

# Service User Experience: Methodologies, Tools, Requirements and Feedback Mechanisms

Executive Summary of the Rapid Integrative Review

April 2024

Authors: Karl McGrath, Jessica Scott and Aisling McGovern

# Executive Summary

## Background

Established under the Child and Family Agency Act 2013, Tusla Child and Family Agency is responsible for the delivery of direct and commissioned services for children and families nationally. They provide a range of services to children and families, such as child protection and welfare, alternative care and adoption, birth information and tracing, family support, children's services regulation, educational welfare services, and domestic, sexual and gender-based violence services.

Tusla commissioned the Centre for Effective Services (CES) to systematically review international best practice methodologies and tools that are relevant to capturing the experiences of service users in a number of their service strands. The aim of the review is to inform Tusla's development of a Service Experience Insights framework.

**Service Experience Insights (SEIs)** are developed when a service actively seeks out, gathers and analyses data and information:

- From the people who come into contact with that service
- About their experiences of that service
- With the purpose of understanding their experiences for quality assurance and quality improvement of services, and
- To identify positive service user experiences so that the service can replicate them.

The specific questions this review has endeavoured to answer are:

---

In child protection and welfare services (CPWS), alternative care services (ACS) and prevention, partnership and family support (PPFS) services for children and families:

1. What is considered 'best practice' (or good principles of practice) in service user engagement for the purpose of developing service experience insights to improve services and/or enhance outcomes for children and families?
  2. What mechanisms, methodologies and tools support service user engagement for the purpose of developing service experience insights to improve services and/or enhance outcomes for children and families?
  3. What dependencies and requirements need to be considered when implementing mechanisms, methodologies and tools to engage service users and utilise the information they share to develop service experience insights to improve services and/or enhance outcomes for children and families?
  4. How can information about service experience insights be communicated back to service users?
-

# Methods

## Literature review design

The review was carried out using a ‘rapid integrative review’ methodology and followed the 6 steps of integrative reviews outlined by Toronto (2020):

- 1) formulate purpose and/or review questions
- 2) systematically search and select literature
- 3) quality appraisal
- 4) analysis and synthesis
- 5) discussion and conclusion, and
- 6) dissemination of findings.

**Integrative reviews** are “a specific review method that summarizes past empirical or theoretical literature to provide a more comprehensive understanding of a particular phenomenon” (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005, p. 546).

A **rapid integrative review** accelerates the process of conducting a traditional integrative review by streamlining or omitting certain aspects of the methodology to produce evidence for stakeholders in a resource-efficient manner.

Step 1 has already been described in the ‘Background’ section. Steps 2-4 of the methodology are summarised below.

## Search and selection of literature

To be included in the review, an article had to meet up to 6 different criteria.

Type of Criteria	Criteria
<b>1. Context</b> (Settings and Services)	The article is directly or indirectly relevant to child protection and welfare services (CPWS), alternative care services (ACS) or prevention, partnership and family support services (PPFS).
<b>2. Population</b>	The article targets current or past service users.
<b>3. Phenomena of Interest</b>	The articles addresses one or more of the following concepts on gathering and utilising service experience insights: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Best practice or principles of practice</li><li>• Methodologies, methods and tools</li><li>• Dependencies and requirements</li><li>• Feedback loops with service users.</li></ul>
<b>4. Language</b>	The article is written in English.
<b>5. Types of Literature</b>	The article is an evidence synthesis, model, framework, guideline or set of standards.
<b>6. Quality of Literature</b>	The article is not judged to be of ‘critically low quality’ during the quality appraisal.

Evidence syntheses, guidelines and standards had to satisfy all 6 criteria. Models and frameworks had to satisfy criteria 1-5, but not criteria 6 because the review team were not aware of a quality assessment tool for models and frameworks.

The review team searched a number of different information sources for literature. These were:

- Articles saved by or provided to the review team during the early planning stages
- 4 electronic databases of peer-reviewed literature
- 3 peer-reviewed journals
- 9 databases and websites of grey literature sources.

# Quality appraisal

The review team assessed the quality of evidence syntheses, guidelines and standards included in the review to help draw conclusions about the robustness and potential limitations of the findings. Frameworks and models were not quality assessed because the review team were not aware of any tools designed to assess frameworks or models.

Three different quality assessment tools were used to assess the evidence syntheses, guidelines and standards:

- AGREE-GRS for practice and service-level guidelines/standards
- AGREE-HS for system-level guidelines/standards, and
- An adapted AMSTAR-2 tool for evidence syntheses.

Each article was assigned a quality rating from ‘high quality’ to ‘critically low quality’. Critically low-quality articles were excluded from the review.

## Analysis and synthesis

The analysis was informed by a narrative synthesis approach:

“‘Narrative’ synthesis’ refers to an approach... and synthesis of findings from multiple studies that relies primarily on the use of words and text to summarise and explain the findings of the synthesis... to ‘tell the story’ of the findings from the included studies” (Popay et al., 2006, p. 5).

The ‘story’ of the findings is presented in a way that is intended to help the reader assess the extent to which the findings may be relevant to their particular context.

