to garner their advice on how to implement the model, and (d) initiating planning with the first four participating counties. These counties were based in or toward the western part of the state: Buncombe, Catawba, Cleveland, and Richmond.

The first project year focused on laying the groundwork for implementation: setting the mission and orienting counties to the model.

In the second year (1999-2000), the Project continued to work on strengthening the capacity of three of the original counties (Buncombe, Catawba, and Richmond) and expanded into three new and more eastern counties (Brunswick, Pasquotank, and Wake). During this time, the training was further developed especially in regards to coordinator training, cross-county exchanges were encouraged, and county advisory committees established. The main challenge to model implementation was funding for FGC coordination. Nevertheless, conferencing was initiated, and data began to be collected from participants on the FGC process.

In the second project year, coordinators were trained, and conferencing was initiated.

During the third year (2000-2001) work continued with six counties: Brunswick, Buncombe, Catawba, Pasquotank, Richmond, and Wake. Although interest in the model remained strong in the state, no new counties were added over the year because of funding difficulties at the local level. The moratorium on county expansion, however, had its benefits. The Project could focus on greatly refining and extending its training approach. Training now moved beyond orienting counties and providing initial coordinator training to offering more in-depth coordinator training and support and, equally important, preparing social workers on their role at conferences. By now, the evaluative feedback from FGC participants helped to inform the development of the training program.

During the third project year, training efforts expanded beyond orienting counties and providing initial coordinator training to more advanced coordinator training and social worker preparation. Evaluative feedback from FGC participants enhanced FGC training.

In its final and fourth year (2001-2002), the Project maintained support of three counties (Buncombe, Catawba, and Wake) and extended into another six counties (Cabarrus, Cumberland, Durham, Harnett, Jackson, and Lincoln). The interest in the model, though, was far greater than these figures would indicate. In response to a spring 2001 NC-DSS call, 28 out of 100 NC counties stated that they were interested in looking at using the model. On the heels of this call, however, the state of North Carolina suffered funding cut-backs which were later severely exacerbated by September 11th economic reverberations. Without any new funding support from the state, many county DSSs were unable to participate in the Project.

Despite these budgetary restraints, the number of trained coordinators and the number of conferences rose in the state. Early successes in conferencing motivated counties to persevere in the initiative. With more systematic training in the evaluation and streamlining of the evaluation plan, counties more easily took part in the evaluation. Policy development was informed by evaluation data from FGC participants along with feedback from other key stakeholders (including child welfare workers, domestic-violence advocates, police, individuals receiving treatment for substance abuse, women prisoners who had killed their partner, and male batterers). At the end of the fourth year, FGC policies were finalized for submission to NC-DSS. In looking ahead, participating counties indicated that they would miss the training from NC-FGC Project; nevertheless, the majority planned to continue conferencing.

The fourth project year saw an increase in the number of trained coordinators and the volume of conferencing. Feedback from FGC participants, domestic-violence advocates, and others contributed to the development of FGC policies.

By the fourth year, the evaluation had sufficient data to provide useful information on the model's implementation and particularly how family group were prepared for the conferences and how they took part in making the plans. The study showed that FGC coordinators in general were diligent in completing the preparatory tasks, and FGC participants were usually satisfied with these preparations. At the end of the conference, they reported that their conference was held in the right place, typically a church or community center, and they felt prepared for the event. Their main complaint about the preparations was that some other people—usually fathers, the other side of the family, or certain service providers-- should have been present at the conference.

Good preparations for the conferences were made, but often the absence of some important family group members or service providers was felt.

During the conference, most thought that they had enough say and could get across their points as needed, but a minority thought they needed more say. In forming their plans, at times they wished that they had been given more information on resources and somewhat clearer presentations by child welfare workers. Contrary to common fears of manipulation by abusers during the family's private time, they and the research observers reported that the most important decision strategies were consensus and following a trusted leader. At the end of the conference, participants usually liked the plan and felt motivated to carry it out.

Participants liked the conference process, and both participants and research observers saw family group members as making the decisions during the family's private time.

