

of competences in the framework of even a single specialty. There are new forms of employment and professional associations. This causes a corresponding change in the content of professional work in the field of social work. There is a necessity in the formation of the unique competencies of each specialist, meeting the requirements of a variety of tasks.

Originality. There are new general and specific competencies of a social worker in the context of its collaboration with experts in the fields of psychology, law, and sociology and information technology.

Conclusion. The current trend in the activities of the social worker is the transition from social assistance to different groups with disabilities to organizing the activities of different social groups at the micro, and macro levels. In the process of the organization and maintenance of this activity the social worker collaborates with professionals in other areas, causing the process of rapprochement between competencies. New forms of utilization of information technology require the transition from information literacy to information competence. There is a necessity of formation of a variety of competencies of future social worker which require knowledge and using the individual characteristics and competences of a student in process of learning.

Keywords: social worker; social work; professional competencies; fourth industrial revolution.

Одержано редакцією 28.02.2017 р.
Прийнято до публікації 03.03.2017 р.

UDC 378

McKenzie, Brad

PhD, Professor Emeritus Faculty of Social Work
University of Manitoba, Canada

ENGAGING FAMILIES TO SUPPORT CHILDREN IN CHILD WELFARE CARE

The primary focus on child safety and risk assessment in child welfare has resulted in higher rates of children in care while devoting only limited resources and efforts to engaging and supporting families. More recent trends in North America have led to several program models that focus on family engagement and support. Evaluation studies summarized in the article suggest benefits that include more collaborative working relationships with families and improved family and child outcomes, although more research is needed to assess long term results. Although many family engagement approaches focus on supporting parents to prevent children from coming into care, a new Family Finding practice model focuses on building a network of caring adults, primarily family members, who will support a child in care through to adulthood. Early evidence suggests this approach can help to overcome the adversity experienced by so many children in care. Implications for social work education and training are highlighted.

Structured Abstract

Introduction. Child welfare has been dominated by policies and practices that focus on child safety and protection while much less attention has been given to supporting families to improve parenting and child care. This article examines recent models of family engagement and support in North America, including a new practice model for children in care.

Purpose. Research evidence is reviewed to demonstrate the need to balance the focus on child protection with services that engage and support families. A new practice model that develops lifetime networks for children in care is summarized.

Results. Although the child protection approach has given needed attention to child safety, it has also resulted in increased investigations for abuse and neglect and more children in care. Evidence suggests that more attention to family involvement leads to increased collaboration with families with related benefits in parenting and child care, although more research is required to assess long term results. Family Finding, a new approach to locating and supporting family members who will provide continuing support for children in care, has the potential to overcome early childhood adversity.

Originality. *Child safety and protection remains an important focus in child welfare but it must be balanced with approaches that engage and support families. Research evidence supports more investment in family involvement in child welfare. Although most family support programs focus on preventing children from coming into care, the Family Finding practice model locates and supports family members who play a significant role in nurturing and supporting children in care through to adulthood.*

Conclusion. *Family Finding for children in care builds on previous models of family engagement and support in child welfare by establishing networks of caring adults for children in care. These have the potential to help overcome early childhood adversity and the trauma experienced by children in care. Social workers and other child welfare workers must develop the knowledge and skills to implement Family Finding and other types of family support models to help build a new paradigm for practice in child welfare. It is also important that professional social work education programs incorporate these approaches within their curricula they are to play an important role in changing the way we practice child welfare.*

Keywords. *Child welfare; Family Findin; family engagement; family support; family involvement; social work education.*

Problem statement. Child welfare has long been dominated by a debate about whether the primary focus of service should be on child protection and safety or family support. Legislation in English speaking countries has given most attention to the protection of children from abuse and neglect. Although supportive services to families are outlined in legislation, and assistance, such as parent aides or family support workers, are occasionally provided, such services are regarded as secondary and subject to the availability of adequate resources. Thus, most policy and practice approaches emphasize the investigation of referrals for child maltreatment from a more forensic perspective which prioritizes a search for evidence of abuse and neglect and an assessment of the future risk of maltreatment. This priority is anchored in a view of the state's responsibilities to protect the rights of the child from the risks of abuse and neglect and to act as the 'alternate parent' when either these harms occur or the risk of such harms reach a certain threshold. Over time this focus has increased as new evidence of the harmful effects of emotional abuse, including the witnessing of domestic violence has emerged. Faced with increased community and parental risk factors such as poverty, poor housing and family addictions, child welfare agencies have been forced to allocate most of their resources to child protection functions rather than family support services. The result has been a growth in referrals for investigation and a growth in the number of children in care in many countries, including the United States (US), Canada, the United Kingdom (UK) and Australia [1]. Using Canada as an example, referrals for investigation doubled between 1998 and 2003, and have remained at this relatively high level since 2003 [2]. Canada has a very high rate of children in care, and Manitoba led all provinces in 2011 with over 3% of its children in care [3]. Indigenous children in care are over-represented in Canada, and in Manitoba they made up 26% of the children in the province in 2014 but 87% of the children in care [3]. The over-representation of minority race children in care is also common in other countries, such as the US and Australia, and factors such as marginalization, colonization and poverty help to explain this trend [4].

