



Report 12

## Preparing Court-Based Child Custody Mediation Services for the Future



**Statewide Uniform Statistical Reporting System**  
*The 1996 Client Baseline Study*

Center for Families, Children & the Courts  
Judicial Council of California  
Administrative Office of the Courts

September 2000

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA**

Chief Justice Ronald M. George, Chair

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

William C. Vickrey  
Administrative Director of the Courts

Michael Bergeisen  
General Counsel

**CENTER FOR FAMILIES, CHILDREN & THE COURTS**

Diane Nunn, Attorney  
Division Director

Isolina Ricci, Ph.D  
Assistant Director

**Production of this report:**

Marlene B. Simon  
Senior Research Analyst  
Report Author

Stanley Sciortino, Ph.D  
Research Analyst

Don Will  
Research Analyst

Mitchell Yee  
Former Research Analyst

Charlene Depner, Ph.D  
Supervising Research Analyst

Fran Haselsteiner  
Editing

Suzanne Bean  
Graphics

# Report 12

## Preparing Court-Based Child Custody Mediation Services for the Future

The turn of the century finds profound changes in California's population and family courts serving that population. Demographic trends and social and economic changes throughout the state have resulted in contested child custody cases that are more problematic, complex, and varied than imagined in past years. Courts have had to expand the kinds and numbers of services they offer to meet the needs of today's family law client.

Reliable information about clients with child custody disputes in California's family courts, their circumstances, problems, and needs, assists the courts in planning and improving their services. This report presents information from the only authoritative source of such data, the Statewide Uniform Statistical Reporting System (SUSRS) of the Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC). SUSRS includes periodic statewide data collections that track cases as they enter court-based mediation, the initial step in the court's child custody determination process, and longitudinal follow-up studies to chart long-term parent and child experiences. SUSRS provides rigorous statewide statistics based on representative samples of court-based child custody and visitation mediations.<sup>1</sup>

Statistics cited in this report are taken from three SUSRS surveys. The report highlights findings from the *1996 Client Baseline Study*, a sample of 2,588 families representing 80 percent of all court-based child custody mediations across the state during the study period. Those findings are compared with results from the *1991 Client Baseline Study*, covering 1,388 families representing 82 percent of all court-based child custody mediations statewide, and the *1993 Client Baseline Study*, covering 2,259 families representing 80 percent of all such cases.

---

Authors' note: The opinions, findings, and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Center for Families, Children & the Courts, the Administrative Office of the Courts, or the Judicial Council of California.

<sup>1</sup> SUSRS studies meet two fundamental criteria accepted by social and behavioral researchers: (1) All eligible parties across the state have an equal opportunity to be included in the research (i.e., research is not restricted to particular programs, services, or geographic locations), thereby ensuring representation of the full range of cases across the state; and (2) the research includes enough cases to permit reliable inferences from the data.

## THE VOLUME AND COMPLEXITY OF CASES ARE INCREASING

### *Caseloads are skyrocketing*

SUSRS statistics document rapid growth in the number of cases entering family court mediation to establish orders for child custody and visitation. In 1987, the estimated yearly case volume was 49,500, rising to 65,500 by 1991, 73,250 by 1993, and 84,550 by 1996.

### *Cases are more complex*

In theory, the disposition of family law cases follows a linear sequence of steps. Parents who cannot reach agreement on their own or with the assistance of third parties, such as attorneys or private mediators, are referred to court-based mediation. If mediation does not result in agreement on all custody and visitation matters the case goes through subsequent dispute resolution procedures that vary with local rules of court. Eventually final orders are made, and it is commonly assumed that they will remain in place for the child's minority.

In practice, family court cases referred to mediation may be at a variety of stages of the dissolution or separation process. Some families are in family court for the first time; some have returned for a modification in existing court orders; some need to develop a complete parenting plan; others need to work out one or two issues. As children grow older and family circumstances change, custody and visitation arrangements often need adjustment. Children may begin to want more input into their custody or visitation schedules. New marriages and new family arrangements or changes in jobs or economic conditions may dictate new custody or visitation arrangements.

In 1996, 26 percent (Table 1<sup>2</sup>) of all cases seen in court-based mediation were returning to court to seek a modification of an existing court order concerning legal custody, physical custody, or division of the child's primary residence. Often the parents have come to court for a modification of only one or two of those orders.

In many instances, the parents may have either an informal agreement or an existing court order on some parts of the parenting plan and need to mediate only on other specific areas. Data from the 1996 study show that 42 percent of the families in mediation had a current court order or an agreement between themselves about legal custody and were there to mediate other issues. Thirty percent of the families had a current court order or an informal agreement about the physical custody of the child

---

<sup>2</sup> Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

already in place, and for 34 percent the order or arrangement concerning the child's primary residence was not at issue (Table 2).

