



Australian Government

Australian Institute of Family Studies

Evaluation of the 2006 family law reforms

December 2009

Rae Kaspiew, Matthew Gray, Ruth Weston,
Lawrie Moloney, Kelly Hand, Lixia Qu

and the Family Law Evaluation Team

Evaluation of the 2006 family law reforms

December 2009

Rae Kaspiew, Matthew Gray, Ruth Weston,
Lawrie Moloney, Kelly Hand, Lixia Qu

and the Family Law Evaluation Team



Australian Government

Australian Institute of Family Studies

This report was commissioned by the Australian Government Attorney-General's Department and the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.

A summary of this report, *Evaluation of the 2006 Family Law Reforms: Summary report*, is available from the Australian Institute of Family Studies <www.aifs.gov.au>.

Prepared by:

Rae Kaspiew
Matthew Gray
Ruth Weston
Lawrie Moloney
Kelly Hand
Lixia Qu

Michael Alexander
Jennifer Baxter
Catherine Caruana
Chelsea Cornell
Julie Deblaquiere
John De Maio
Jessica Fullarton
Kirsten Hancock
Bianca Klettke
Jodie Lodge
Shaun Lohoar
Jennifer Renda
Grace Soriano
Robert Stainsby
Danielle Wisniak

© Commonwealth of Australia 2009

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part may be reproduced by any process without prior written permission from the Commonwealth Copyright Administration, Attorney-General's Department, 3-5 National Circuit, Barton ACT 2600 or posted at <www.ag.gov.au/cca>.

Views expressed in this publication are those of individual authors and may not reflect those of the Australian Government or the Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Suggested citation:

Kaspiew, R., Gray, M., Weston, R., Moloney, L., Hand, K., Qu, L., & the Family Law Evaluation Team. (2009). *Evaluation of the 2006 family law reforms*. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

ISBN 978-1-921414-22-0

Edited by Lan Wang, Lauren Di Salvia and Neil Conning
Typeset by Lan Wang

Printed by Print Bound

Contents

List of figures	vi
List of tables	xi
Acknowledgements	xvii
Executive summary	E1
1. Introduction, background and methodology	1
1.1 Background to the 2006 family law reforms	1
1.2 The family law system after 1 July 2006	4
1.3 Evaluation methodology	12
1.4 Structure of this report	22
2. Characteristics of separated parents: Challenges and issues for family relationships and wellbeing	23
2.1 Socio-economic and demographic characteristics of separated parents	24
2.2 Separated parents' reports of experiencing family violence	24
2.3 Experience of mental health problems, alcohol/drug misuse, or other addictions before separation	28
2.4 Co-occurrence of family violence, mental health problems and addiction issues	29
2.5 Quality of relationships between parents after separation	30
2.6 Summary	32
3. Use and effectiveness of new and expanded family relationship services	35
3.1 Clients using FRSP services	36
3.2 Service use by parents who are not separated	44
3.3 Service use by parents who separate	47
3.4 Staff assessments of their service's operation	51
3.5 Family relationship services and Indigenous clients	54
3.6 Client satisfaction	58
3.7 Summary	62
4. Pathways towards parenting arrangements	65
4.1 Negotiating and deciding parenting arrangements after separation	65
4.2 Referral pathways	70
4.3 Pathways and family violence	77
4.4 Satisfaction with pathways	81
4.5 Pathway coordination	83
4.6 Summary	90
5. Family dispute resolution	93
5.1 A note on FDR with exceptions and certificates	93
5.2 A note on terminology and changing practice	94
5.3 Operation and outcomes of FDR	95
5.4 Summary	110
6. Care-time arrangements: Community opinions, prevalence and durability of different arrangements, and trends across the years	111
6.1 Opinions of parents about post-separation parental involvement and equal care time for children	112
6.2 Prevalence of different care-time arrangements: Reports of parents who separated post-reform	117
6.3 Care-time arrangements in post-reform court files	123
6.4 Durability of different care-time arrangements	126
6.5 Extent of change in care-time arrangements since the 2006 reforms	128
6.6 Summary	134
7. Care-time arrangements: Negotiations and family profiles	137
7.1 Characteristics of parents with different care-time arrangements	137
7.2 Development of care-time arrangements: Process and evaluations	149