At the end of the Project, counties were asked for their views on what it had been like to take part. In response, the interviewees stressed the following:

- The Project helped to promote strengths-based and family-centered practice across their agencies and solidified collaborations with other community organizations.
- The conferences benefited the children for whom they were held by decreasing child maltreatment and expanding placement possibilities.
- Conferences were held at minimal cost to Social Services.
- The training built understanding of the model and motivated Social Services and community agencies to support the effort.
- The main barrier to FGC implementation was paying for coordinators.
- Counties were confused as to when to use different models for involving families in service planning and needed a state plan that encompassed multiple systems.

Funding cut-backs along with escalating child protective services' workload and worker turn-over adversely affected the capacity of North Carolina counties to provide resources for FGC implementation. At the same time, these same pressures highlighted all the more the necessity of utilizing a partnership approach to safeguarding children

that joined together the resources of family groups, community organizations, and public agencies.

The federal review of the North Carolina child welfare system noted substantial progress in foster care delivery, child welfare training, and collaboration with other agencies. At the same time, the review stressed the need for improvement particularly in child protection, services to adolescents, and the inclusion of parents and teens in service planning.

The primary question at this juncture is not the "future of FGC in North Carolina" but more fundamentally about creating a range of practices that promote the voice of family and extended family to better the lives of their young relatives. The following set of recommendations has been formulated with this goal in mind:

1. Developing and promoting a state plan for encouraging the voices of family and extended family.
 2. Adopting a clear set of policies for implementing models that involve family members in safe and effective ways and utilizing the expertise of child and women's advocates in formulating these policies.
 3. Increasing service effectiveness by identifying key dimensions of family-involvement models so that these dimensions are deployed in particular contexts.
 4. Maintaining links with other reform efforts in human services and offering joint training.
 5. Providing additional funding and training geared to small, rural counties so that reform efforts can be fostered beyond the larger counties.
-

MISSION AND KEY PRINCIPLES

Mission (Pennell, Macgowan, Waites, & Weil, 1998)

To use Family Group Conferencing in order to develop partnerships among families, neighbors, community members and leaders, and public agencies that protect, nurture, and safeguard children and other family members by building on the strengths of the family and their community.

Key Principles and Practices of Family Group Conferencing (Pennell, 1999)

FGC Principles	FGC Practices
Build broad-based support and cultural competence	By including a wide-range of community organizations and public agencies in planning, guiding, resourcing, and evaluating the program. By each partner retaining own distinctive role and responsibilities.
Enable the coordinators to work with family groups in organizing their conferences	By selecting coordinators who are respectful of families and their communities, By making conference organizing the coordinator's primary role in relationship to the family, and By providing the coordinator with cultural and practice consultation.
Have the conference belong to the family group	By giving reasons for holding the conference that the family group and service providers can understand and agree with, By holding the conference in a place and in a way that fits the family's culture, and By inviting more family group members than service providers.

FGC Principles	FGC Practices
Foster understanding of the family and creativity in planning	By inviting different sides of the family, and By broadly defining what is "family."
Help the conference participants take part safely and effectively	By preparing family group and service providers, By building in supports and protections, and By arranging transportation, child care, interpretation, etc. as needed.
Tap into the strengths of the family group in making a plan	By asking information providers to share concerns, knowledge, and resources but not to dictate the solutions, and By ensuring that the family group have their private time to come up with their plan.
Promote carrying out the plan	By providing timely approvals of plans with regards to safety and resourcing, By integrating supports and resources of family group, community organizations, and public agencies, By building in monitoring and evaluation of plans and follow-up meetings.
Fulfill the purpose of the plan	By implementing the plans as agreed or revising them together as needed, and By supporting the efforts of the family group and service providers.
Change policies, procedures, and resources to sustain partnerships among family groups, community organizations, and public agencies	By developing and using integrative and culturally competent approaches, and By using program evaluation as a means of changing practice and policy.

Permission is granted to reproduce and use the above "Key Principles and Practices of Family Group Conferencing" as long as their authorship is acknowledged as follows:

Pennell, J., with the assistance of J. Hardison and E. Yerkes. (1999). **North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project: Building partnerships with and around families: Report to the North Carolina Division of Social Services, Fiscal year 1998-1999**. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University, Social Work Program, North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project.