Those existing court orders or informal agreements that parties were in court to change and those court orders or agreements that were not at issue in the current mediation had been established by various means. The parents might simply have reached agreement on their own, with the help of an attorney, or through private mediation; or the order or agreement might have been reached through court-based mediation, a mediator's recommendation to the court, or a court-ordered custody evaluation. Mediators reported that almost half the families (47 percent) entered the current mediation with custody or visitation orders or agreements that had been reached using court-based methods. (Table 2a).

What are the implications of these data for court services? Parents seeking modifications may require special services tailored to families who already have an agreement in place. Procedures for all clients must recognize, and if possible anticipate, points at which custody and visitation agreements are most vulnerable to change and recognize that parenting plans may be made up of many separate points of agreement. Parent education can be an essential tool, giving mothers and fathers the skills to adapt to the child's changing needs. In addition, these findings emphasize the extensive use of court resources by a large proportion of family court clients. For almost half the families included in the *1996 Client Baseline Study*, the current mediation was not their first use of a family court service.

### ***Many parents are not represented by legal counsel***

There is a strong impression that family court is dealing with a large and ever-increasing number of clients who lack representation. SUSRS statistics show that in half the families who come to family court (53 percent; Table 3) at least one person is pro per. When only one party is represented, neither mothers nor fathers are more likely to have attorneys. In 12 percent of the families fathers were the only represented party; mothers were the only party with an attorney in 13 percent of the cases. Those statistics do not show an increase since the first data collection in 1991. However, the SUSRS findings can be generalized only to those families who use family court services, not to all family court users.

A recent study of cases involving child support orders<sup>3</sup> found higher proportions of un-represented clients. Among child support cases involving the district attorney, at least one party lacked representation in 97 percent of the cases; among non-DA child support cases, 70 percent. Families coming to court for a child support order are less

---

<sup>3</sup>Judicial Council of California, *Review of Statewide Uniform Child Support Guidelines* (1998).

likely to be represented by attorneys than those seeking child custody and visitation orders. Again, the child support study findings cannot be generalized to family court as a whole.

Reliable statistics on the proportion of family court users represented by attorneys will be available only when the new Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) is fully implemented. Until then, only statistics based on specific groups of clients, nonsystematic counts of individual courts, and impressionistic or anecdotal evidence are available.

The proportion of families mediating child custody and visitation without both parents represented by legal counsel (53 percent) may be lower than other estimates for family court users, but it is still a serious problem for family court. In 25 percent of the families, one parent lacks representation; in 28 percent of the families, both are pro per. Lack of representation places a burden on the court to maintain fairness and ensure an informed agreement in these cases, where the most important issues a family may ever have to consider are at stake.

## **NEW KINDS OF CASES FACE THE COURTS**

### ***Cases require cultural competence***

The pattern of ethnic diversity among mediation clients closely matches the composition of the California population. In the three baseline surveys, a third of all clients were people of color (34 percent in 1996; Table 4). Hispanics were the largest minority group (22 percent in 1996), followed by Blacks (7 percent), Asian or Pacific Islanders (3 percent), and American Indians, Eskimo, and Aleut (2 percent).<sup>4</sup> In 14 percent of the families (Table 4a) the parents are from different ethnic backgrounds.

The close correspondence of the ethnic breakdown of mediation clients and the statewide population suggests that each ethnic group uses the courts in proportion to its representation in the state population. There is no indication that any particular ethnic group underutilizes or overutilizes the service.

What are the implications of these trends for courts? The statistics make it clear that court-based mediation programs must be prepared to serve a multicultural clientele by providing culturally competent services. The ethnic diversity found among

---

<sup>4</sup>Clients reported their own ethnic identifications. Category labels were taken from the U.S. Census.

mediation participants demands a broad repertoire of mediation skills as well as sensitivity to, and awareness of, the various cultural traditions governing parenting roles. At the same time, as required by statute (Family Code section 3180), the mediator must consider the best interest of the children, including their health, safety, and welfare.

### ***Custody arrangements for never-married parents***

Additional SUSRS statistics emphasize new kinds of cases and challenges, such as fragile families, facing family courts. Debate about child custody and visitation policy usually considers divorcing couples, but federal child support assurance initiatives are increasing the number of family court clients who have never been married. Parenting agreements about child custody and visitation must now incorporate issues unique to mothers and fathers who may never have thought of themselves as a family. In 1991, 16 percent (Table 5) of cases involved never-married parents. That figure rose to 22 percent in 1993 and increased to 26 percent by 1996. Most of the never-married parents had, however, lived together at one time.