Firstly, the findings are broken down according to the review questions, which address four phenomena of interest to this review.

Secondly, within each section, the findings are then broken down to show what the literature for **Type 1: Green** settings and services suggests as these are the settings and services most directly relevant to this review. This is followed by a consideration of the literature from **Type 2: Blue** and **Type 3: Pink** contexts, which are less directly relevant but may still provide useful learning that can supplement the limited literature on Type 1 settings and services.

Thirdly, within each section and type of context, findings from non-empirical literature (i.e. models, frameworks, guidelines, and standards) are discussed first and then compared with findings from the empirical literature to assess the extent to which the empirical and non-empirical literature align.

Finally, within each of the sections and sub-sections above, the review team clarify the types of service users certain findings are intended for, while recognising that most of the included literature is directed towards children and young people.

## Findings

### Characteristics and quality of the literature

Thirty-two articles were included in the review: 10 guidelines, 8 frameworks, 5 models, 5 evidence syntheses and 4 standards.

There are several notable characteristics shared across the 32 articles. The included articles project a heavily Anglo-European perspective, with most published by teams in Ireland, the United States and UK in particular. The vast majority of articles are directed towards children and young people, with relatively few focusing specifically on families or parents/guardians. Gathering and utilising service experience insights (SEIs) was the main focus of only 5 of the included articles, with many more focusing on broader yet related concepts like ‘participation’ and ‘quality improvement’. Furthermore, only one-third of the included articles were classified as **Type 1**, meaning most articles were not focused on CPWS, ACS or PPFS settings specifically. Given these characteristics, readers should interpret the findings cautiously.

The results of the quality assessments of guidelines, standards and evidence syntheses further emphasise a need for readers to interpret the review findings cautiously, as all except two guidelines were judged to be of ‘low’ or ‘critically low’ quality.

#### **Types of contexts (settings and services):**

Findings were categorised as being drawn from 3 types of contexts (settings and services):

- **Type 1: Green** is literature that is specific to Child Protection and Welfare Services (CPWS), Alternative Care Settings (ACS) and/or Prevention, Partnership and Family Support (PPFS) settings/services.
- **Type 2: Blue** is literature on social work, social care or family support settings and services in general.
- **Type 3: Pink** is literature in settings and services that are broader than type 1 or type 2 contexts, but which is also intended to be applicable to type 1 or type 2 contexts.

#### **Types of literature:**

- We use the term ‘*empirical literature*’ to refer to evidence syntheses.
- We use the term ‘*non-empirical literature*’ to refer to models, frameworks, guidelines and standards.

We make this distinction because we typically placed more confidence in a finding if it was supported by the empirical literature.

The findings from evidence syntheses are usually based on studies whose data come from real-world observations and experiments. Their findings are ‘evidence-based’. On the other hand, it is not always possible to tell if models, frameworks, guidelines and standards are based on data from real-world observations and experiments, nor did the review team always try to check this. As such, we treat the findings from models, frameworks, guidelines and standards more cautiously and refer to them collectively as

## Best practices and principles of practice

Twenty-five articles addressed best practices and principles of practice.

As shown in Table 1 (pg. 7), many important practices and guiding principles were identified with relevance to developing SELs. For practices and principles listed under '*General Practices and Principles*', these tended to be described in a way that implied they have general applicability to all service user feedback methodologies. '*Additional principles and practices*' specify extra principles and practices relevant to specific methods of developing SELs.

Table 1 also identifies the type of service users each practice and principle was specified for. However, the review team have little reason to believe that many of the principles and practices identified for one type of service user could not be applied to a broader range of service users. For example, that 'services respond proactively to feedback' only appeared in the literature on parents/guardians, but it is conceivable that some readers might view this as applicable to children and young people too. As such, the review team encourage readers to also consider the extent to which practices and principles not specified as applicable to their particular setting or type of service user may actually be applicable to them.

With that in mind, a consistent finding across the various types of literature is the importance of listening to, understanding, and valuing the voices of children and young people. The **Type 1** empirical literature further supports ensuring children and young people have choice on whether and how to participate, clarity about the purpose of participating, and access to a range of engaging child-friendly options in which to share their experiences.

The **Type 2** and **Type 3** literature reaffirms much of the Type 1 literature, while also suggesting further principles and practices. For instance, it is recommended that the participation of children and young people be seen as a process rather than one-off event, with special efforts made to enable marginalised children and young people to participate. Principles such as voluntary participation, respect, inclusivity, accountability, and safety were frequently recommended, and staff should be trained and supported to facilitate meaningful child participation.

The **Type 1** literature on principles of practice for parents, guardians and families is relatively scant, but suggests actively seeking feedback and responding proactively may also be important when seeking SELs from fathers.

## Mechanisms, methodologies and tools

Sixteen articles addressed mechanisms, methodologies and tools (MMTs).

The empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of MMTs for developing SELs ranges from limited at best to absent at worst. Many of the MMTs proposed in the non-empirical literature were simply not examined by the empirical literature, making it hard to comment on their effectiveness. Where MMTs were examined in the empirical literature, the findings suggest that:

- evidence on the effectiveness of continuous quality improvement (CQI) processes is limited but promising. It indicates that CQI processes may contribute to a range of positive outcomes for service users and organisations when the right external factors are present, such as sufficient time, training, resources and leadership support (Zuchowski et al., 2019).

- evidence on the effectiveness of procedures for the participation of individual children and young people is limited, sometimes conflicting, and heavily dependent on external factors, which are discussed in further under ‘Dependencies and requirements’ (Kennan et al., 2016).
- evidence on the effectiveness of procedures for the collective participation of children and young people is absent (Kennan et al., 2016).
- evidence on the quality of feedback questionnaires for families and parents indicates they have considerable weaknesses and uncertain quality (Ayala-Nunes et al., 2014).

Despite the weak evidence-base for MMTs, several non-empirical sources provide overarching frameworks or methodologies that could usefully inform an SEI framework. The frameworks are also complementary in several respects.

Starting with the **Type 1** literature, O’Brien and Watson (2002) propose a relatively comprehensive 5-stage quality assurance (QA) framework for child welfare services which suggests (1) defining outcomes and standards, (2) incorporating quality assurance throughout the agency, (3) gathering data and information, (4) analysing data and information, and (5) using the analyses and information to make improvements. The framework also has some flexibility, in that a range of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods can be applied at stage 3 to gather service user feedback, such as complaints systems, interviews, focus groups and surveys.

Turning to the **Type 2** and **Type 3** literature, the SUFFICE framework (Ward et al., 2016) and BIVKA methodology (Krogstrup & Brix, 2018) are less comprehensive but can supplement parts of O’Brien and Watson’s (2002) QA framework. Both the SUFFICE framework and BIVKA methodology have components relevant to gathering and analysing data -- steps 3 and 4 of the QA framework -- with both advocating qualitative data collection methods to facilitate service users to provide rich descriptions of their experiences. The SUFFICE framework in particular provides a series of tools and templates which could be incorporated as part of the QA framework, while the BIVKA methodology recommends several rounds of data gathering and analysis that start with service users before moving to other stakeholders.

## Dependencies and requirements

Twelve articles addressed dependencies and requirements.

Implementation of the best practices and principles of practice previously discussed should be considered dependencies and requirements, in and of themselves, for effectively developing SEIs. As such, readers are recommended to also consult Table 1 when considering dependencies and requirements.

Beyond the best practices and principles of practice, the **Type 1** literature was surprisingly limited in its discussion of dependencies and requirements, and addresses concepts that are broader than SEIs, such as ‘participation’ and ‘continuous quality improvement’, rather than focusing on SEIs directly.

Nevertheless, the available literature identifies a number of structural, cultural, process and relationship factors that may be required when developing SEIs (Kennan et al., 2016; Zuchowski et al., 2019). At an organisational and service-level, for example, sufficient time, training, resources and leadership support are examples of key structural requirements identified in the

non-empirical **Type 1** literature (Zuchowski et al., 2019). An organisation that collectively views children as knowledgeable social actors, and that genuinely values and emphasises children's participation and empowerment, are key cultural dependencies (Kennan et al., 2016). Important process requirements can vary depending on the method of engagement with service users but usually include, for example, providing participants with clear information and clarity about the meaning of participation and what it entails (Kennan et al., 2016). Finally, at an individual-level, relationship factors with service users can be important requirements, such as the presence of positive, trusting, stable relationships between children and their case-workers (Kennan et al., 2016).

The **Type 2** and **Type 3** literature reiterate the importance of several structural dependencies and requirements, but also propose two useful overarching models -- the 'Lundy Model' and '7P Model' -- that could support a systematic consideration of cultural, process and relationship factors when developing SEIs with children and young people. The models appear to be complimentary in several ways and neither assume that simply providing a space for sharing experiences will automatically lead to those experiences being heard or acted upon. Lundy's (2007) model proposes that as well as 'space', children also need to be facilitated to 'voice' their views in the presence of a listening 'audience' that has sufficient 'influence' to act upon those views. Like the Lundy model, the 7P model emphasises the 'process' of participation, but can also guide a deeper consideration of why, how and with whom service experience insights will be developed. That is, the 7P model also guides a systematic consideration of the 'purpose' of engaging service users; how they are understood or 'positioned' culturally; whether 'power relations' are well managed, and the safety of participants is 'protected' to allow diverse 'perspectives' to be captured; and in what way the wider context or 'place' is likely to impact participation.

## Feedback loops

Eight articles addressed feedback loops.

Despite feedback loops with service users being considered a best practice, the literature in this review provides scant detail on how to do this. Where detail can be found, it is drawn from the non-empirical literature, and it is limited to guidance for children and young people.

That said, collectively the **Type 1**, **Type 2** and **Type 3** non-empirical literature suggest that feedback provided to children and young people about their involvement in an SEI process should be delivered clearly, rapidly, reach all children involved in the SEI process and offer opportunities to participate in follow-up and evaluation activities. The feedback should ask children about their satisfaction with the participatory process and their views on how it could be improved, as well as inform them of key findings, next steps, and how their views influenced resulting decisions, activities, and impacts.