7.3	Quality of inter-parental relationships	160
7.4	Profiles of families with different care-time arrangements	168
7.5	Summary	172
8.	Parental responsibility: Decision-making about issues affecting the child and financial support	175
8.1	Decision-making responsibilities	175
8.2	Financial support for children post-separation	191
8.3	Summary	201
9.	Parental responsibility and time: Perspectives and practices of lawyers and other service providers	205
9.1	Philosophical support for shared parental responsibility	206
9.2	Understanding the distinction between parental responsibility and time	207
9.3	Parental expectations about shared time	210
9.4	Working with parents to produce child-focused outcomes	214
9.5	Who did the legal changes favour?	219
9.6	Bargaining? Dynamics and issues	222
9.7	Summary	229
10.	Family violence and child abuse: Parents' pathways and professionals' perspectives	231
10.1	Professionals' estimates of family violence and views of the family law system response	233
10.2	Screening for and identifying abuse and family violence	237
10.3	Service provision sector responses: Insights from clients and service provision professionals	240
10.4	Legal system responses: Insights from family law professionals	245
10.5	Summary	253
11.	Children's wellbeing	255
11.1	Methodological issues	256
11.2	Care-time arrangements and children's wellbeing	257
11.3	Family violence, safety issues and the nature of inter-parental relationships	262
11.4	Care-time arrangements, violence and safety issues, inter-parental relationships and child wellbeing: Estimates using LSAC	270
11.5	Summary	272
12.	Grandparenting and the family law reforms	275
12.1	Grandparents and the 2006 family law reforms	275
12.2	Views of parents in general about the grandparent–grandchild relationship	278
12.3	Parental separation and the grandparent–grandchild relationship	282
12.4	Consideration of time with grandparents when making parenting arrangements	288
12.5	Family lawyers' perceptions	289
12.6	Grandparents' knowledge and use of legislation and services under the 2006 reforms	290
12.7	FRSP staff perceptions about grandparent–grandchild relationships	295
12.8	Summary	299
13.	The 2006 reforms and the courts	301
13.1	Case management: A brief overview	301
13.2	Differences in patterns of filings and representation in the FCoA, FMC and FCoWA	304
13.3	The FMC and the FCoA: Implications for the administration of the <i>SPR Act 2006</i>	314
13.4	Summary	318
14.	The implementation of Division 12A of Part VII: Principles for conducting child-related proceedings	321
14.1	Key insights from the FLS 2006 and 2008	322
14.2	Differences between the FMC and the FCoA	325
14.3	Less adversarial trials in the FCoA: Qualitative insights	327
14.4	The Family Court of Western Australia model	331
14.5	Summary	333
15.	The application of the <i>SPR Act 2006</i> amendments to the <i>Family Law Act 1975</i>	335
15.1	The workability of the <i>SPR Act 2006</i>	335

15.2	Decision-making post-1 July 2006: <i>Goode and Goode</i>	343
15.3	Objects and principles: Meaningful involvement and protection from harm	347
15.4	Parental responsibility	350
15.5	Time arrangements	354
15.6	Factual considerations: s60CC(3)(c)	357
15.7	Summary	359
16.	Summary of key findings and conclusions	361
16.1	Implications of the findings for the key evaluation questions	361
16.2	Conclusion	366
	References	369
	Case list	375
	Acronyms, abbreviations and glossary	377

Appendices*

Appendix A Historical context: Family law and social change in Australia, 1976–2006

Appendix B Evaluation framework and project methodologies

Appendix C Instruments

Appendix D Legislation

Appendix E Supporting tables and figures

* The appendices are available for viewing and download from the website of the Australian Institute of Family Studies: <www.aifs.gov.au>.

List of figures

Figure 1.1	Data collected in the course of the evaluation	14
Figure 2.1	Experience of different forms of emotional abuse before or during separation, fathers and mothers, 2008	27
Figure 2.2	Having mental health and addiction issues before separation, fathers' and mothers' reports, by experience of family violence, 2008	31
Figure 2.3	Quality of inter-parental relationship, by whether parent had safety concerns, fathers and mothers, 2008	33
Figure 3.1	Agreement with the statement: "If you are thinking of separating, it is important to consult a lawyer", by separation status, fathers and mothers, 2006 and 2009.	51
Figure 4.1	Service providers' views on whether they have adequate information about the family law reforms to assist clients, 2009	84
Figure 4.2	Service providers' views on proportion of clients who have some misunderstanding about when they are required to attend FDR, 2008	85
Figure 5.1	Fathers and mothers who contacted or used counselling, FDR or mediation, by experience of family violence, 2008	100
Figure 5.2	Service providers' views about the proportion of clients for whom FDR was inappropriate due to family violence, 2009	106
Figure 5.3	Service providers' views about the proportion of clients for whom FDR was inappropriate due to child abuse or neglect, 2009	106
Figure 6.1	Parents' views about whether children do best when both parents stay involved in their lives after separation, fathers and mothers, 2006 and 2009	114
Figure 6.2	Parents' views about whether children do best when both parents stay involved in their lives after separation, non-separated and separated fathers and mothers, 2006 and 2009	114
Figure 6.3	Parents' views about the appropriateness of equal care time for children, by different age groups, fathers and mothers, 2009	116
Figure 6.4	Parents who thought that equal care time was totally appropriate for children, by different age groups, non-separated and separated fathers and mothers, 2009	117
Figure 6.5	Care-time arrangements: Proportion of nights per year that children spent with each parent, by age of child, 2008	120
Figure 6.6	Shared care-time arrangements, by age of child, 2008	121
Figure 6.7	Proportion of children in different age groups who never saw one parent, by age of child, 1997, 2003 and 2006–07	130
Figure 6.8	Proportion of children in different age groups who experienced equal care-time arrangements, by age of child, 1997, 2003 and 2006–07	131
Figure 7.1	Educational attainment, by care-time arrangement, fathers, 2008	139
Figure 7.2	Educational attainment, by care-time arrangement, mothers, 2008	139
Figure 7.3	Employment rates, by care-time arrangements, fathers, 2008	140
Figure 7.4	Employment rates, by care-time arrangements, mothers, 2008	141
Figure 7.5	Proportion of re-partnered parents, by care-time arrangement, mothers and fathers, 2008	142
Figure 7.6	Distance/time parents live apart from each other, by care-time arrangement, fathers, 2008	143
Figure 7.7	Distance/time parents live apart from each other, by care-time arrangement, mothers, 2008	143
Figure 7.8	Individual income (median per year), by care-time arrangements, mothers and fathers, 2008	144
Figure 7.9	Relationship status at separation, by care-time arrangement, fathers, 2008	145
Figure 7.10	Relationship status at separation, by care-time arrangement, mothers, 2008	145
Figure 7.11	Reports that fathers were "very involved" in the focus child's day-to-day activities pre-separation, fathers and mothers, 2008	146
Figure 7.12	Reports that mothers were "very involved" in the focus child's day-to-day activities pre-separation, fathers and mothers, 2008	147