Although it can be argued that the child protection focus has helped to ensure child safety, most investigations are not substantiated, and even if children are removed from their parents, not all of these children fare well in foster and residential care. When compared with children in the general population, children in care experience poorer educational outcomes, higher rates of mental and physical health problems, higher rates of disability, and higher rates of social problems in adulthood [3; 5]. Although some children in care do well, poorer outcomes for some of the children in care are related to the poor quality of the foster and residential care they receive. However, a more significant factor is the inability of the in-care experience to provide services that fully compensates for the trauma experienced by many of these children prior to admission to care. It is also recognized that an in-care experience that fails to foster connections with families, communities, and culture often contributes to poor adjustment in

adolescence and adulthood. Finally, from a practice perspective, the primary reliance on a child protection approach often leads to a conflictual relationship between parents and social workers, and this makes the development of an ongoing helping relationship, which is so important to improved parenting and family reunification, more difficult.

In contrast to the child protection approach, a family support orientation in child welfare gives priority attention to developing partnerships with families and providing support as a first response to the needs of families when concerns regarding child care are identified. In this approach, increased resources are devoted to early intervention and support to prevent more serious problems associated with abuse and neglect. In cases where child protection services are required to ensure child safety, attempts are made to engage with the family and maintain family connections even if a child must be placed in care. The emphasis on family connections recognizes the ongoing value of family to the well-being of children, and the opportunities that may exist for reunification, if not with the primary parents, then with members of the extended family. In many communities, notably in Indigenous communities, this family support orientation is combined with a community building focus where the emphasis is on building community capacity to care for their own children and families [4]. Concerns are raised that too much attention to family support and reunification may limit the provision of child protection services in circumstances where child safety is at risk, and the consequences can be the failure to address continuing problems of abuse and neglect within the family unit. In these circumstances, the child's well-being is threatened, and in very serious cases it may result in the death of a child. The major policy question then, is whether the child protection and family support orientations can be reconciled so that the strengths of these approaches can be realized within a framework that helps to overcome the weaknesses apparent in placing too much emphasis on either one approach or the other.

Purpose of the article. The provision of family support services is not new in child welfare; however, such services have been marginalized by a preoccupation with child safety at the expense of family support. This article explores the growth in services focusing on family engagement and support, particularly in North America, in an order to assess progress towards the goal of achieving a better balance between providing child protection and family support services in child welfare. This goal is assessed by first reviewing some of the research evidence on these approaches, and then examining a new service model, called Family Finding, for its potential to contribute to the paradigm shift from child protection to family engagement and support. Implications for professional education and training in social work and allied professions are highlighted.

Literature review on family engagement in child welfare. The shift to a family support paradigm as a primary response to parenting problems in child welfare, including abuse and neglect, requires increased attention to family engagement. Family engagement is a family-centered and strengths-based approach to making decisions, setting goals and achieving better outcomes for children and families. It seeks to empower families by working with them in a collaborative fashion to address the needs of their children. Research has demonstrated several benefits of increased attention to family engagement in child welfare, including the following: a) involving family members early in the process may eliminate the need for placement outside the home; b) trust and mutual respect are encouraged by directly involving the family in decision-making, and this involvement makes it more likely they will commit to working on the agreed plan; c) the inclusion of kinship or extended family members in case planning increases the number of people that can provide solutions to a problem and participate in helping to meet identified goals; and d) a collaborative working partnership makes it more likely that child welfare workers and family members will be able to define the family's unique needs and develop relevant and culturally appropriate service plans [6].