Biographical Sketches

Joan Pennell, MSW, PhD, is Professor and Director at North Carolina State University, Social Work Program. She received her AB from Earlham College (Indiana), her MSW from Dalhousie University (Nova Scotia, Canada), and her PhD from Bryn Mawr College (Pennsylvania). She taught previously at the University of Manitoba, School of Social Work, and Memorial University of Newfoundland, School of Social Work, where she also served as Interim Director and chaired its PhD Committee. She has extensive research and practice experience in the areas of child welfare, domestic violence, and alternative social service programming. As a member of the (Canadian) National Crime Prevention Council, she advised the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General and chaired the Council's Youth Crime Prevention Committee. She served as an evaluation consultant to the Healthy Families Thriving Communities Collaboratives, which are addressing child welfare needs in District of Columbia neighborhoods. As a principal investigator for the Family Group Decision Making Project in Newfoundland & Labrador (Canada), she administered and evaluated an early demonstration project of family group conferencing in North America. She is currently the principal investigator and project director for the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project. On the model, she has numerous publications and has presented in the United States, Canada, New Zealand, England and Australia, and serves as an advisory committee member to the American Humane Association, Children's Services Division.

Jennifer Hardison, MSW, is the Evaluator and Trainer for the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project. She manages the statewide evaluation processes of the Project and provides training to counties. She earned her MSW from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She graduated in May 2000 from the advanced standing program with a concentration in macro social work practice. She worked with the NC FGC Project as a field student during the 1999-2000 school year. She received her BSW from Appalachian State University in 1997. Prior to entering graduate school, she taught English in the public school system in Puebla, Mexico for eleven months after which she worked as an advocate, doing outreach and providing support services for battered Latinas. She has also worked with the Department of Mental Health/Developmental Disabilities/Substance Abuse's Willie M. Services program.

Patricia Dodson, MSW, LCSW, is part-time trainer for the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project. received her BA degree from Meredith College with a social work certification in 1982. Later, she completed her Masters in Social Work Degree from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1992. Pat worked as a social worker in child welfare with Wake County Department of Human Services for over 13 years. She worked in many capacities in child welfare including CPS case management, Parenting Group Coordinator, Clinical therapist with the Child Sexual Abuse Team. She also provided consultation to CPS case management units in Family Centered Practice and Family Group Conferencing. She has also worked as clinical social worker in private practice and has taught courses in the social work program at NCSU. In addition to her work with the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project, Pat currently works as a consultant/trainer with the Wake County Partnership for Educational Success project providing training and consultation to staff in the use of family centered practice techniques and the use of Family Group Conferencing in the educational setting.

Amy Coppedge, BA, is the Project Assistant for the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project. She received her BA in German and Creative Writing from Hamilton College in 1987, after which she spent a year as a full-time volunteer with the Community for Creative Non-Violence in Washington, D.C. She then spent time working for the NC Wildlife Federation, traveling and backpacking around the country, and eventually working as a Pastry Chef. She "retired" from the restaurant industry in 1998 and began working at NC State University. She joined the FGC Project in the Spring of 2000 and hopes to pursue her MSW at the University of North Carolina's School of Social Work.

Tanya Smith Brice, MSW, is a research assistant with the NC Family Group Conferencing Project. She is interested in using FGCs to address the disproportionate confinement of minority youth in North Carolina's juvenile justice system. She is particularly interested in those juveniles who have involvement in both the juvenile justice and child welfare systems. Tanya is originally from South Carolina, where she has experience working with children involved in the juvenile justice system, particularly juvenile sex offenders and their families. She has also served as the Family Services Director of the Central South Carolina Habitat for Humanity, where she assisted families in addressing housing needs. Tanya is active with the National Association of Social Workers, having served in leadership capacities