Figure 7.13	Whether parenting arrangements had been sorted out, by care-time arrangements, fathers, 2008	150
Figure 7.14	Whether parenting arrangements had been sorted out, by care-time arrangements, mothers, 2008	150
Figure 7.15	Main pathway for sorting out parenting arrangements, fathers, 2008	152
Figure 7.16	Main pathway for sorting out parenting arrangements, mothers, 2008	152
Figure 7.17	Flexibility of parenting arrangements, fathers, 2008	154
Figure 7.18	Flexibility of parenting arrangements, mothers, 2008	154
Figure 7.19	Reports by parents that the current parenting arrangements were working “really well” or “fairly well” for fathers, fathers and mothers, 2008	155
Figure 7.20	Reports by parents that the current parenting arrangements were working “really well” or “fairly well” for mothers, fathers and mothers, 2008	155
Figure 7.21	Reports by parents that the current parenting arrangements were working “really well” or “fairly well” for focus child, fathers and mothers, 2008	156
Figure 7.22	Fathers’ views on whether the parenting arrangements were working well for them, the mother and the child, 2008	158
Figure 7.23	Mothers’ views on whether the parenting arrangements were working well for them, the father and the child, 2008	158
Figure 7.24	Reports by parents that their arrangement worked “really well” or “fairly well” for focus child, by age of the focus child, fathers and mothers combined, 2008	159
Figure 7.25	Frequency of communication between parents about the child, by care-time arrangement, fathers, 2008	161
Figure 7.26	Frequency of communication between parents about the child, by care-time arrangement, mothers, 2008	161
Figure 7.27	Quality of inter-parental relationship, by care-time arrangement, fathers, 2008	163
Figure 7.28	Quality of inter-parental relationship, by care-time arrangement, mothers, 2008	163
Figure 7.29	Reports of violence, by care-time arrangement, fathers, 2008	165
Figure 7.30	Reports of violence, by care-time arrangement, mothers, 2008	165
Figure 7.31	Safety concerns associated with ongoing contact, by care-time arrangements, fathers and mothers, 2008	166
Figure 7.32	Prevalence of mental health and/or issues relating to alcohol/drugs or other addictions before separation, by care-time arrangements, fathers and mothers, 2008	167
Figure 8.1	Proportion of fathers who said that both parents were equally involved in decision-making about the focus child for each issue, by care-time arrangements, 2008	177
Figure 8.2	Proportion of mothers who said that both parents were equally involved in decision-making about the focus child for each issue, by care-time arrangements, 2008	178
Figure 8.3	Proportion of fathers who said that the mother mainly made decisions about the focus child for each issue, by care-time arrangements, 2008	179
Figure 8.4	Proportion of mothers who said that the mother mainly made decisions about the focus child for each issue, by care-time arrangements, 2008	179
Figure 8.5	Proportion of fathers who said that the father mainly made decisions about the focus child for each issue, by care-time arrangements, 2008	180
Figure 8.6	Proportion of mothers who said that the father mainly made decisions about the focus child for each issue, by care-time arrangements, 2008	180
Figure 8.7	Shared decision-making, by level of pre-separation involvement of the father in their child’s life, parents with focus child living mostly/entirely with mother (66–100%), 2008	182
Figure 8.8	Shared decision-making, by level of pre-separation involvement of the father in their child’s life, parents with focus child in shared care time (35–65%), 2008	182
Figure 8.9	Shared decision-making, by reports of family violence, parents with focus child living mostly/entirely with mother (66–100%), 2008	183
Figure 8.10	Shared decision-making, by reports of family violence, parents with focus child in shared care time (35–65%), 2008	183