Respectful and trusting relationships are foundational to family engagement and these are dependent on an approach to interviewing intended to communicate collaboration and

partnership. Methods consistent with this approach are motivational interviewing and solution-focused casework. Motivational interviewing is a person-centred method that uses a variety of techniques to overcome a client's ambivalence to resistance or change and increase their commitment to the change process [7]. In child welfare, solution-focused casework, which is based on solution-focused interviewing methods, uses engagement skills to develop a partnership with the family, focus attention on pragmatic everyday family life tasks, and promote skills within the family to avoid behaviours that may lead to child maltreatment [8]. Research studies on the effectiveness of solution-focused casework have reported increased family engagement, better achievement of case goals and objectives, and fewer re-referrals for child maltreatment among parents receiving these types of services following discharge than a similar group of families receiving more traditional child welfare services [9].

Strategies to encourage family involvement in child welfare have grown over the past 10-15 years, and different forms of engagement have included the expansion of kinship or extended family care, family group decision-making, family team conferences, *Signs of Safety* and differential response models of providing child welfare services.

The focus on kinship care reflects an attempt to use extended family members (e.g., grandparents, aunts, uncles) as the alternate placement of choice when the biological parents are unable to care for their children. Kinship care helps to maintain family connections, and is particularly valuable in maintaining cultural traditions when children from a minority cultural and ethno-racial groups must be admitted to care. Research suggests that kinship care provides positive outcomes that are at least as good as foster care, although such an option is not always available or suitable for all children [10].

Family group decision-making or family group conferences involve the formal process of convening decision-making meetings of all family members willing to be involved in planning for a child in need of protection. These decision-making meetings are organized and facilitated by a family conference specialist, and during the meeting the family meets on their own to establish a case plan for the child. Family group conferencing in child welfare originated in New Zealand, but the approach has been adopted and implemented in many countries. This service approach has been effective in promoting family involvement in the planning and care of children referred to the child welfare system, although a recent evaluation of the use of this approach in one US location found no difference in the rates of re-referrals for child maltreatment among families involved in family group decision-making and those receiving service as usual [11]. However, the rates of re-referrals for both groups of families were quite low so this makes it less likely that significant statistical differences would emerge.

Family team conferences engage family members in meetings designed to develop and implement case plans. In these types of meetings, family members have a voice at the table; thus, it stresses family engagement and participation. However, they are not exclusively responsible for developing the care plan as is the case in the family group decision-making approach. Evaluations of this approach to family involvement indicate that success depends on the presence of family members, the support and training provided to encourage meaningful engagement, and the need to hold regular follow-up meetings for accountability purposes [12].

Signs of Safety, first developed in Australia, is a comprehensive approach to the practice of child protection, which incorporates a variety of methods and techniques to encourage parental and child participation in assessing risk and identifying strategies to ensure the safety of the child. Although the emphasis is on strengthening family capacity to ensure the safety of the child in the family home, the assessment and engagement process may also lead to a decision that the child may require out-of-home care. Some evaluations of this practice model have found the approach is associated with increases in worker morale, clearer decision-making, better relationships between caseworkers and family members, some reduction in the rate of child removal, and a decrease in the amount of time cases remain open to a child welfare agency [13; 14].

In general, evaluations of family engagement approaches have reported positive benefits by service users and caseworkers alike on measures related to the quality of caseworker visits with families, enhanced family decision-making skills, and more targeted services. Although there is some evidence of improvements in family preservation, and a reduction of re-reports of child maltreatment, further study of the outcomes for children and youth in the child welfare system is required [12]. One factor that complicates the assessment of results from new innovations in family engagement is the high workloads carried by staff working in the child welfare system. This influences the extent to which services can be transformed from a child protection role, where the focus is on investigation, and related safety planning for the child, to an approach where family support and engagement is the primary focus. A second factor is the challenge of establishing good research designs and measures for assessing outcomes, particularly over the longer term. Continued attention to research and longer term evaluation of outcomes will help to provide evidence-based lessons on best practices within the child welfare system.