About one-quarter (23 percent) of the never-married parents never lived together and may have no history of co-parenting. Helping these parents work out custody and visitation arrangements to encourage the noncustodial parent's ongoing contact with the child is a formidable challenge. As national child support enforcement efforts and the efforts to quickly establish paternity increase, so will these kinds of cases.

## **SHRINKING RESOURCES FOR FAMILIES**

SUSRS statistics indicate that most mediation clients negotiate the complicated family law system and deal with the complexities of shared parenting with very limited resources.

### ***Unemployment and poverty are common***

Almost a quarter of all parents using family court services (23 percent in 1996; Table 6) are not employed, and almost a third (30 percent; Table 7) have incomes less than \$800 per month. These statistics have remained relatively stable across the three studies (1991, 1993, and 1996). Sizable discrepancies are found in the employment and poverty statuses of mothers and fathers. In 1996, 33 percent (Table 6a) of all mothers and 14 percent of all fathers were unemployed. Also in 1996, 38 percent

(Table 7a) of all mothers and 21 percent of all fathers earned less than \$800 per month.<sup>5</sup>

### ***Programs should be geared for the highschool-educated client***

In 1996, 28 percent (Table 8) of the parents in mediation had a high school diploma only, and 11 percent had completed less than a high school education. The educational levels of mothers and fathers are roughly equivalent. In 1996, 37 percent of the mothers and 40 percent of the fathers had no formal education beyond high school (Table 8a). The number of clients with limited formal education is large enough to suggest that forms and informational materials be designed for ease of accessibility by those at lower education levels.

## **MEETING THE NEEDS OF TODAY'S FAMILY COURT CLIENTS**

### ***Serving multiproblem families***

Family court has had to change and adapt to meet yet another significant challenge—the serious family problems that are commonly raised in court-based mediation sessions. SUSRS 1996 statistics show that in over half (51 percent; Table 9) of all sessions, parents raised concerns about physical or sexual child abuse, child neglect or abduction, substance abuse, or domestic violence. In 30 percent of all cases, more than one such matter arose, usually in the form of counterallegations between parents. These statistics are consistent with those in 1991 and 1993. The statistics cover a wide range of circumstances, running the gamut from documented incidents to concerns that a problem might arise; so they are not accurate indicators of the prevalence of these family problems. What they do measure with great precision is the frequency with which serious, often multiple, family problems enter the mediation session. In more than half of all mediation sessions, mediators must be equipped to deal with far more than the disposition of parental time with children.

For many families, custody deliberations spark concerns about parental behavior toward the child. In 1996, concerns about child neglect were raised in 16 percent (Table 10) of the mediation sessions. Physical abuse of the child was raised in 7

---

<sup>5</sup>This analysis reports income without linking it to the poverty line defined by the U.S. Census because SUSRS income measurement methods do not correspond with those employed by the U.S. Census. Specifically, SUSRS measures exclude sources included by the census, such as actual AFDC, welfare, SSI, and child support. SUSRS measures income net of taxes, whereas the Census uses pre-tax dollars. The SUSRS figure includes all income sources, such as employment, unemployment benefits, social security, disability, and spousal support from previous relationships. An imputed average benefit of \$450 per month was used for AFDC recipients. Under the most conservative estimates, an SUSRS defined income of less than \$800 per month would likely fall below the U.S. Census poverty line.



percent of all sessions. Sexual abuse of the child came up in 3 percent of all mediations. Parental abduction of the child was a concern in 6 percent of all cases. More common are concerns about a parent's lifestyle or interactions with the other parent. In 1996, problems with alcohol or drug abuse affected custody deliberations for one-third of all families (30 percent). Parents in 30 percent of all families brought up concerns about domestic violence in their custody deliberations. Allegations that one parent maligned the other in front of the child were raised in 23 percent of all sessions; harassment by the other parent was claimed in 21 percent of the sessions, stalking in 5 percent. In 13 percent of the mediations a parent was accused of not showing up for visitation, while in 26 percent it was claimed that the custodial parent was preventing visitation. These are all indicators of serious conflict between the parents, resulting in a climate of stress that may have serious consequences for their children. In addition, these kinds of allegations increase the need for investigation, referrals, and monitoring.

Effective case disposition for multiproblem families demands an unprecedented range of expertise from the courts. CFCC added a Special Services section in late 1997 to help meet these needs and to offer individual courts technical assistance and services. *Justice in the Balance 2020*, the 1993 report of The Commission on the Future of the California Courts<sup>6</sup>, recognized the critical need for access to a broad range of human resource services and recommended an advocacy role for the courts in the mobilization of community services for families. Since then a number of courts have begun innovative programs in collaboration with community and state agencies to address these problems.