Figure 8.11	Shared decision-making, by whether parent had safety concerns for focus child and/or self, parents with focus child living mostly/entirely with mother (66–100%), 2008	185
Figure 8.12	Shared decision-making, by whether parent had safety concerns for focus child and/or self, parents with focus child in shared care time (35–65%), 2008	185
Figure 8.13	Shared decision-making, by main family law pathways, fathers' reports, parenting arrangements sorted out, 2008	186
Figure 8.14	Shared decision-making, by main family law pathways, mothers' reports, parenting arrangements sorted out, 2008	186
Figure 8.15	Liability of fathers to pay child support to mothers, by care-time arrangement, fathers' and mothers' reports, 2008	192
Figure 8.16	Receipt of child support by fathers, by care-time arrangement, mothers' and fathers' reports, 2008	194
Figure 8.17	Child support payments made in full and on time, by care-time arrangements, father payers' and mother payees' reports, 2008	197
Figure 8.18	Child support payments paid neither in full nor on time, by care-time arrangements, father payers' and mother payees' reports, 2008	197
Figure 8.19	Full compliance with child support liability, by whether decision-making was shared, father payers' and mother payees' reports, 2008	198
Figure 8.20	Perceived fairness of child support payments for self, other parent and current partner, by gender of parents, 2008	199
Figure 8.21	Perceived fairness of child support payments for self, by whether paying or receiving child support, fathers' and mothers' reports, 2008	199
Figure 8.22	Perceived fairness of child support payment for self, by whether payment fully complied, father payers' and mother payees' reports, 2008	200
Figure 8.23	Perceived fairness of child support payments for self, by care-time arrangements, father payers' and mother payees' reports, 2008	201
Figure 8.24	Perceived fairness of child support payments for self, by whether decision-making responsibilities were shared, father payers' and mother payees' reports, 2008	201
Figure 9.1	Agreement with the statement: "Spelling out a general expectation of shared parental responsibility after separation is a positive development", lawyers and service providers	207
Figure 9.2	Agreement with the statement: "It is easy for clients to understand the difference between equal shared parental responsibility and equal time", lawyers and service providers	208
Figure 9.3	Understanding of the exceptions to the equal shared parental responsibility presumption by parents and system professionals, lawyers' views, 2008	209
Figure 9.4	Perceptions of the proportion of mothers and fathers who expect equal time, lawyers and service providers	211
Figure 9.5	Agreement with the statement: "The current (policy) framework makes it easy to assist parents reach arrangements that are developmentally appropriate for their children", lawyers and service providers	215
Figure 9.6	Agreement with the statement: "The legislative reforms towards shared parental responsibility have benefited children in most cases", family lawyers, pre- and post-1 July 2006	216
Figure 9.7	Estimates of the proportion of parents who were able to focus substantially on their children's needs, service providers, 2009	217
Figure 9.8	Perceptions of whether the legislative reforms have generally favoured fathers or mothers, lawyers, 2006 and 2008	220
Figure 9.9	Perceptions of whether the legislative reforms have generally favoured fathers or mothers, by gender of lawyer, 2008	220
Figure 9.10	Perceptions of whether the legislative reforms have generally favoured parents or children, lawyers, 2006 and 2008	221
Figure 9.11	Agreement with statements concerning parents' motivation in seeking care-time arrangements and links with child support, lawyers, 2008	223
Figure 9.12	Estimates of proportion of potential CSA payers seeking more time with children so they pay less child support, service providers, 2009	224

Figure 9.13	Estimates of proportion of potential CSA payees trying to stop ex-partner having more time with children to avoid losing child support, service providers, 2009	224
Figure 9.14	Views about whether property settlements have changed in favour of mothers or fathers, by gender of lawyer, 2008	225
Figure 9.15	Average property division allocated to mothers and fathers, pre-2006 reforms (2008 data)	226
Figure 9.16	Average property division allocated to mothers and fathers, post-2006 reforms (2008 data)	226
Figure 9.17	Frequency of clients seeking to change finalised property settlements, pre- and post-reform, lawyers' reports, 2008	227
Figure 9.18	Frequency of clients seeking to change finalised parenting and property arrangements, post-reform, lawyers' reports, 2008	228
Figure 10.1	Estimates of proportion of families where family violence or abuse has been an issue, lawyers and service provision sector professionals, 2008 and 2009	234
Figure 10.2	Agreement with the statement: "The child's right to meaningful involvement with both parents is given adequate priority in the family law system", lawyers and service provision professionals, 2008 and 2009	235
Figure 10.3	Agreement with the statement: "The need to protect children and other family members from harm from family violence and child abuse is given adequate priority in the family law system", lawyers and service provision professionals, 2008 and 2009	236
Figure 10.4	Assessment of own ability to screen for the presence of family violence and abuse, lawyers, 2006 and 2008	238
Figure 10.5	Agreement with the statement that FRCs have been able to screen adequately for family violence and child abuse, lawyers, 2006 and 2008	239
Figure 10.6	Agreement with the statement: "The legal system has been able to screen adequately for family violence and child abuse", lawyers, 2008	240
Figure 10.7	Agreement with the statement: "The prospect of an adverse costs order has discouraged allegations of violence or child abuse that are genuinely held and/or likely to be true", lawyers, 2006 and 2008	249
Figure 10.8	Agreement with the statement: "The prospect of an adverse costs order has discouraged false allegations of violence or child abuse", lawyers, 2006 and 2008	249
Figure 11.1	Negative measures of child wellbeing, by care-time arrangements, fathers' reports, 2008	260
Figure 11.2	Positive measures of child wellbeing, by care-time arrangements, fathers' reports, 2008	260
Figure 11.3	Negative measures of child wellbeing, by care-time arrangements, mothers' reports, 2008	261
Figure 11.4	Positive measures of child wellbeing, by care-time arrangements, mothers' reports, 2008	261
Figure 11.5	Negative measures of child wellbeing, by reports of experience of family violence, fathers' and mothers' reports, 2008	262
Figure 11.6	Positive measures of child wellbeing, by reports of experience of family violence, fathers' and mothers' reports, 2008	263
Figure 11.7	Negative measures of child wellbeing, by whether parents had any safety concerns for self and/or focus child, fathers' and mothers' reports, 2008	264
Figure 11.8	Positive measures of child wellbeing, by whether parents had any safety concerns for self and/or focus child, fathers' and mothers' reports, 2008	264
Figure 11.9	Negative measures of child wellbeing, by nature of inter-parental relationships, fathers' and mothers' reports, 2008	265
Figure 11.10	Positive measures of child wellbeing, by nature of inter-parental relationships, fathers' and mothers' reports, 2008	265
Figure 11.11	Negative measures of child wellbeing, by care time and safety concerns (health, learning, getting along, overall progress), mothers' report, 2008	271
Figure 11.12	Negative measures of child wellbeing, by care time and safety concerns (social-emotional development), mothers' report, 2008	271