More extensive evaluations have been conducted on differential response systems in child welfare. Differential response approaches to child welfare distinguish between those referrals where serious abuse or neglect threatens the immediate safety of the child and those where family assessment and support are the preferred and first offered method of intervention. In cases where there are immediate and serious concerns about child safety an investigative response, including the gathering of evidence of abuse or neglect will be launched. In less serious cases investigation is replaced with an alternate response emphasizing family engagement, ongoing support services, counselling and referrals to other community helping sources. In some jurisdictions, more than 60% of families referred for child protection services are referred to the alternate service pathway where the first response is to engage with families, recognize their strengths and offer family support services to improve parenting approaches and child well-being. In an evaluation of a differential response approach in Manitoba, parents reported a high level of satisfaction with child welfare services received through the alternate family response service pathway, child safety was not compromised and there were improvements in child and family well-being [15]. More comprehensive evaluations of differential response programs have been conducted in the US where laws have often required or enabled the use of this service approach. A summary of US evaluation studies on differential response found that these systems generally led to increases in family satisfaction, more family cooperation in implementing case plans, increases in the amounts of service provided to families, and higher worker satisfaction. Some studies have also reported modest reductions in out-of-home care and reduced costs over time from using a differential response approach [16]. For example, research in Ohio found that out-of-home placements were significantly lower for alternate response families when compared to a control group of families [17]. As well, research in Minnesota found that there was a reduction in the reoccurrence of maltreatment and out-of-home placement for families in the alternate response service stream, and cost savings were achieved over a follow-up period because of lower rates of re-referrals [18].

Although research on family involvement in child welfare demonstrates the general value of increased family engagement and support, the impact on the well-being for children and youth in care has not always been the primary focus of analysis. Instead more attention is given to working relationships with parents, and the effects of early intervention and better parenting to prevent children from coming into care. Family Finding is a more recent approach to family engagement, which shifts the focus to children who are in care. It is defined as a set of strategies, tools and beliefs that are used to develop lifelong networks of family and community members who will support the child in achieving permanency and well-being through to early adulthood. Thus, Family Finding focuses on family connections at a different stage in the child welfare continuum, that is, after children have been in care, often for some time. In the next section, results from early research on Family Finding are summarized, and in the following section the Family Finding practice model being implemented in Manitoba is

described. This section also includes a brief summary of the research design being used to evaluate this pilot project.

Family Finding: Early Research Results. Family Finding involves casting a wide net to identify and engage family members and other people important people to the child who will participate in decisions affecting the child and provide support to enhance their development as emerging adults. Originally developed as an approach to build permanency for youth aging out of foster care, its application has expanded to include younger children who have been admitted to care. In the US, the *Fostering Connections to Success and Enhancing Adoptions Act* of 2008 (Public Law No. 110-351), also known as the *Fostering Connections Act*, requires child welfare agencies to identify and locate family members within 30 days of removing a child, and make efforts to engage them in providing ongoing support to enhance emotional and legal permanency for the child [12]. Although various practice models have been established to support family connections, the most influential model is that developed by Kevin Campbell [19].

Family Finding services have been implemented in many jurisdictions in the US, the UK and Canada, and some of the early results have been encouraging. In the first two years of a seven-year study at one Ontario site, the child welfare agency reported that 44 % of the children served were adopted or reunified with family members, and that 72% of the children had an intact and functioning lifetime network of relatives, siblings and other important adults.

Supportive federal legislation and funding in the US, including funds for evaluation, has meant that most research on Family Finding has occurred there. Studies of early Family Finding projects in the US found increases in family-based permanency placements and family connections for children served in these programs [20]. Since then Family Finding services have grown significantly and many of these have been evaluated. Research findings from many of the studies conducted between 2013 and 2015 have been summarized [21]. Variations in the service model were reported; for example, in some sites specialized Family Finding staff were used but elsewhere coaches were used to train child welfare workers to use Family Finding methods in their work with children in care. Despite some variations in the consistency of implementing Family Finding services, results demonstrated increases in legal permanency and the number of supportive connections, primarily among extended family members likely to support ongoing adjustment of the child and successful transition to adulthood.

Despite these results, there are complexities that need to be considered. In one large experimental study in North Carolina there was no significant difference in discharge to permanency when Family Finding participants were compared to those receiving service as usual; however, Family Finding had a favourable impact on contact with relatives and financial hardships experienced by those 13 years and older [22]. In a qualitative study involving 57 youth, 18 parents and 10 relatives, researchers found that overall the family was a source of support to youth in foster care, and that Family Finding services helped parents and other relatives mend relationships and develop support networks. However, the process was stressful for some participants in some circumstances; for example, some parents and youth expressed distrust of family members or the child, and hesitated to welcome them into their lives. In addition, some expressed concerns that services did not focus on maintaining connections once initial relationships had been established [23].