for the South Carolina Chapter. She has made numerous professional presentations throughout the Carolinas on issues of juvenile delinquency and family group conferencing. Tanya holds an MSW from the University of South Carolina, and is currently pursuing a PhD in Social Work from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Stephanie Francis, MSRA, is a Ph.D. student in the School of Social Work at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She is interested in issues of domestic and family violence. She is currently working as a research assistant on the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project. She is particularly interested in the use of FGC with families experiencing both child abuse and neglect and spouse abuse. Stephanie received both her BA in Sociology and her MSRA in Therapeutic Recreation from UNC-CH. She provided therapeutic recreation services to children in special education classrooms in the Chapel Hill Public Schools for two years during her Masters program. She then worked for a year as a Community Inclusion Specialist for people with mental retardation and developmental disabilities before returning to school for her Ph.D.. Stephanie currently volunteers as a crisis counselor, group facilitator, and shelter adult advocate with Interact, the domestic violence and sexual assault advocacy agency for Wake County, North Carolina. Upon completion of her degree, she is planning to teach. She is interested in both collegiate level teaching and community education.

Paul Bright, BA (hons), is Chief Inspector for the Hampshire Constabulary, England where he heads the Criminal Justice Department, Police Headquarters. Part of his job is to improve the care and support provided for victims of crime. Paul's first involvement with Family Group Conferencing was with the Basingstoke Police Division, Hampshire County. That project was based around juvenile offenders and saw a 30% reduction in recidivism. As the project progressed Paul developed partnerships with both professional and voluntary agencies using FGCs in childcare and educational welfare. He sits on the county's FGC strategic group. He also has worked over a two-year period to develop the DoVe project, a FGC domestic violence project in Hampshire, which held its first conference in November 2001. Referrals are plentiful, and it is hoped that 24 conferences will be held over the next 14 months. Portsmouth University is conducting research on behalf of the multi-agency steering group, which is chaired by Paul. The DoVe project has links with similar projects in the Netherlands and Raleigh, NC. Paul is at NC State University for 5 months, working alongside Dr. Joan Pennell, Social Work Program; James Horner, Director, AOMP; and Commander Chris Hoina, Cary

Police Department on a Fulbright Scholarship. He is one of 6 police officers in the UK who have won Fulbright Scholarships to study in the U.S. for the 2001-2 academic year. He is serving as a visiting scholar with the NC-FGC Project.

Iris Carlton-LaNey, PhD, is a Professor in the School of Social Work, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She is the author of several articles, book chapters and a monograph entitled, "Elderly Black Farm Women as Keepers of the Community and the Culture." She has co-edited two books entitled, *African American Community Practice Models Historical and Contemporary Responses* (1996) (with Dr. N. Yolanda Burwell) and *Preserving and Strengthening Small Towns and Rural Communities* (1999) (with Drs. Richard Edwards & P. Nelson Reid). She is currently working on a third edited book entitled, *African American Leadership in Social Welfare History: An Empowerment Tradition*. She has served as the guest of a special issue of the *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* entitled, "The Legacy of African American Leadership in Social Welfare." Dr. Carlton-LaNey has served on many boards and task forces and currently is serving on the Durham County Social Services Board. She is a faculty consultant with the NC Family Group Conferencing Project.

Eun-Kyoung Othelia Lee, MSW, CAGS, PhD is assistant professor at North Carolina State University Social Work Program. She received her BA from Catholic University of Korea, her MSW from Smith College School for Social Work, and Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study in Rehabilitation Counseling from Boston University Sergeant College of Allied Health Professionals. She recently completed her PhD at Columbia University School of Social Work and worked at the Lighthouse International Arleen R. Gordon Research Institute as Research Associate. She has taught practice seminar courses and conducted multicultural training at Columbia University as an adjunct faculty. Prior to her doctorate, she was Senior Counselor at the Korea Employment Promotion Agency for the Disabled. Her main research is on psychosocial aspects of aging and disability. She is a faculty consultant for the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project.