Figure 12.1	Agreement with the statement that: “It is important for children to maintain the same level of contact with their grandparents on both sides after parental separation”, by separation and residence status, fathers and mothers, 2009	279
Figure 12.2	Perceived closeness of current relationship between their own parents and children, by separation and residence status, fathers’ and mothers’ reports, 2006	280
Figure 12.3	Perceived current level of involvement of their own parents in children’s lives, by separation and care-time arrangements, fathers’ and mothers’ reports, 2009	281
Figure 12.4	Preference regarding level of involvement of own parents, by separation and residence status, fathers and mothers, 2009	281
Figure 12.5	Current levels of closeness of relationship between grandparents and grandchildren after separation, grandparents’ reports, 2009	283
Figure 12.6	Current frequency of grandparents getting together or spending time with grandchildren after separation, grandparents’ reports, 2009	283
Figure 12.7	Changes in relationship between their own parents and children since separation, by residence status, parents’ reports, 2006	284
Figure 12.8	Changes in involvement of grandparents in grandchildren’s lives since separation, by residence status, parents’ reports, 2009	284
Figure 12.9	Level of closeness of relationship with grandchild, before parental separation and at the time of the survey, as reported by grandparents, 2009	285
Figure 12.10	Change in closeness of relationship with grandchildren, grandparents’ reports, 2009	286
Figure 12.11	Satisfaction with relationship with grandchild, grandparents’ reports, 2009	288
Figure 12.12	Proportion of parents indicating that time with grandparent was considered in parenting arrangements for focus child, by main pathways, pre- and post-reform	289
Figure 12.13	Frequency of face-to-face contact with grandchild before and since attending the service, grandparents’ reports, 2009	295
Figure 13.1	Number of applications for final orders, by court, 2004–05 to 2008–09	305
Figure 13.2	Number of applications for final orders, property only, by court, 2004–05 to 2008–09	307
Figure 13.3	Number of consent orders applications, FCoA, 2004–05 to 2008–09	308
Figure 13.4	Number of ICL orders, FCoA and FMC, 2004–05 to 2008–09	309
Figure 13.5	Applications for final orders for which ICL orders were made, child only and children and property, by court, 2004–05 to 2008–09	309
Figure 13.6	Self-represented litigants as a proportion of applications for final orders, child only, children and property, and property only, by court, 2004–05 to 2008–09	311
Figure 13.7	Number of Form 4s and Form 66s filed, by court, 2004–05 to 2008–09	312
Figure 13.8	Applications for final orders for which a Form 4 notice was filed, children only and children plus property, 2004–05 to 2008–09	312
Figure 14.1	Agreement with the statement: “The Division 12A process is a desirable change”, 2006 and 2008	323
Figure 14.2	Agreement with the statement: “The less adversarial court processes proposed by the Division 12A reforms will be/are more attentive to the interests of the child”, 2006 and 2008	323
Figure 14.3	Agreement with the statement: “For most children the less adversarial court processes in the Division 12A reforms will deliver/delivers better outcomes than the traditional court process”, 2006 and 2008	324
Figure 14.4	Agreement with the statement: “The less adversarial court processes in the Division 12A reforms will be/are more attentive to the goal of future parental cooperation”, 2006 and 2008	324
Figure 14.5	Agreement with the statement: “Division 12A provides sufficient flexibility to deal appropriately with allegations of violence and abuse”, 2006 and 2008	325
Figure 14.6	Agreement with the statement: “Most litigants will feel/feel they got a fair hearing in the Division 12A process”, 2006 and 2008	326