### ***Widespread concerns about safety***

In 1996 (as noted above), mediators reported that parents bring up domestic violence concerns before or during 30 percent (Table 10) of the sessions. A still larger proportion, 55 percent (Table 11) of all cases, enter court-based mediation with a current or previous domestic violence restraining order preventing one parent from coming near the other. When asked if they are concerned about future violence, 28 percent (Table 12) of the parents say they are very or somewhat concerned. Not surprisingly, when examined separately, 39 percent (Table 12a) of the mothers and 18 percent of the fathers indicate such concern.

Concern about violence in family law cases has prompted a reevaluation of policies and procedures that govern services to families. The Uniform Standards for Court-Connected Mediation of Child Custody and Visitation Disputes (California Standards of Judicial Administration section 26) currently in effect, invokes

---

<sup>6</sup> Judicial Council of California (1993) pp. 125–26.

safeguards such as separate mediation sessions and the inclusion of support persons. It also makes provisions for mediator training in the area of domestic violence. Each year since 1987, CFCC has provided specialized training to court mediators, evaluators, and investigators. The new mediation standards, which have been adopted by the Judicial Council as a rule of court effective July 1, 2001 (Rule 1257.1 of the California Rules of Court, The Uniform Standards of Practice for Court-Connected Child Custody Mediation), are even more responsive to this area.

The Judicial Council has also adopted rule of court 1257.7, Domestic Violence Training Standards for Court-Appointed Child Custody Investigators and Evaluators, which became effective on January 1, 1999. Training meeting these standards has been taking place throughout the state. Guidelines for families with a history of violence are currently being implemented in a number of courts, and protocols for handling domestic violence cases as mandated by Family Code section 3170(b), are currently in the process of development. These guidelines will be recommended to the Judicial Council for adoption as a rule of court effective January 1, 2002.

### **FOCUS OF MEDIATION PROGRAM MUST BE CONSEQUENCES FOR CHILDREN**

Mediation deliberations affect well over 100,000 California children every year—an estimated 109,400 in 1991; 121,600 in 1993; and 143,700 in 1996. For many of these children, plans for custody and visitation will span most of their childhood years. Nearly half of all mediations (46 percent; Table 13) concern a preschool child; 62 percent involve children between 5 and 12 years old. A relatively small proportion of mediating families (19 percent) have adolescent children (13 years of age or older). (Since a family may have children in more than one age group, the percentages add to more than 100 percent.) These percentages have remained fairly stable over the three studies.

The high proportion of very young children covered in mediation plans raises issues about age-appropriate child custody arrangements. Although some limited research is available to guide these deliberations, the experience and judgment of court mediators is particularly critical to the fate of individual children.<sup>7</sup>

#### ***Concerns about the child's well-being***

Serious concerns about a child's well-being come up in over half of all mediation sessions (63 percent; Table 14). Emotional adjustment of the child was the most

---

<sup>7</sup> Mary F. Whiteside, "Custody for Children Age 5 and Younger" (1998), §36(4), *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*, p. 479–502

common issue (27 percent of all sessions; Table 14a), followed by concern with child safety (19 percent). The issue of the parenting plan's appropriateness for the child's age was raised in 16 percent of the sessions. Also commonly considered were the child's behavioral problems (in 13 percent of the sessions) and developmental progress (in 9 percent of the sessions). A concern that a child has difficulty with transitions was raised in 10 percent of the sessions, and 9 percent of sessions discussed a child's refusal to visit. Medical needs of the child were discussed in only 7 percent of the sessions.

These kinds of concerns were as likely to come up individually as they were to be combined with other issues. In 32 percent (Table 14) of all cases, just one concern was raised; in 31 percent, multiple concerns were raised.

### ***Child Protective Services investigations***

Statewide statistics also showed that Child Protective Services has investigated a quarter of all families seen in child custody mediation. According to parents in 1993 and 1996, Child Protective Services investigated a report about children in 25 percent (Table 15) of all mediating families. In 1991 the figure was 22 percent.

### ***Witness to interparental violence***

Statewide statistics also reveal that, in 41 percent of all families seen in mediation (Table 16), at least one parent reported that a child had witnessed violence between the parents.

Whether or not a parent knows that a child has witnessed violence, it is very likely that a child is aware of, and affected by, it. The emotional climate surrounding a child in households with actual violence or even with the threat of violence implied by harassment, maligning, or stalking, may be difficult for the child. The Family Code on custody of minor children, Section 3020a, states "The Legislature further finds and declares that the perpetration of child abuse or domestic violence in a household where a child resides is detrimental to the child."