Karen Sandell, MSSA, PhD, is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Social Work at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. She received her BS from Pennsylvania State University and her MSSA and PhD from the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio. Dr. Sandell taught previously at the Mandel School and was a Principal Investigator and Project Director for the Ohio

Competency-Based Child Welfare Graduate Education Program, funded by the Children's Bureau. She served as a training associate for the Institute for Human Services in Columbus, Ohio, and was a professional associate for ACTION for Child Protection. Dr. Sandell has extensive practice experience in the area of child welfare including child neglect and abuse, foster care, intensive family services, interdisciplinary service planning, community education, and risk assessment. In addition, she has extensive experience in public human services planning and administration including developing interdisciplinary community teams, program planning, development and administration, and quality assurance. Dr. Sandell is also involved in women's studies and has developed a social work practice course on Special Issues in Working with women and has taught an interdisciplinary distance-learning course on Violence Against Women with faculty from UNC-Chapel Hill and Central University. She is a faculty consultant for the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project.

Cheryl Waites, MSW, ACSW, EdD, is an Associate Professor at North Carolina State University, Social Work Program. She received her BA from Hunter College (CUNY), her MSW from Fordham University, and her Ed.D from North Carolina State University. She has previously taught at UNC Pembroke where she was the Coordinator of Field Education and taught Child Welfare, Social Work Practice and Race and Ethnic Relations (Multi-Cultural Social Work Practice). She has extensive experience in Child Welfare. Prior to teaching she worked as an Interim Program Administrator, Supervisor, Family Therapist, Protective Services Worker, and a Permanency Planning Social Worker. She has also published and done extensive training in the areas of Child Welfare, Practice Methods and Diversity. She is a faculty consultant for the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project.

Marie Weil, MSW, DSW, is Berg-Beach Distinguished Professor at the School of Social Work at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She serves as the Associate Director of the Jordan Institute for Families and edits the *Journal of Community Practice*. Previously, she was Associate Professor at the University of Southern California. She received her doctoral degree from CUNY, her MSW from the University of Pennsylvania, and her BA degree in Philosophy from UNC-CH. She has a twenty-year career in academia and social work research with major foci on services for families and children, community practice, and program evaluation. Her recent publications include two books on community practice: *Community practice: Models in action* and *Community practice: Conceptual models*. She has also

published ten other books. Recent book chapters and articles focus on community development and domestic violence, and two chapters in the *Encyclopedia of Social Work* "Community practice: Conceptual models" and "Citizen participation", as well as the co-authored chapter with Joan Pennell, "Initiating Conferencing: Community Practice Issues" in Burford and Hudson (Eds.), *Family Group Conferencing: New Directions in Community-Centered Child and Family Practice*. Recently she completed three studies: A five-year project needs assessment, program development research and evaluation research for the North Carolina Family Preservation and Family Support Program, a one-year project examining case management in health settings for federal HRSA, and a North Carolina Study of Best Practices in Family Preservation in Mental Health Settings. In addition to fifteen other studies, she has conducted research on nonprofit organizations and was a PI for the seven-year California Adolescent Family Life Evaluation Project. She is a faculty consultant for the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project.

Last revised: 7 January 2002

Document author: Dr. Joan Pennell

Publications & Presentations for the North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project

Publications

Books

Pennell, J., & Anderson, G. (Eds.). (2005). *Widening the circle: The practice and evaluation of family group conferencing with children, youths, and their families*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Chapters

Pennell, J., & Weil, M.. (2000). Initiating conferencing: Community practice issues. In G. Burford & J. Hudson (Eds.), *Family group conferences: New directions in community-centered child and family practice* (pp. 253-261). Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Articles

Waites, 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.

Pennell, J. (2004). Family group conferencing in child welfare: Responsive and regulatory interfaces. In P. Adams (Ed.), *Restorative Justice, Responsive Regulation, and Social Welfare*, special issue of *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 31 (1), 117-135.

Macgowan, M. J., & Pennell, J. (2001). Building social responsibility through family group conferencing. *Social Work with Groups*, 24(3/4), 67-87.

Turner, T., Watts, B., Messinger, L., Lillie, M., Hardison, J., & Pennell, J. (with the assistance of R. Terrago). (2001). Family group conferencing and welfare

reform: A partnership strategy for safety and economic sufficiency. *Protecting Children*, 10(3), 52-61.