List of tables

Table 2.1	Socio-economic and demographic characteristics of separated parents, 2008	25
Table 2.2	Experience of physical hurt before separation, or emotional abuse before or during separation, fathers and mothers, 2008	26
Table 2.3	Family violence reported by clients who attended an FRSP service to sort out issues about their children after a relationship break-up or separation, 2008	27
Table 2.4	Current safety concerns, fathers and mothers, 2008	28
Table 2.5	Mental health problems and addiction issues, before separation, father and mother reports, 2008	29
Table 2.6	Experience of family violence, by mental health and addiction issues, before separation, mothers and fathers, 2008	30
Table 2.7	Quality of current inter-parental relationship, fathers' and mothers' reports, 2008	31
Table 2.8	Quality of inter-parental relationship, by experience of family violence, before separation, fathers and mothers, 2008	32
Table 2.9	Family violence and mental health/addiction issues, before separation, by current safety concerns, fathers and mothers, 2008	33
Table 3.1	Socio-economic and demographic characteristics of registered FRSP clients aged 15 years or over, by type of service attended, 2008–09	37
Table 3.2	Educational attainment and labour force status, by type of service attended, registered clients aged 15 years and over, 2008–09	38
Table 3.3	Number of and percentage change in clients, by FRSP service type, 2006–07 to 2008–09	39
Table 3.4	Number of calls to FRAL, 2006–07 to 2008–09	39
Table 3.5	Number of calls made to and by Mensline, 2006–07 to 2008–09	40
Table 3.6	Main reason indicated by client for attending early intervention service, by type of service attended, 2009	41
Table 3.7	Main reason indicated by client for attending a post-separation service, by type of service attended, 2009	41
Table 3.8	Main relationship discussed by caller, Mensline, 2006–07 to 2008–09	42
Table 3.9	Main issue discussed by caller, Mensline, 2006–07 to 2008–09	42
Table 3.10	Caller presenting needs, FRAL, 2006–07 to 2008–09	43
Table 3.11	Number of presenting needs recorded, individual registered clients aged over 15 years, 2006–07 and 2008–09	43
Table 3.12	Use of services to support relationships or resolve problems, parents living with a partner, fathers and mothers, 2009	45
Table 3.13	Socio-economic and demographic characteristics of parents, by whether services used to support relationship, partnered fathers and mothers, 2009	46
Table 3.14	Socio-economic and demographic characteristics of parents, by whether services used to resolve relationship problems, partnered fathers and mothers, 2009	46
Table 3.15	Socio-economic and demographic characteristics, by whether used services to resolve relationship problems before separation, separated fathers and mothers, 2009	47
Table 3.16	Number of services used during or after separation, fathers and mothers, 2008	48
Table 3.17	Socio-economic, demographic and relationship characteristics of post-reform parents, by whether used services during or after separation, separated fathers and mothers, 2008	49
Table 3.18	Types of services contacted or used during or after separation, fathers and mothers, pre- and post-reform	50
Table 3.19	Agreement (agree or strongly agree) with statements about the accessibility of their service, service professionals' perceptions, by type of service, 2009	52
Table 3.20	Agreement (agree or strongly agree) with statements about operational aspects of service delivery, service professionals' perceptions, by types of service, 2009	53
Table 3.21	Agreement (agree or strongly agree) that service can meet different aspects of service delivery, service professionals' perceptions, by type of service, 2009	54

Table 3.22	Positive rating (good or excellent) of service's capacity to work well with different types of clients, service professionals' perceptions, by type of service, 2009	55
Table 3.23	Proportion of FRSP clients identifying as being Indigenous, by type of service, registered clients aged 15 years or over, 2006–07 to 2008–09	56
Table 3.24	Whether parents who had used the service to support a relationship would recommend the service to others in similar circumstances, fathers and mothers, 2009	58
Table 3.25	Whether non-separated parents who had used services to resolve relationship problems would recommend the service to others in similar circumstances, fathers and mothers, 2009	59
Table 3.26	Whether separated parents who used services to resolve problems before separation would recommend the service used to others in similar circumstances, fathers and mothers, 2009	59
Table 3.27	Whether separated parents who used services post-separation would recommend the service used to others in similar circumstances, mothers and fathers 2009	59
Table 3.28	Clients' favourable ratings of service delivery, by type of service, 2009	60
Table 3.29	Clients' favourable ratings of service delivery, by gender and family circumstances, early intervention services, 2009	61
Table 3.30	Clients' favourable ratings of service delivery, by gender and family circumstances, post-separation services, 2009	62
Table 4.1	Parents who had sorted out arrangements: Main family law pathway used, fathers and mothers, pre- and post-reform	66
Table 4.2	Main family law pathway being used by parents who were in the process of sorting out arrangements, fathers and mothers, post-reform	66
Table 4.3	Services contacted/used during/after separation, by main pathways used by parents who had sorted out arrangements, post-reform	67
Table 4.4	Parents who were in the process of sorting out arrangements: Services contacted/used during/after separation, by main pathways used, post-reform	68
Table 4.5	Parents who had nothing sorted out regarding parenting arrangements: Likelihood of reaching arrangements involving selected pathways, post-reform	69
Table 4.6	Referral pathways, by type of FRSP service attended, 2009	70
Table 4.7	Services attended, by type of early intervention service attended and whether referred to by other service, 2009	72
Table 4.8	Services attended, by type of post-separation service attended and whether referred to by other service, 2009	73
Table 4.9	Referral pathways into and out of the Family Relationship Advice Line, 2006–07 to 2008–09	74
Table 4.10	Use of and referrals from other services, by reason for attending the FRSP service, 2009	75
Table 4.11	Where family dispute resolution or mediation took place, pre- and post-reform	76
Table 4.12	Main pathways used, by parents' reports of family violence, parents who had sorted out parenting arrangements, post-reform	77
Table 4.13	Main pathways used by parents' reports of family violence, parents who were in the process of sorting out parenting arrangements, post-reform	78
Table 4.14	Reports of family violence, by whether parenting arrangements had been sorted out, mothers and fathers, post-reform	78
Table 4.15	Reports of experience of family violence, by type of FRSP service used, 2009	79
Table 4.16	Post-separation services clients' experience of family violence, by referral pathways, 2009	80
Table 4.17	Early intervention services clients' experience of family violence, by referral pathways, 2009	80
Table 4.18	Parents agreement (agree or strongly agree) about the process of reaching a parenting agreement, by whether parenting arrangement sorted out, mothers and fathers, post-reform	81
Table 4.19	Parents agreement (agree or strongly agree) about the process of reaching parenting agreement soon after separation, mother and fathers, pre-reform	82