To summarize, results from early research on Family Finding have been encouraging in that several studies have identified positive effects, and even where ambivalent results have been reported on rates of legal permanence (e.g., family reunification or adoption), no negative effects have been identified. Although the Family Finding theory of change is compelling, more research is required to provide a better understanding of outcomes, and the factors that affect success. An additional consideration is that recent revisions to the practice model may influence outcomes. For example, the current practice model that is being implemented in Manitoba employs seven rather than six stages, and a new pre-service stage focusing on alignment, where

the confidence and commitment to develop a family network for the child among service providers, is carefully examined.

Implementing Family Finding in Manitoba. Family Finding in Manitoba is based on Kevin Campbell's revised practice model that includes seven stages and an alignment stage that involves foundation work before beginning the Family Finding process. The two-year pilot project launched in September, 2016 is intended to serve at least 150 children with the goal of achieving a permanent placement for at least 75% of these children. It is based on four core beliefs: a) every child or youth has an immediate and/or extended family that can be found if we try; b) loneliness can be devastating, even dangerous, to healthy child development, and is experienced by most children and youth in care; c) a permanent, meaningful connection to a family and caring adults helps a child or youth develop a sense of belonging and hope; and d) the single factor most clearly associated with positive outcomes for young people is a meaningful, life-long connection to a family and community of support.

The need for Family Finding in child welfare is based on several premises. One is evidence of high rates of trauma or adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) among children in care. Important ACEs include childhood abuse, neglect and household dysfunction, including such things as exposure to family violence, and parental substance abuse. The loneliness associated with exposure to these experiences and subsequent placement compounds these difficulties for children in care. Three or more ACEs are associated with unhealthy lifestyles, low educational achievement, neurological problems and higher rates of suicide. An ACEs score of six or more can shorten a person's life by 20 years. However, relationships and experiences with a lifetime network of caring adults, including family and non-family members, can provide the basis for belonging, emotional support and stability to both recover from and buffer the trauma arising from ACEs experienced in childhood [24].

The Manitoba model of Family Finding operates in a service context where there is a high proportion of Indigenous children in care, and where Indigenous child welfare agencies are engaged in providing many of the services to children in care. The initial focus of the pilot project is on children in emergency placement resources, including foster and group homes, where there are no immediate prospects of family reunification. Although an optional model of Family Finding involves the use of coaches to provide training to existing caseworkers who provide Family Finding services as part of their regular duties, Manitoba's pilot project, called *Bringing Families Together*, uses specialized Family Finding staff. The Manitoba pilot project has four specialized Family Finding staff, a clinical supervisor, a director and a part-time secretary. Family Finding staff work closely with agency case managers in implementing the service model. Their role is to locate individuals who will participate as part of the child's network, and facilitate meetings of the network to develop and implement a service plan leading to permanent placement supported by a lifetime network within a six to 12-month period. Ongoing service is then provided by the agency-based case manager. Each Family Finder carries a caseload of approximately 11 families, which includes approximately 20 children due to sibling groups. A unique feature of the Manitoba model of Family Finding is its expanded definition of permanency which may include adoption, family reunification, independent living for older children, or a long-term kinship care or foster care arrangement where foster care payments may still be required as a means of financial support for the families. Manitoba's definition of permanency includes four stages or components:

- The ***Knowing One's Story and History Stage*** is intended to provide the child with a sense of belonging, culture and identity.
- The ***Safety and Stability Stage*** establishes a safe, stable and reliable place for the child to learn life skills and healthy coping mechanisms.
- The ***Certainty and Responsibility Stage*** is realized through locating trusting caregivers in the child's life who will provide the supports and resources to enable the child to transition to adulthood, autonomy and interdependence.

- The **Lifelong Connections Stage** focuses on the development and maintenance of connections with the child's network of support, with special attention to the child's biological and extended family network.

A summary of each step of the Manitoba model of Family finding is outlined below. Ongoing coaching support is being provided by Kevin Campbell who designed this Family Finding practice model.

Pre-Service Alignment: This involves a first meeting the Family Finders, the agency case manager and their respective supervisors. Permanency needs and safety concerns are reviewed, general goals and their time frames for implementing Family Finding services are identified, and the level of staff commitment to the Family Finding process, including the respective roles and responsibilities are discussed.

Step 1: Engagement: The Family Finder and case manager hold a first meeting with an identified parent or alternate family member connected to the child to explain the Family Finding service, and begin to identify those who may become potential network members. Depending on the age of the child, plans for the child's involvement in the process will be discussed, and initial work on a genogram or family tree may occur.

