



Interactive hypothetical



Where are you located?

- Metropolitan
- Regional



What is your role?

- Counsellor
- FDRP
- Lawyer
- Service Manager
- Social scientist (social worker/psychologist)
- Support worker
- Other



What type of organisation do you work for?

- Government
- Not for Profit
- Community
- Private
- Sole provider



What size is your organisation?

- Small (Under \$500,000)
- Medium (\$500,000 to \$5,000,000)
- Large (above \$5,000,000)

Jones Family



Father: Peter (38 years, works in construction)

Mother: Clare (36 years, part time teacher's aide)

Children: Blake (9 years), Ruby (7 years)

Parents separated November 2015. Mother is in family home.



VRO obtained December 2015. Mother is the applicant, Father is the respondent. Children not included on the VRO. Magistrate advises to go to Family Court of Western Australia.



The father breached the VRO when he turned up at a school event, concert and sporting activity. The mother has reported these breaches to the Police. The family home was broken into and property removed, Mother suspects Father but there is no evidence.



Father presents at Family Court Western Australia (FCWA) where he is advised to go to a Family Relationship Centre (FRC).

Father tells the FRC

Mother has stopped contact, however the VRO does not include the children. Father tells FRC that the mother wants revenge and has filled the kids' heads with lies. He alleges the mother is mentally unstable, a nervous wreck and that she is overprotective of the kids and “babies” his son.

Mother tells the FRC

Mother alleges a history of physical violence and controlling behaviour including pushing, yelling, property damage, checking phone, trying to control her movements and who she sees.



Mother reports he is very authoritarian father, picks on Blake and is very critical of him. Mother reports Blake is sensitive and frightened of Dad. Mother confirms she has stopped contact due to her believing both Blake and Ruby are fearful of their dad. Dad buys the children presents when they do as he wants.



Mother says the children don't like visiting Dad because they say he is mean to Blake and calls Mum mean names. Mother believes Ruby is frightened but she is favoured by Dad in terms of praise and attention.

Q1: Should the children be seen as part of the FDR intake assessment?



- Yes, they should be seen/assessed with the parents
- Yes, they should be seen/assessed separately to the parents
- No
- Unsure



The FDR Children's Practitioner speaks to Blake separately. Blake says his father slaps his face, locks him in his room in the dark (light bulb taken out) and shouts at him. Upon this assessment with the child FDR is determined unsuitable. Section 60I/66H (b) certificate issued (not suitable for FDR).

Q2: Should the Children's Practitioner refer to DCPFS (Child Protection) due to allegations by Blake and Mother that Father exposed children to family and domestic violence and physically assaulted Blake?



- Yes
- No
- Don't know



FRC makes reports to DCPFS with allegations of abuse.

DCPFS advises the FRC that the case is currently open for family support.



Father applies to FCWA for kids live with him and spend time with
Mother.



The case is referred to a Child Related Proceedings (CRP) list. The Family Consultant advises Magistrate of allegations of family violence and abuse and recommends Case Assessment Conference (CAC). The matter is assigned to a Case Assessment Conference (CAC) with a Family Consultant and orders made to obtain information from the Police and DCPFS prior to the CAC.



Q3: Should the children be involved in the CAC?

- Yes, interviewed by the Family Consultant and views shared with the parents
- Yes, interviewed by Family Consultant but views not shared with parents
- No
- Don't know



At the CAC, the Family Consultant interviews parents separately and gathers further information about the issue of family violence and the risks to the children.



Following the CAC a memorandum is written detailing the risk factors and making recommendations. In this memorandum recommendations are be made for a behaviour change program and supervised time.



Q4: Given the alleged family violence, should the father be ordered supervised contact ongoing whilst completing the FDV men's behaviour change program (MBCP)?

- Yes
- No, contact should be unsupervised
- No, the father should have no contact
- Don't know



Parties return to Court for a directions hearing and orders by consent are made for the father to attend a reportable Family and Domestic Violence (Men's Behavioural Change) program and have supervised time with the children and to return to meet with the Family Consultant for a Child Inclusive Child Dispute Conference.

Q5: Should the children be consulted prior to any consideration of contact (supervised or not)?



- Yes
- No
- Don't know



The parties and the children return to meet with the Family Consultant for a Child Inclusive Child Dispute Conference. The children are interviewed and their views canvassed. Children are very clear that they do not wish to spend time with their father.



Father has completed MBCP. Completion report states his level of engagement and insight into children's experiences of FDV was limited.

Q6: What contact arrangements should be recommended?



- No Contact: the children have expressed the view that they do not wish to see their father at this time and there has been no demonstration that the risk / safety issues have been addressed.
- Supervised contact: although the children have said they do not wish to see their father, it is in their 'best interests' to have a relationship with him. Supervised contact will enable risk / safety issues to be monitored and managed.
- Unsupervised contact: father has completed the requirements of the court (MBCP) and should have unsupervised time with his children.
- Don't know