Table 4.20	Parents agreement (agree or strongly agree) about the process of reaching parenting agreements, by main family law pathway, fathers and mothers who have sorted out parenting arrangements, post-reform	82
Table 4.21	Parents agreement (agree or strongly agree) about the process of reaching parenting agreement soon after the separation, by main pathways used, mothers and father, pre-reform	83
Table 4.22	Service providers' agreement (agree or strongly agree) of their service's referral processes and ability to work with other agencies, 2009	85
Table 4.23	Service professionals providing favourable ratings regarding their own service's ability to work with different services, by service type, 2009	86
Table 4.24	Service professionals' agreement (agree or strongly agree) with perceptions of FRCs and FRAL, 2009	87
Table 4.25	Agreement that FRCs have been able to work well in an integrated way, family lawyers and service professionals, pre- and post-reform	87
Table 4.26	Proportion of clients referred to services by family lawyers, by type of service 2006 and 2008	88
Table 5.1	Outcomes of FDR, 2008	97
Table 5.2	FDR outcomes for clients who tried to sort out parenting arrangements, mothers and fathers, by where FDR took place, 2009	97
Table 5.3	Living arrangements specified by FDR agreement, mothers and fathers, by where FDR took place, 2009	98
Table 5.4	Impact of FDR parenting agreement on time the focus child spent with the client, mothers and fathers, by where FDR took place, 2009	99
Table 5.5	Parents' agreement (agree or strongly agree) about aspects of parenting agreement/processes, mothers and fathers, by where FDR took place, 2009	99
Table 5.6	Agreement rates and issue of certificates, by experience of family violence inflicted by other parent, 2008	101
Table 5.7	Agreement rates, mothers and fathers, by fear, abuse or threats and ability to negotiate, 2009	101
Table 5.8	Issue of certificates, mothers and fathers, by fear, abuse or threats and ability to negotiate, 2009	103
Table 5.9	State of parenting arrangements, by outcome from FDR, 2008	103
Table 5.10	Main pathway used to sort out parenting arrangements, parents who have sorted out parenting arrangements, by outcome from FDR, 2008	104
Table 5.11	Main pathway being used to sort out parenting arrangements, parents in process of sorting parenting arrangements, by outcome from FDR, 2008	105
Table 5.12	Parents who had contacted or used a lawyer, by whether contacted or used counselling, FDR or mediation, or had attempted FDR, 2008	109
Table 6.1	Care-time arrangements: Proportion of nights per year that children spent with each parent, by age of child, 2008	119
Table 6.2	Frequency of daytime-only care, child has daytime-only care with one parent, reports by fathers and mothers, 2008	122
Table 6.3	Care-time arrangements for children subject to proceedings with final arrangements, post-1 July 2006	124
Table 6.4	Care-time arrangements for children subject to proceedings with final arrangements, by type of case, post-1 July 2006	125
Table 6.5	Care-time arrangements for children subject to proceedings with final arrangements, by court, post-1 July 2006	126
Table 6.6	Care-time arrangements at separation and at interview, 2004-05 and 2009	127
Table 6.7	Care-time arrangements for children subject to proceedings with final arrangements, pre- and post-reform	132
Table 6.8	Judicial determination cases: Care-time arrangements for children subject to proceedings with final arrangements, pre- and post-reform	133
Table 6.9	Consent cases: Care-time arrangements for children subject to proceedings with final arrangements, pre- and post-reform	133
Table 7.1	Parents' current level of involvement in their focus child's day-to-day activities and level of pre-separation involvement, reports by non-separated and separated fathers and mothers, 2009	148