**Table 1: Summary table of best practices and guiding principles of practice relevant to developing service experience insights**

Best Practices and Guiding Principles of Practice	Type 1 Settings & Services		Type 2/3 Settings & Services
	Non-Empirical literature	Empirical literature	Non-Empirical literature
<b>General Practices and Principles</b>			
Services value, listen to, understand and take seriously the views of all parties	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■
Services respect the right of all children and young people to be heard, without discrimination on any grounds			■
Services view participation and feedback as a process rather than one-off event, which requires time and resource commitments			■
Services consider the evolving capacities of young people and encourage them to participate to an increasing degree as their capacities evolve			■
Services seek feedback from diverse, representative service users, but also make special efforts to include people affected by marginalisation or discrimination			■ ■
Services consider the nature and extent of service users' involvement when developing service experience insights			■
Service users have choice about if and how to participate, with a range of options available		■	■ ■
Service users have clarity about the purpose of sharing feedback		■	■ ■
Services provide all relevant information needed for participation in a way that is age-appropriate, meets the communication needs of all parties, and in settings where the choice to participate can be made freely	■	■	■
Services provide adequate support to service users, including access to advocates to assist with communicating their views	■	■	■
Services gather information through child-friendly and engaging mediums		■	■
All processes in which children and young people are heard are transparent, informative, voluntary, respectful, relevant to children's lives, inclusive, supported by trained staff, safe, and accountable			■
Parties are kept informed (in an age-appropriate way) of resulting developments throughout the feedback process	■ ■	■	■ ■
Services respond proactively to feedback		■	
Services ensure relevant parties can identify the impact of feedback			■

Best Practices and Guiding Principles of Practice	Type 1 Settings & Services		Type 2/3 Settings & Services
	Non-Empirical literature	Empirical literature	Non-Empirical literature
Children and young people: ■ Parents/Guardians: ■ Families: ■ Service Users in General: ■			
<b>Additional Practices and Principles for Monitoring, Evaluation and Information Systems</b>			
Services actively seek feedback on a regular basis from service users and/or significant people in their lives <sup>1</sup>	■ ■	■ ■	■ ■
Services have robust, transparent systems for managing feedback that support ethically using data and communicating clearly with relevant parties	■ ■		■
Services have data management strategies that facilitate real-time feedback to staff to improve services		■	
<b>Additional Practices and Principles for Complaints Systems<sup>2</sup></b>			
Service users are entitled to make complaints	■		
Complaints systems are developed in consultation with all interested parties	■		■
The organisation has procedures and guidelines for dealing with complaints that all parties can access	■ ■		
There is a culture of openness and transparency that welcomes feedback via complaints, with no adverse consequences for raising issues of concern	■	■	■
Parties right to confidentiality is respected	■ ■		
Service providers provide speedy, constructive, and agreeable solutions as close to the point of delivery as possible within clear and reasonable time limits	■ ■	■	
Parties have a right of appeal and are made aware of options to escalate a complaint to an external body	■		
There are mechanisms for parties to provide feedback on the complaints process and its effectiveness is regularly reviewed	■		
<b>Additional Practices and Principles for Ethical Research</b>			

<sup>1</sup> There may be exceptional circumstances where feedback from significant people in a service users life are not appropriate (e.g. seeking the parental feedback of a child service user when a court direction limits the degree of parental involvement in the child's life).

<sup>2</sup> Complaints systems should be considered as a component of a larger monitoring, evaluation and information system. In that way, the principles and practices of monitoring, evaluation and information systems should also be considered relevant to complaints systems.

Best Practices and Guiding Principles of Practice	Type 1 Settings & Services		Type 2/3 Settings & Services
	Non-Empirical literature	Empirical literature	Non-Empirical literature
Children and young people: ■ Parents/Guardians: ■ Families: ■ Service Users in General: ■			
Researchers avoid the selection of topics that exploit, invade the privacy of, or compound problems experienced by, children and young people			■
Researchers ensure the confidentiality of research participants			■
Researchers use their findings for the benefit of research participants			■
<b><i>Additional Practices and Principles for Participatory Action Research</i></b>			
Researchers are committed to research that reflects and addresses the real-life problems, needs, desires, and experiences of youth researchers			■
Researchers are committed to genuinely collaborative research processes with youth researchers			■
Researchers are committed to actively seeking knowledge that is transformative in the lives of children and young people			■
Children and young people: ■ Parents/Guardians: ■ Families: ■ Service Users in General: ■			

# Discussion

## Gaps in the Findings

The findings highlight important principles, practices, methodologies, and requirements for developing SEIs, and provide some guidance on feedback loops with service users. However, the findings also have gaps in certain areas. For instance, the literature included in this review provided no, or very little, guidance on ‘ethics’, ‘participatory and peer-led research’, ‘levels or types of service user participation’, ‘strategies for identifying and recruiting participants’ and ‘implementation guidance’, and this limited guidance is reflected in the SEI framework.