Guidebooks

Harper, C., Pennell, J., & Weil, M. (2001). *Family group conferencing: Evaluation guidelines*. Denver, CO: American Humane Association.

Manuals

Pennell, Joan, Macgowan, Mark, Waites, Cheryl, & Weil, Marie. (1998). *North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Training Project: Building partnerships with and around families*. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Social Services and North Carolina State University, Social Work Program.

Proceedings

Pennell, J. (2006). Culture, safety, and family violence: Restorative justice as peacemaking. In W. Tie, S. Jülich, & V. Walters (Eds.), *New frontiers in restorative justice: A reviewed selection of conference papers* (pp. 81-93). Auckland, New Zealand: Massey University, Center for Justice and Peace Development, School of Social and Cultural Studies.

Pennell, J., Burford, G., Macgowan, M., Waites, C., & Weil, M. (2000). Partnership-building evaluation in Newfoundland/Labrador and North Carolina. In *1999 Family Group Decision Making Roundtable and International Conference on Evaluating Family Group Decision Making: Summary of the Proceedings* (pp. 129-132). Englewood, CO: American Humane Association.

Waites, C., Macgowan, M., Pennell, J., Weil, M., & Carlton-LaNey, I. (2000). Family group conferencing: Building partnerships with African American, Latino/Hispanos, and Native American families and communities. In *1999 Family Group Decision Making Roundtable and International Conference on Evaluating Family Group Decision Making: Summary of the Proceedings* (pp. 49-54). Englewood, CO: American Humane Association.

Reports

Bright, P. (2002) *The Fulbright Police Scholarship 2001/2 : research into domestic violence and the use of family group conferences*. Winchester, Hamps. : Hampshire Constabulary. Available in Adobe Acrobat format at: <http://www.hampshire.police.uk/index.htm?Fulbright.htm>

Pennell, J., with T. Turner & J. Hardison. (2002). *North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project: Building partnerships with and around families: Final Report to the North Carolina Division of Social Services, Fiscal year 2001-2002*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University, Social Work Program, North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project.

Pennell, J., with T. Turner & J. Hardison. (2001). *North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project: Building partnerships with and around families: Report to the North Carolina Division of Social Services, Fiscal year 2000-2001*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University, Social Work Program, North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project.

Pennell, J., with the assistance of A. Coppedge, M. Diehl, J. Hardison and E. Yerkes. (2000). *North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project: Building partnerships with and around families: Report to the North Carolina Division of Social Services, Fiscal year 1999-2000*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University, Social Work Program, North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project.

Pennell, J., with the assistance of J. Hardison and E. Yerkes. (1999). *North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project: Building partnerships with and around families: Report to the North Carolina Division of Social Services, Fiscal year 1998-1999*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University, Social Work Program, North Carolina Family Group Conferencing Project.

Presentations and Workshops

National or International

Presenter

Pennell, J. (2004, December). Culture, safety, and family violence. Keynote speaker at *New Frontiers in Restorative Justice*, Centre for Justice and Peace, Massey University at Albany, Auckland, New Zealand.

Pennell, J. (2004, October). Cultural safety, family violence, and group work. Plenary speaker at *Group Work Reaching across Boundaries: Disciplines, Seasons of Life, Practice Settings, Cultures and Nations*, 26th Annual International Symposium, Association for the Advancement of Social Work with Groups, Detroit, MI.

Henderson, S., Pennell, J., and Family Group Members. (2004, June). Family perspectives on FGC: Focus groups in a rural county. Workshop at *From Margin to Mainstream: 2004 Conference on Family Group Decision Making*, Harrisburg, PA.

Pennell, J., Inglis, S., & Bright, P. (2002, October). FGCs and family violence – Guidelines for safety conferencing. Building on Strengths: International Perspectives on Family Group Conferencing, International Conference Hosted by Family Rights Group, Manchester, England.

Pennell, J., & Bright, P. (2002, October). Dealing with issues of family violence. Building on Strengths: International Perspectives on Family Group Conferencing, International Conference Hosted by Family Rights Group, Manchester, England.