Step 2: Search: The engagement and search steps are closely connected but in the search step the Family Finder identifies and connects with potential members of the network. This can be a complex process due to distance or lack of contact details but social media, such as Facebook, help in the search process.

Step 3: Preparation: A preparation conference known as a 'Blended Perspectives' meeting is convened with interested family members and other important adults, including caregivers, the Family Finder and the case manager. Where family members live some distance away, skype or teleconference arrangements are used to engage participants. This step focuses on a discussion of strengths, needs and worries, and the commitment of each member in attendance to participate in future discussions and meetings. This meeting also focuses on identifying the biggest unmet need, next steps, and any new members who should be invited to the next meeting.

Step 4: Planning and Decision-Making: This is a critical stage in the process and may require more than one meeting. A decision-making meeting is convened with family members and other key service providers. Goal statements are reviewed and with the participation of all members three possible plans are identified. The feasibility of each plan is assessed and if no plan appears suitable new plans will be generated until an acceptable plan to address needs is identified. Action steps for the next six weeks are identified and the first 'Lifetime Network' meeting is scheduled.

Step 5: Lifetime Network Meetings: Lifetime Network meetings are organized to continue the work phase intended to achieve a permanency placement and provide ongoing support for the child. The Family Finder facilitates these meetings, focusing on team building, reviewing tasks and activities and ensuring that the child's needs are being addressed. Service progress and results are also monitored.

Step 6: Healing and Development: In this step, plans to obtain any community therapeutic services required for the child will be discussed, and assistance from the caseworker will be provided, if necessary.

Step 7: Legal Permanency: The final step includes continued efforts by the Lifetime Network to achieve permanency. Once a permanency plan is in place, results and ongoing commitments to provide longer term support are reviewed. Although formalized Family Finding services conclude at this step, ongoing services may continue to be provided by the agency case manager if the child is not formally discharged from care.

Funding for the pilot project includes resources for a comprehensive evaluation, and based on these results a decision about whether to adopt this innovation throughout the Manitoba child welfare system will be made. In the Manitoba evaluation, a mixed methods research design

involving the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data is being used. There are three evaluation components. A formative or process evaluation will document implementation activities, including program fidelity and whether the program is being delivered in a pattern consistent with best practices. Data will be collected on the services provided to participants during the pilot project; as well, qualitative interviews with key stakeholders and case studies will be conducted to document the lessons learned during implementation.

An outcome evaluation will assess results for children involved in the pilot project. This stage of the evaluation will include surveys to assess permanency, and a selected number of well-being outcomes, such as resiliency. Although it is not possible to include an experimental design where cases are randomly assigned to treatment and control groups, non-equivalent comparison groups will be constructed to assess differences in outcomes for those children who receive Family Finding services and those who receive service as usual.

A final component of the evaluation will assess costs and benefits related to the service. The costs for delivering Family Finding services will be compiled, along with estimated costs for foster care and related services for participants, and then these will be compared with costs for a sample of children who did not receive Family Finding services. Differences in future social costs and savings will be estimated if such information is available; however, a longitudinal follow-up study may be required to validate these estimates.

Conclusion. Important developments in family engagement in child welfare have been summarized in this article and these illustrate the paradigm shift that is underway in moving from a predominant focus on child protection to an increased emphasis on family support, particularly in North America. Specific attention was given to Family Finding, an innovative approach to connecting children in care to a lifetime network of family and community members who will support them and help them to achieve improved outcomes during childhood and their transition to adulthood. Children in care remain one of our most vulnerable populations, and they deserve the best service we can possibly design. Although there is sufficient evidence to support greater emphasis on policies and practices that promote family support, more research is required to determine what works best under what circumstances, and how these must be balanced with adequate attention to child safety. New investments in workload adjustment, training and staff development are also required to ensure that child welfare workers receive the level of support they require in moving from a more investigative approach in child welfare work to a family engagement and support approach.

There are also implications for professional education in social work and allied disciplines working in this field. Professional courses and training in child welfare have most often given priority attention to legislation and the various tools and methods used to assess safety and risk within the child protection framework of practice. Although these are important, equal attention is required to family engagement skills. Although general courses on interviewing skills are common in professional social work education, how to establish a working alliance with family members in child welfare where more resistance to engagement is common, requires special attention. In addition, attention in the curriculum is required to the various family support and engagement practice models in child welfare. Finally, it is also important to recognize that our efforts to transform child welfare services in ways that strengthen families and reduce the number of children requiring out-of-home care require system-level changes that target social issues such as poverty, inadequate housing and inequality because these are contributing problems to family dysfunction and child maltreatment. The development of advocacy skills within the social work profession is important to these changes, but advocacy on these issues must also engage other professions, the public, and politicians if we are to make a real difference in the lives of vulnerable children and families.