As such, the review team have pointed readers towards additional literature that was not included in this review, but which may be worthy of consideration as part of the development of a Service Experience Insights framework. These include, but are not limited to:

- Shippee et al’s (2015) *Framework of Patient and Service User Engagement in Research* to facilitate a consideration of how and at what stages service users could participate in the research process
- Groot and Abma’s (2022) *Ethics Framework for Citizen Science and Public and Patient Participation in Research* to facilitate researchers to consider various ethical features of their work
- Lander et al’s (2023) *Framework for Intentional and Actional Components on Engaged Participation in Public Health Research Studies* to facilitate the recruitment of participants to share their Service Experience Insights
- Scaccia et al’s (2015) *Model of Implementation Readiness* combined with Meyers et al’s (2012) *Quality Implementation Framework* to facilitate the implementation of a Service Experience Insights framework in practice throughout an organisation.

While the additional literature above could help to fill some of the gaps in the findings, they were not developed in child protection and child welfare contexts. As such, readers need to carefully assess the applicability of this additional literature to their specific contexts.

## Limitations

A number of limitations reduce the strength of the conclusions that can be drawn from the review and require readers to **exercise considerable caution when considering the transferability of the findings** to their particular contexts.

In terms of the review’s methodology, the review team accelerated the process of conducting a traditional integrative review by streamlining or omitting various methods so that it could be completed more efficiently. This allowed the review team to complete the review within a relatively short timeframe, but it also introduced limitations that may increase the likelihood of bias in the review.

In terms of the literature included in the review, there were two main limitations related to the quantity and quality of the literature. Firstly, most of the included literature does not focus primarily on developing SEIs and is drawn from contexts that are not directly relevant to CPWS, ACS and PPFS contexts. Furthermore, the majority of the included literature focuses on children and young people, with relatively little focused on families, parents, and guardians.

Secondly, the quality assessments of guidelines, standards and evidence syntheses indicated that the vast majority of these types of literature were of ‘low’ or ‘critically low’ quality.

## Key learnings and considerations

The review team identified 7 key learnings and considerations for Tusla that may be helpful for the development of a Service Experience Insights framework. The review team drew on the findings of the review when identifying these learnings and considerations, but also examined how they fit with existing frameworks, strategies and toolkits published by Tusla.

### **Key Learning and Consideration 1**

There is unfortunately a limited amount of literature directly addressing Service Experience Insights in CPWS, ACS and PPFS settings. Due to this the review team have also drawn on literature outside of these contexts.

Much of the literature included in the review is directed mainly towards children and young people, is judged to be of low quality and is currently lacking in support from empirical evidence.

Readers are encouraged to exercise considerable caution when interpreting the findings of the review and carefully assess the transferability of the findings to their particular context.

### **Key Learning and Consideration 2**

With the above caveats in mind, the findings of this review could still be interpreted as indicating best practice in gathering and utilising SEIs and should be an important source of information for the development of an SEI framework.

### **Key Learning and Consideration 3**

The gaps and limitations identified in the literature included in this review suggest that Tusla may want to consider additional sources of information (e.g. stakeholder consultations; short narrative literature review targeting gaps in this review, etc.) to assist with developing a comprehensive SEI framework.

Areas that additional sources of information could helpfully address include ‘feedback loops’, ‘implementation and ethics guidance’, and the development of SEIs with parents, guardians and families.

### **Key Learning and Consideration 4**

Given the relatively limited evidence-base to underpin SEI frameworks, Tusla may want to consider evaluating its SEI framework over time. This could facilitate Tusla in generating its own evidence-based on SEI practices and principles and assess if the SEI framework is working as intended to improve services and outcomes for service users.

### **Key Learning and Consideration 5**

The findings of this review re-affirm much of the content of the existing frameworks, strategies and toolkits developed by Tusla and DCEDIY, which in turn suggest that Tusla may already be working towards many of the findings of this review.

This review also suggests gaps and limitations in the existing frameworks, strategies and toolkits of Tusla may be reflective of gaps and limitations in the wider literature.

### **Key Learning and Consideration 6**

The findings of this review can supplement the content of existing frameworks, strategies and toolkits in several areas. In particular, they highlight a broader range of best practices and principles of practice, and points towards some additional dependencies and requirements for SEIs.

Furthermore, the review findings suggest supplementing the Lundy Model with other models and methodologies that can provide a more wide-ranging framework for systematically gathering and utilising SEIs. These include, for example, the 7P model, the SUFFICE framework, and O'Brien and Watson's QA process.

#### **Key Learning and Consideration 7**

In some areas, Tusla's existing Toolkits may provide more useful guidance than the findings of this review. Specifically, the documents contain a wealth of suggestions for exercises, activities and tools to generate participation, and provide more detailed guidance on establishing methods or structures that feedback can be provided through.

## **Conclusions**

This rapid integrative review aimed to inform the development of Tusla's Service Experience Insights (SEIs) framework for child protection and welfare services (CPWS), alternative care services (ACS), and partnership, prevention, and family support (PPFS) services.