Table 8.1	Involvement of each parent in decision-making about focus child, mothers and fathers, 2008	176
Table 8.2	Parental responsibility outcomes, pre- and post-1 July 2006	187
Table 8.3	Parental responsibility outcomes, judicial determination and consent, pre- and post-1 July 2006	187
Table 8.4	Parental responsibility outcomes, by type of case, post-1 July 2006	188
Table 8.5	Reasons given for deciding on sole-to-mother parental responsibility outcomes, post-1 July 2006	188
Table 8.6	Parental responsibility outcomes in files judicially determined, by court, post-1 July 2006	189
Table 8.7	Parental responsibility outcomes, by allegation of violence or child abuse, judicially determined and consent after proceedings cases, post-1 July 2006	190
Table 8.8	Parental responsibility outcome, by age of child, post-1 July 2006	190
Table 8.9	Child support compliance, by liability status and gender of parent, 2008	195
Table 8.10	Child support compliance, by payment liability, father payers' and mother payees' reports, 2008	196
Table 10.1	Agreement that screening for child abuse and neglect or family violence is a core part of the service, service provision professionals, 2009	237
Table 10.2	Positive assessments of own ability to identify issues of child abuse and neglect or family violence in their work, service provision professionals, 2009	238
Table 10.3	Parents' reports of safety concerns while attending a service, 2009	241
Table 10.4	Services with procedures/protocols to deal with family violence or child abuse and/or neglect disclosures, service provision professionals' reports, 2009	242
Table 10.5	Agreement that procedures and protocols in place for dealing with disclosures safeguarded families using the service, service provision professionals, 2009	243
Table 10.6	Positive rating of ability to make referrals in the context of disclosures of child abuse and neglect or family violence, service provision professionals, 2009	244
Table 10.7	Positive assessments of own ability to assist families with issues of child abuse and neglect of family violence, service provision professionals, 2009	244
Table 11.1	Health and wellbeing of focus children by gender of parents, 2008	259
Table 11.2	Relationship between child wellbeing and care-time arrangements, statistically significant estimates, 2008	267
Table 11.3	Relationship between child wellbeing and family violence, safety concerns and inter-parental relationships, summary of regression modelling, 2008	268
Table 11.4	Wellbeing of children in different care-time arrangements, multivariate analysis, teachers' report, LSAC	273
Table 11.5	Children's self-report of feelings and PPVT, multivariate analysis, LSAC	273
Table 12.1	Agreement with the statement that: "It is important for children to maintain the same level of contact with their grandparents on both sides after parental separation", fathers and mothers, 2009	278
Table 12.2	Use of services or courts, by paternal and maternal grandparents, 2009	291
Table 12.3	Circumstances of grandparents who sought help regarding time with or care arrangements of a grandchild, grandparents' reports 2009	293
Table 12.4	Outcomes of care arrangements for grandchild(ren), grandparents' reports, 2009	293
Table 12.5	Evaluations of agreed-upon arrangements and level of child focus in agreement process, grandparents' reports, 2009	294
Table 12.6	FRSP staff agreement that after the 2006 reforms more parents and grandparents want grandchildren to spend time with grandparents, by type of service, 2008	296
Table 12.7	FRSP staff perceptions about support their service provides for grandparents and other family members, 2009	297
Table 13.1	Number of matters started as Magellan cases, 2004-05 to 2008	303
Table 13.2	Final orders for children and children plus property, by court, 2004-05 to 2008-09	305
Table 13.3	Number of applications for final orders, by type of final order and court, 2004-05 to 2008-09	306
Table 13.4	Proportions and characteristics of appeals, 2004-05 to 2007-09	308

Table 13.5	Cases with an ICL ordered, by file determination, post-reform	310
Table 13.6	Cases with an ICL ordered, by court, post-reform	310
Table 13.7	Judicially determined cases that have an allegations of violence raised by and against applicants and respondents, by court, pre- and post-reform	314
Table 13.8	Cases finalised by consent after proceedings that have an allegations of violence raised by and against applicants and respondents, by court, pre- and post-reform	314
Table 13.9	Number and average length of matters, by file determination and court, post-reform	319
Table 15.1	Factual Issues alleged during proceedings, by type of proceeding, ranked from overall most frequent to least frequent, post-reform	341

Acknowledgements

This report was commissioned by the Australian Government Attorney-General's Department and the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.

The authors would like to acknowledge and thank all of those who participated in or assisted with the evaluation, including: the Family Court of Australia, the Federal Magistrates Court, the Family Court of Western Australia, the Child Support Agency, family relationship service providers, Family Relationship Services Australia, Council on the Aging New South Wales, Mensline Australia and the Family Law Section of the Law Council of Australia. We also acknowledge the helpful assistance of staff from the Australian Government Attorney-General's Department and the Australian Government Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.

While many staff at Australian Institute of Family Studies contributed to the fieldwork and report, we especially would like to acknowledge Leah Bromfield, Ben Edwards, Daryl Higgins, Melissa Johnstone, Robyn Parker, Antonia Quadara, Nick Richardson, Elly Robinson, Jennifer Russell, Diana Smart, Sarah Williams and Suzie Vassallo.

We would particularly like to acknowledge the major contribution made by Associate Professor Bruce Smyth to the development of the Evaluation Framework and design of a number of the studies. We are also grateful to Professor Richard Chisholm, who assisted in the development of the Evaluation Framework. Associate Professor Smyth and Professor Chisholm also made major contributions to the analysis of the Family Lawyers Survey 2006.

We extend special thanks to Professor Alan Hayes, Director of the Australian Institute of Family Studies, for his expertise, advice, insightful comments on the report and unwavering support at all times.

Of course, the evaluation would not have been possible without the 28,000 people who provided information about their lives or professional experiences during the course of the evaluation, including parents, grandparents, family relationship service staff, lawyers, judicial officers, family consultants and professional staff in the three family courts. Without this generous willingness to participate, the evaluation would not have been possible.