Pennell, J. (2002, October). FGC & family violence: Sharings from North Carolina. Presentation at DoVe Project Forum, Basingstoke, England.

Pennell, J., & Bazemore, G. (2002, June). Theory-based evaluation of FGC. Skills-building institute at Revolutionizing Practice with Children and Families: Sustaining and Growing the FGDM Movement, 2002 Family Group Decision Making Roundtable & Skills-Building Institutes, Monterey, CA.

Pennell, J., Francis, S., & Mann, S. (2002, June). Safety measures for domestic violence. Workshop at Revolutionizing Practice with Children and Families: Sustaining and Growing the FGDM Movement, 2002 Family Group Decision Making Roundtable & Skills-Building Institutes, Monterey, CA.

Pennell, J., & Glover, L. (2002, March). Sometimes it's just a family thing: Family group conferencing and mediation. Workshop at 7th National Child Welfare Conference, Children's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC. (Funding from Hunter College, School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Permanency Planning)

Bayless, L., Mattingly, J., Merkel-Holguin, L., Pennell, J., Rideout, P., Vincent, P., & Yip, D. (2002, March). Involving families in the decision making process: Commonalities and unique strengths of the family meeting models. In J. Meltzer (Moderator) workshop at the Children 2002: Making Children a National Priority, Child Welfare League of America National Conference, Washington, DC.

Pennell, J. (2001, July). The promise of restorative justice for family violence: The case of family group conferencing. In E. Zedlewski (Chair), The promise of restorative justice. Panel conducted at the . . . and Justice for All: Creating Racial and Ethnic Justice, National Criminal Justice Association Forum 2001, Sedona, AZ.

Pennell, Joan. (2000, July). Feminist praxis, Making family group conferencing work. In Restorative Justice and Family Violence, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

Sandell, K., & Waites, C. (2000, June). Ethical issues in family group conferencing research. Presentation at the 2000 Family Group Decision Making Roundtable: Advancing Innovations. Madison, WI.

Turner, T., Lillie, M., Pennell, J., & Weil, M. (2000, June). Family group conferencing and welfare-to-work: Compatible or conflictual? Discussion group at 2000 Family Group Decision Making Roundtable: Advancing Innovations, Madison, WI.

Turner, T., Pennell, J., Mims, S., Weil, M., & Hardison, J. (2000, June). A partnership model for child welfare: The intersection of training and policy to

sustain family group conferencing. Presentation at 2000 Family Group Decision Making Roundtable: Advancing Innovations, Madison, WI.

Hardison, J. (2000, April). Can FGC contribute to integrated services? In Open Space Technology Sessions at the Third International Forum on Family Group Conferencing, Winchester, Hampshire, England.

Macgowan, M. J., Waites, C., LaNey, I.C., Brice, T., Koball, G., & Hardison, J. (2000, April). Culturally responsive programming for Family Group Conferences. In Open Space Technology Session at the Third International Forum on Family Group Conferencing, Winchester, Hampshire, England.

Pennell, J. (2000, April). Partnership building: A framework for evaluating FGC. In Research Seminar at the Third International Forum on Family Group Conferencing, Winchester, Hampshire, England.

Sandell, K., Webb, J., & Whitehall-Smith, M. (2000, April). Cultural Competence & FGC. An Open Space Technology session focusing on issues of diversity in FGC; Discussion of considerations for coordinators, communities and participants, especially those with special needs. Third International Forum on Family Group Conferencing, Winchester, Hampshire, England.

Harper, C., & Pennell, J. (2000, February). Working together: Child welfare collaboratives and family group conferencing (Part 1, Overview of Family Group Conferencing). Presentation at the Third National Roundtable on Innovative Community-Based Partnerships, Kansas City, MO.

Cooke, L., & Pennell, J. (2000, February). Working together: Child welfare collaboratives and family group conferencing (Part 2, Overview of Family Group Conferencing). Presentation at the Third National Roundtable on Innovative Community-Based Partnerships, Kansas City, MO.