Despite assessing 32 articles, the literature's overall quality and relevance were limited, with a strong focus on children and young people compared to parents, guardians, or families. Given these limitations, readers should interpret the findings cautiously and carefully assess their applicability to their specific context. And yet, while the review team believe it is important to be upfront about these limitations, we are also keen to stress that the literature still provides many important insights, learnings and guidance.

We believe the findings of this review can complement existing Tusla frameworks by providing a broader perspective on best practices, principles of practice, and dependencies and requirements for developing SEIs in particular. It may be possible to fill some of the gaps in the findings by considering additional sources of information (such as stakeholder consultations or a more traditional literature review targeting gaps in this review's findings) and evaluating the SEI framework over time when developed and implemented.

# Reference List

- Alam, S. L. (2021). Many hands make light work: towards a framework of digital co-production to co-creation on social platforms. *Information Technology and People*, 34(3), 1087–1118. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-05-2019-0231>
- Augsberger, A., Collins, M. E., & Levine, B. F. (2022). Family Engagement in Child Welfare System-Level Change: A Review of Current Models. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10443894211067855>
- Ayala-Nunes, L., Jiménez, L., Hidalgo, V., & Jesus, S. (2014). Family feedback in Child Welfare Services: A systematic review of measures. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 44, 299–306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.07.004>
- Baran, M., & Sawrikar, V. (2022). Service-level barriers and facilitators to father engagement in child and family services: A Systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative studies. *PsyArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/vm3bn>
- Cahill, H., & Dadvand, B. (2018). Re-conceptualising youth participation: A framework to inform action. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 95, 243–253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.11.001>
- Care Inspectorate. (2012). *Practice Guide: Involving children and young people in improving children's services*.
- Council of Europe. (2012). *Council of Europe Recommendation on the participation of children and young people under the age of 18*.
- Council of Europe. (2016). *Child Participation Assessment Tool: Indicators for measuring progress in promoting the right of children and young people under the age of 18 to participate in matters of concern to them*.
- Department of Health and Children. (2003). *National Standards for Foster Care*.
- Dworetzky, B., Hoover, C. G., & Walker, D. K. (2023). Family Engagement at the Systems Level: A Framework for Action. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 27, 969–977. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-023-03619-2>
- Groot, B., & Abma, T. (2022). Ethics framework for citizen science and public and patient participation in research. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 23(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-022-00761-4>
- Hawaii Child Welfare Services. (n.d.). *Hawaii Child Welfare Services (CWS): Family Partnership and Engagement Practice Model*.
- Health and Social Care Regulatory Forum. (2009). *Framework for Public & Service User Involvement in Health and Social Care Regulation in Ireland*.
- Health Information and Quality Authority. (2012). *National Standards for the Protection and Welfare of Children: for the Health Service Executive Children and Family Services*.
- Health Information and Quality Authority. (2014). *National Standards for Special Care Units*.
- Health Information and Quality Authority. (2017). *Background document to support the development of National Standards for Children's Residential Centres*.
- Health Information and Quality Authority. (2018). *National Standards for Children's Residential Centres*.
- Jackson, R., Brady, B., Forkan, C., Tierney, E., & Kennan, D. (2020). Influencing policy and practice for young people in foster care: Learning from a model of collective participation. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 113(104901), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.104901>
- Kaehne, A., Beacham, A., & Feather, J. (2018). Co-production in integrated health and social care

- programmes: A pragmatic model. *Journal of Integrated Care*, 26(1), 87–96.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JICA-11-2017-0044>
- Kennan, D., Brady, B., & Forkan, C. (2016). *Exploring the Effectiveness of Structures and Procedures Intended to Support Children's Participation in Child Welfare, Child Protection and Alternative Care Services: A Systematic Literature Review*.
- Kennan, D., Brady, B., & Forkan, C. (2019). Space, Voice, Audience and Influence: The Lundy Model of Participation (2007) in Child Welfare Practice. *Practice: Social Work in Action*, 31(3), 205–218.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09503153.2018.1483494>
- Krogstrup, H., & Brix, J. (2018). *Service User Involvement in Collaborative Governance: Introducing a Nordic Welfare State Model*. <https://vbn.aau.dk/en/publications/service-user-involvement-in-collaborative-governance-introducing->
- Lander, J., Heiberger, A., Von Sommoggy, J., Schulz, A. A., Dresch, C., Altawil, H., Schmitt, G., & Wirtz, M. A. (2023). Intentional and actional components of engaged participation in public health research studies: qualitative synthesis of a recruitment and retention process into the theory-informed INTACT-RS framework. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 23(1), 1–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-023-01838-3>
- Lundy, L. (2007). 'Voice' is not enough: Conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(6), 927–942.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701657033>
- McAuley, K., & Brattman, M. (2002). *Hearing Young Voices: Consulting Children and Young People, including those experiencing Poverty or other forms of Social Exclusion, in relation to Public Policy Development in Ireland: Key Issues for Consideration*.
- Meyers, D. C., Durlak, J. A., & Wandersman, A. (2012). The Quality Implementation Framework: A Synthesis of Critical Steps in the Implementation Process. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 50(3–4), 462–480. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-012-9522-x>
- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2021). *Looked-after children and young people: NICE guideline*.
- O'Brien, M., & Watson, P. (2002). *A framework for quality assurance in child welfare*.
- Park, S. (2019). Beyond patient-centred care: a conceptual framework of co-production mechanisms with vulnerable groups in health and social service settings. *Public Management Review*, 22(3), 452–474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1601241>
- Partnership for Maternal Newborn and Child Health. (2020). *Global Consensus Statement on Meaningful Adolescent and Youth Engagement*. <http://www.youthpower.org/youth-engagement-cop>
- Partnership for Maternal Newborn and Child Health. (2022). *Practical guidance resource to operationalise the global consensus statement on meaningful adolescent and youth engagement (MAYE)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icpr.2004.1333674>
- Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, L., Rodgers, M., Britten, N., Roen, K., & Duffy, S. (2006). *Guidance on the Conduct of Narrative Synthesis in Systematic Reviews: A Product from the ESRC Methods Programme: Vol. Version 1*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1001/archderm.1985.01660090059014>
- Rodríguez, L., & Brown, T. (2009). From voice to agency: Guiding principles for participatory action research with youth. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 123, 19–35.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/yd>
- Save the Children. (2018). *General Children's Participation Criteria: Sectoral Guideline and Instruments for Ensuring Children's Meaningful Participation*.
- Scaccia, J., Cook, B., Lamont, A., Wandersman, A., Castellow, J., Katz, J., & Beidas, R. (2015). A practical