References

1. Gilbert, R., Fluke, J., O'Donnell, M., Gonzalez-Izquierdo, A., Brownell, M., Gulliver, P. et al. (2012). Child maltreatment: Variations in trends and policies in six developed countries. *The Lancet*, 379 (9817), 758-772.

2. Public Health Agency of Canada (2010). *Canadian incidence study of reported child abuse and neglect – 2008: Major findings*. Ottawa: Government of Canada. Retrieved from <http://cwrp.ca/sites/default/files/publications/en/CIS-2008-rprt-eng.pdf>.
3. Brownell, M., Chartier, M., Au, W., MacWilliam, L., Schultz, J., Guenette, W., & Valdiva, J. (2015). *Education outcomes of children in care*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Manitoba Centre for Health Policy, University of Manitoba.
4. McKenzie, B., & Shangreaux, C. (2011). From child protection to community caring in First Nations child and family services. In K. Kufeldt & B. McKenzie (Eds.), *Connecting research, policy, and practice in child welfare* (2nd ed.) (pp. 323-338). Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
5. Turney, K., & Wildeman, C. (2016). Mental and physical health of children on foster care. *Pediatrics*. doi:10.1542/peds. 2016 –1118.
6. National Technical Assistance and Evaluation Center for Systems of Care (2010). *Family involvement in the improving child welfare outcomes through systems of care initiative*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Youth and Family Children's Bureau.
7. Miller, W., & Rollnick, S. (2012). *Motivational interviewing: Helping people change* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
8. Antle, B., Christenson, D., Barbee, A., & Martine, M. (2008). Solution-based casework: A paradigm shift to effective, strengths-based practice for child protection. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 2, 197-227.
9. Antle, B., Christenson, D., van Zyl, M., & Barbee, A. (2012). The impact of the solution-based casework (SBC) practice model on federal outcomes in public child welfare. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 36, 342-353.
10. Dill, K. (2011). Finding the best home: A comparative analysis of kinship and foster care placements. In K. Kufeldt & B. McKenzie (Eds.), *Connecting research, policy, and practice in child welfare* (2nd ed.) (pp. 173-185). Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
11. Allan, H., Corwin, T., Fluke, J., Harlaar, N., Hollinshead, D., Horner, A., et al. (2015). *No place like home*. Denver, Colorado: The Kempe Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Child Abuse & Neglect and Casey Family Programs.
12. Child Welfare Information Gateway (2016). *Family engagement: Partnering with families to improve child welfare outcomes*. Retrieved from <https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/f-fam-engagement/>.
13. Turnell, A., & Edwards, S. (1999). *Signs of Safety: A solution and safety approach to child protection casework*. New York: Norton.
14. Turnell, A. (2013). Signs of Safety: A comprehensive briefing paper. Retrieved from www.signsofsaety.net/products-page/booklet/signs-of-safety-briefing-paper/.
15. McKenzie, B., Taylor, A., & Maksymy, S. (2011). *Evaluation of the General Child and Family Services Authority's differential response/family enhancement pilot projects*. Winnipeg: The General Child and Family Services Authority.
16. Child Welfare Information Gateway (2014). *Differential response to reports of child abuse and neglect*. Retrieved from <https://www.childwelfare.gov>.
17. Loman, L., & Siegel, G. (2014). *Ohio alternative response evaluation extension: Final report to the Ohio Supreme Court*. St. Louis, Missouri: Institute of Applied Research. Retrieved from <http://iarstl.org/papers/OhioARFinalExtensionReportFINAL.pdf>.
18. Loman, L., & Siegel, G. (2005). Alternative response in Minnesota: Findings of the program evaluation. *Protecting Children*, 20, (2/3), 78-92.
19. Family Finding website at www.familyfinding.org/
20. Dewey, J., Tipon, G., DeWolfe, J., Sullins, C. & Park, C. (2013). The path from process to outcome: A cross-site evaluation of 24 Family Connection grantee projects. *Child Welfare*, 92(6), 9-38.
21. Vandivere, S., & Malm, K. (2015). *Family Finding evaluations: A summary of recent findings*. Bethesda, Maryland: Child Trends. Retrieved from <http://www.childtrends.org>.
22. Malm, K., Vandivere, S., Allen, T., Williams, S., & McKlindon, A. (2014). *A rigorous evaluation of family finding in North Carolina*. Bethesda, Maryland: Child Trends.
23. Bringwatt, E., Allen, T., & Williams, S. (2013). *Client voices: Youth, parent and relative perspectives on Family Finding*. Bethesda, Maryland: Child Trends. Retrieved from <http://www.childtrends.org>.
24. Schreiber, E. (2016). *ACES and child trauma leave lasting scars*. Retrieved from www.rawhide.org.