Cahn, Katherine, Lupton, Carol, & Pennell, Joan. (1999, May). Connecting policy and research. Plenary with Carol Harper (Facilitator) at the 1999 Family Group Decision Making Roundtable and International Conference on Evaluating Family Group Decision Making, American Humane Association conference, Seattle, WA.

Pennell, Joan, Burford, Gale, Macgowan, Mark, Waites, Cheryl, & Weil, Marie. (1999, May). Partnership-building evaluation in Newfoundland/Labrador and North Carolina. Presentation at the 1999 Family Group Decision Making Roundtable and International Conference on Evaluating Family Group Decision Making, American Humane Association conference, Seattle, WA.

Waites, Cheryl, Macgowan, Mark, Pennell, Joan, & Weil, Marie. (1999, May). Family group conferencing: Building partnerships with African American, Latino/Hispanos, and Native American families and communities. Presentation at the 1999 Family Group Decision Making Roundtable and International Conference on Evaluating Family Group Decision Making, American Humane Association conference, Seattle, WA.

State or Local

Presenter

Pennell, J. (2001, October). Family group conferencing: What is it and how do get it going? Workshop for Children's Justice Task Force Conference 2001, Morgantown and Charleston, WV.

Pennell, J. (2000, November). Family group conferencing: Empowerment Evaluation. Presentation to doctoral class, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, School of Social Work, Chapel Hill, NC.

Pennell, J. (2000, June). Family group conferencing: Building partnerships within and around families. Workshops for Virginia Commonwealth University, School of Social Work, Virginia Institute for Social Services Training Activities, Williamsburg and Roanoke, VA.

Pennell, J., & Turner, T. (2000, May). Family group conferencing. Presentation at Leadership Roundtable, North Carolina Association of County Directors of Social Services and the Jordan Institute, Asheville, NC.

Pennell, J., & Francis, S. (2000, March). Using family group conferencing in situations of domestic violence. Presentation at the North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence Region IV meeting, Raleigh, NC.

Carlton-LaNey, I. (1999, November). Family group conferencing: Serving families and building partnerships. Paper presented at the meeting of the Annual conference of the North Carolina Foster Parents Association, Durham, NC.

Sandell, K., Pennell, J., & Hernandez, T. (1999, October). Family Group Conferencing in North Carolina. Workshop at Embracing Diversity, Renewing Ourselves, the Eighth Annual Conference and Training of North Carolina Family Based Services Association, Wrightsville Beach, NC.

Pennell, J., & Macgowan, M. (1999, August). Family group conferencing in North Carolina: Policy and practice. Workshop at the First Annual North Carolina Court Improvement Conference, Raleigh, NC.

Waites, C. & Macgowan, M. (1999, March). Family Group Conferencing: Building partnerships with and around families. Workshop presentation at the North Carolina Division of Social Services Conference, Winston-Salem, NC.

Macgowan, Mark. (1998, November). Family group conferencing: Partnerships to stop family violence. Showcase of Excellence, NC State University Extension, Raleigh, NC.

Pennell, Joan, & Waites, Cheryl. (1998, November). Family Group Conferencing Training Project. Presentation at Families for Kids and IV-E Waiver Monthly Meeting, North Carolina, Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Social Services, Burlington, NC

Last revised: 19 September 2006

Memorial University of Newfoundland School of Social Work
Family Group Decision Making Project

MANUAL FOR COORDINATORS AND COMMUNITIES:

THE ORGANIZATION AND PRACTICE OF FAMILY GROUP DECISION MAKING

©August 1995

Gale Burford, Joan Pennell and Susan MacLeod

Table of contents

[English](#) | [Espagnol](#) | [Espagnol \(Guatemala\)](#) | [Français](#) |
[Inuktitut \(Labrador Inuit\)](#)

Federal Project Number 4887 01 92 008

Major Federal Funding Bodies:

Health (formerly Health and Welfare)
Family Violence Prevention Division
Human Resources Development
National Welfare Grants Justice
Discretionary Funds Section
Solicitor General
Police Policy and Research

Co-sponsor in Nain:

Labrador Inuit Health Commission