- implementation science heuristic for organizational readiness: R = MC2. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 43(4), 484–501. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21698.A>
- Shippee, N. D., Domecq Garces, J. P., Prutsky Lopez, G. J., Wang, Z., Elraiyah, T. A., Nabhan, M., Brito, J. P., Boehmer, K., Hasan, R., Firwana, B., Erwin, P. J., Montori, V. M., & Murad, M. H. (2015). Patient and service user engagement in research: A systematic review and synthesized framework. *Health Expectations*, 18(5), 1151–1166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.12090>
- The National Children's Office, The Children's Rights Alliance, & The National Youth Council of Ireland. (2005). *Young Voices: guidelines on how to involve children and young people in your work*.
- Toronto, C. (2020). Overview of the Integrative Review. In C. Toronto & R. Remington (Eds.), *A Step-by-Step Guide to Conducting an Integrative Review* (1st ed., pp. 14–29). Springer Nature.
- Ward, V., Pinkney, L., & Fry, G. (2016). Developing a framework for gathering and using service user experiences to improve integrated health and social care: The SUFFICE framework. *BMC Research Notes*, 9(437), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-016-2230-0>
- Wells, K., & Sametz, L. (1985). Involvement of Institutionalized Children in Social Science Research: Some Issues and Proposed Guidelines. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 14(3), 245–251.
- Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The Integrative Review: Updated Methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 52(5), 546–553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmn.2007.11.006>
- Zuchowski, I., Miles, D., Woods, C., & Tsey, K. (2019). Continuous Quality Improvement Processes in Child Protection: A Systematic Literature Review. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 29(4), 389–400. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731517743337>

## Appendix: Articles Included in the Rapid Integrative Review

Citation	Title	Country	Funder/Commissioner	PICO Classifications		
				Population	Phenomena of Interest	Context
Frameworks (n=8)						
Alam (2021)	Many hands make light work: Towards a framework of digital co-production to co-creation on social platforms	Australia	Facebook Inc.	Service users (generic)	SEI is (co-) primary focus	Type 3
Cahill and Dadvand (2018)	Re-conceptualising youth participation: A framework to inform action	Australia	Not Stated	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
Dworetzky et al. (2023)	Family Engagement at the Systems Level: A Framework for Action	United States	Lucile Packard Foundation for Children's Health	Families	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
Health and Social Care Regulatory Forum (2009)	Framework for Public & Service User Involvement in Health and Social Care Regulation in Ireland	Ireland	Health & Social Care Regulatory Forum	Service users (generic)	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
O'Brien and Watson (2002)	A framework for quality assurance in child welfare	United States	Children's Bureau	Children and young people	SEI is (co-) primary focus	Type 1
Park (2019)	Beyond patient-centred care: A conceptual framework of co-production mechanisms with vulnerable groups in health and social service settings	United States	Not Stated	Service users (generic)	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
Rodríguez and Brown (2009)	From voice to agency: Guiding principles for participatory action research with youth	United States	Not Stated	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3