Бред МакКензі,

доктор філософії, заслужений професор факультету соціальної роботи Манітобського університету, Канада

ЗАЛУЧЕННЯ СІМЕЙ ДЛЯ ПІДТРИМУВАННЯ ДІТЕЙ, ЯКІ ПЕРЕБУВАЮТЬ ПІД ОПІКОЮ В СИСТЕМІ ОХОРОНИ ДИТИНСТВА

Основна увага в системі охорони дитинства, що приділяється питанням безпеки дітей і оцінюванню ризику для них, призвела до збільшення частки дітей під опікою, у той час, як

залученню і підтримуванню сімей присвячено лише обмежені ресурси та зусилля. Наслідком останніх тенденцій у Північній Америці є поява низки моделей програм, зорієнтованих на участь та підтримування сімей. Оцінювальні дослідження, узагальнені в статті, пропонують переваги, що включають більш тісну співпрацю у робочих відносинах із сім'ями та покращені результати роботи із сім'єю і дитиною, проте існує потреба у подальших дослідженнях для оцінювання довгострокових результатів. Хоча багато підходів, спрямованих на залучення сім'ї, наголошують на підтримуванні батьків для попередження розміщення дітей під опіку, нова модель практики «Пошук родичів» акцентує на створенні мережі добливих дорослих, передусім з числа членів сім'ї, які будуть підтримувати дитину, що знаходиться під опікою, до досягнення нею дорослого віку. Перші дані свідчать про те, що цей підхід може допомогти подолати негаразди, що їх переживають так багато дітей, які перебувають під опікою. Наголошено на значенні цього досвіду для професійної освіти та практичної підготовки в галузі соціальної роботи.

Ключові слова: охорона дитинства; пошук родичів; залучення членів сім'ї; підтримування сім'ї; участь членів сім'ї; освіта в галузі соціальної роботи.

Одержано редакцією 10.03.2017 р.
Прийнято до публікації 14.03.2017 р.

UDC 364.442.2(410)(477)

MARTOVYTSKA Nataliya,

Senior teacher, Candidate Degree of Pedagogical Sciences, Ph D Foreign Language Department, Department of Social Work and Social Pedagogy, Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University at Cherkasy

SOCIAL AND LEGAL PROTECTION OF CHILDREN IN NEED IN GREAT BRITAIN AND UKRAINE

Introduction. Human rights are the basic things we all need in order to live with dignity: food, housing, education and health care; the right to spend time and communicate with others, to access information, form opinions, express ourselves, and hold religious beliefs; and the right to be free from violence, exploitation and abuse. Everyone, including children, has these rights just because they are human, no matter what their circumstances. Human rights mean that children must be respected as the people they are today, not just when they reach 18.

Purpose of the article is to study the level of children's welfare in Great Britain and in Ukraine, to compare the reasons of children being neglected or in need, the ways of solving problem of this category of children.

Results. In recent years Ukraine has seen a positive trend of increasing the number of foster families and family-type homes and the number of children in them. According to data from regions in Ukraine, the family care (guardianship, foster families and family-type homes) reached 73,212 orphans and children deprived of parental care, which is 0.3% more than last year. But there are still many problems which remain to be discussed. That's why the country is looking for new decision of improving children's welfare system via adopting experience from other countries which have already reached positive results in this area.

Originality. The article highlights the tendencies in children's welfare system in Great Britain and in Ukraine, describes its strong and weak points. It also states the actions that may be carried out to strengthen the state's social welfare sector. Comparison of children welfare in Britain and Ukraine are suggested in the article. Comparative analysis of the term "children in need" and "parental responsibilities" in Ukraine and in Great Britain is offered in the article.

Conclusions. Child protection is a fundamental part of safeguarding children. Welfare of children in need is carried out in Britain and in Ukraine in different ways. But each is aimed to protect children, their rights and to give an opportunity to live in a family (either in biological or foster one).