Citation	Title	Country	Funder/Commissioner	PICO Classifications		
				Population	Phenomena of Interest	Context
Ward et al. (2016)	Developing a framework for gathering and using service user experiences to improve integrated health and social care: The SUFFICE framework	United Kingdom	National Institute of Health Research and Leeds South and East Clinical Commissioning Group	Service users (generic)	SEI is (co-) primary focus	Type 3
<b>Models (n=5)</b>						
Augsberger et al. (2022)	Family Engagement in Child Welfare System-Level Change: A Review of Current Models	United States	None.	Families	SEI is not primary focus	Type 1
Hawaii Child Welfare Services (n.d.)	Hawaii Child Welfare Services (CWS) Family Partnership and Engagement Practice Model	United States	Hawaii Child Welfare Services	Children and young people, and families	SEI is not primary focus	Type 1
Kaehne (2018)	Co-production in integrated health and social care programmes: A pragmatic model	United Kingdom	Not Stated.	Service users (generic)	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
Krogstrup and Brix (2018)	Service user involvement in collaborative governance: Introducing a Nordic Welfare State model	Denmark	Not Stated	Service users (generic)	SEI is (co-) primary focus	Type 3
Lundy (2007)*	'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child	United Kingdom	None (Northern Ireland Commissioner for Children and Young People commissioned research informing the model's development)	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
<b>Guidelines (n=10)</b>						
Care Inspectorate (2012)	Practice Guide: Involving children and young people in improving children's services	United Kingdom	Care Inspectorate	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3

Citation	Title	Country	Funder/Commissioner	PICO Classifications		
				Population	Phenomena of Interest	Context
Council of Europe (2012)**	Council of Europe Recommendation on the participation of children and young people under the age of 18	Europe	Council of Europe	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
Council of Europe (2016)**	Child participation assessment tool: Indicators for measuring progress in promoting the right of children and young people under the age of 18 to participate in matters of concern to them	Europe	Council of Europe	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
McAuley and Brattman (2002)	Hearing Young Voices: Consulting Children and Young People, including those experiencing Poverty or other forms of Social Exclusion, in relation to Public Policy Development in Ireland: Key Issues for Consideration	Ireland	Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation and Open Your Eyes to Child Poverty Initiative	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2021)	Looked-after children and young people: NICE guideline	United Kingdom	National Institute for Health and Care Excellence	Children and young people, and parents/guardians	SEI is not primary focus	Type 2
Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (2020)***	Global Consensus Statement: Meaningful Adolescent and Youth Engagement	Switzerland	World Health Organisation (?)	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child	Practical guidance resource to operationalize the global consensus	Switzerland	World Health Organisation	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3

Citation	Title	Country	Funder/Commissioner	PICO Classifications		
				Population	Phenomena of Interest	Context
Health (2022)***	statement on meaningful adolescent and youth engagement (MAYE)					
Save the Children (2018)	General Children's Participation Criteria: Sectoral Guideline and Instruments for Ensuring Children's Meaningful Participation	Sweden and Albania	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
The National Children's Office, The Children's Rights Alliance, The National Youth Council (2005)	Young Voices: Guidelines on How to Involve Children and Young People in your work	Ireland	The National Children's Office, The Children's Rights Alliance, and The National Youth Council	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
Wells and Sametz (1985)	Involvement of Institutionalized Children in Social Science Research: Some Issues and Proposed Guidelines	United States	Cleveland Foundation	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 3
<b>Standards (n=4)</b>						
Department of Health and Children (2003)	National standards for foster care	Ireland	Department of Health and Children	Children and young people, and families	SEI is not primary focus	Type 1
Health Information and Quality Authority (2012)	National standards for the protection and welfare of children: For Health Service Executive children and family services	Ireland	Health Information and Quality Authority	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 1
Health Information and Quality Authority (2014)	National standards for special care units	Ireland	Health Information and Quality Authority	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 1

Citation	Title	Country	Funder/Commissioner	PICO Classifications		
				Population	Phenomena of Interest	Context
Health Information and Quality Authority (2018)	National standards for children's residential centres	Ireland	Health Information and Quality Authority	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 1
<b>Evidence Syntheses (n=5)</b>						
Ayala-Nunes et al. (2014)	Family Feedback in Child Welfare Services: A Systematic Review of Measures	Spain and Portugal	Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia	Families	SEI is (co-) primary focus	Type 1
Baran and Sawrikar (2022)	Service-level barriers and facilitators to father engagement in child and family services: A systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative studies	United Kingdom	None	Parents / guardians	SEI is not primary focus	Type 1
Health Information and Quality Authority (2017)	Background document to support the development of National Standards for Children's Residential Centres	Ireland	Health Information and Quality Authority	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 1
Kennan et al. (2016)	Exploring the effectiveness of structures and procedures intended to support children's participation in child welfare, child protection and alternative care services: A systematic literature review	Ireland	Tusla	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 1
Zuchowski et al. (2019)	Continuous quality improvement processes in child protection: A systematic literature review	Australia	Centre for Research Excellence in Integrated Quality Improvement and the Lowitja Institute	Children and young people	SEI is not primary focus	Type 1

\*Lundy (2007) did not, in and of itself, meet the eligibility criteria of the review due to the context in which it was originally developed (i.e. education). However, it was included after the review team identified other articles during full-text screening which had applied the Lundy Model in a child protection and welfare context (Jackson et al., 2020) and for the purpose of gathering and utilising SEIs (Kennan et al., 2019).

\*\*Companion documents.

\*\*\*Companion documents.



[effectiveservices.org](http://effectiveservices.org)

# TúsLA

An Ghníomhaireacht um  
Leanaí agus an Teaghlach  
Child and Family Agency