## **CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE PLANNING**

The volume, complexity, and diversity of cases entering today's family courts are indicative of the challenges courts will continue to face in the future:

- Courts should continue to anticipate steady growth in the volume of family law cases.

- A substantial proportion of cases will return to court for partial orders or modifications of previous custody and visitation orders.
- Courts must be geared for the pro per client. Currently at least one client is not represented in over half of all mediation cases.
- Court-based mediation programs must develop new competencies:
  - Cultural competency to serve a multicultural clientele. Courts must be equipped to deal with custody deliberations that reach impasse on cultural issues and/or involve disputes about the cultural traditions in which the child will be raised.
  - The competency to work with fragile families. Parents who have never been married to each other or never lived together need help in developing long-term parenting commitments.
- Family courts must be equipped to serve clients who have limited personal resources. Many clients, particularly mothers, lack basic financial resources. A large sector of clients have no formal education beyond high school.
- A substantial segment of cases entering family court require referrals or orders to ancillary human services. Innovative court/community partnerships are needed to provide these services. A high proportion of families cite issues involving child neglect, abuse, and potential abduction as well as parental substance abuse, increasing the need for investigation, referrals, and monitoring. Parenting plans for these families may need to include arrangements for supervised visitation.
- Safety is a critical issue in many custody decisions. More than half of all clients entering mediation are now or have once been protected by a domestic violence restraining order. Court security must be adequate to ensure the safety of clients and court staff. Court orders for neutral drop-off/pick-up points for transferring children may be needed.
- Custody determination in the courts will continue to involve a high proportion of cases in which the child's well-being is a serious concern. Currently, nearly one-third of all families express concern about a child's emotional well-being. Child Protective Services has investigated a report about children in 25 percent of all mediating families. Children in nearly half of all families have witnessed domestic violence. The courts face the challenge of protecting the health, safety, welfare, and best interest of the next generation.

***Table 1. Modifications***

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Missing	45	2
No	1,878	73
Yes	665	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Counselor Report Form).

**Table 2. Initial Status of Legal Custody, Physical Custody and Primary Residence**

<b>Legal Custody</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Missing	97	4
Initial order	887	34
TRO / modifications / review	516	20
Not an issue	1,088	42
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Physical Custody</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Missing	94	4
Initial order	831	32
TRO / modifications / review	891	34
Not an issue	772	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Primary Residence</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Missing	159	6
Initial order	735	28
TRO / modifications / review	826	32
Not an issue	868	34
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Counselor Report Form).

***Table 2a. Methods Used to Reach Previous Court Order or Agreement for Legal Custody, Physical Custody, or Primary Residence***

	<i>N</i>	%
Court-based	1,226	47
Not court-based	368	14
No previous order or agreement	708	27
Unknown / missing	286	11
<b><i>Total</i></b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Counselor Report Form).

Table counts any case that used court-based methods to reach a previous court order or agreement for any of the following: Legal custody, physical custody, or primary residence; then any case with a previous court order or agreement reached using non-court based methods; then any case with no previous order or agreement in any of the categories. Remaining cases are Unknown/Missing.

**Table 3. Legal Representation of Parents**

	<i>N</i>	%
None represented	682	28
Mother only	321	13
Father only	283	12
Both represented	908	38
Missing	211	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,405</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Client Profile Form).



**Table 4. Parent's Ethnicity**

	<i>N</i>	%
American Indian	86	2
Asian / Pac. Isl.	144	3
Black	316	7
White	2,388	54
Hispanic	943	22
Missing	506	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,383</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the parent level (Client Profile Form).

**Table 4a. Family Ethnicity**

	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	824	34
Same	1,247	52
Different	334	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,405</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Client Profile Form).

**Table 5. Parent's Marital Status**

	<i>Year</i>					
	<b><u>1991</u></b>		<b><u>1993</u></b>		<b><u>1996</u></b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Missing	43	2	9	0	42	2
Never married	319	16	480	22	637	26
Ever married	1,684	82	1,684	77	1,726	72
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,046</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,173</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,405</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1991, 1993, and 1996 Client Baseline Studies*. Data analyzed at the family level (Client Profile Form).

**Table 6. Parent's Current Employment Status**

	Year					
	<u>1991</u>		<u>1993</u>		<u>1996</u>	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	20	1	190	5	271	6
No	1,033	27	1,206	30	1,024	23
Yes	2,827	73	2,692	66	3,088	70
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,880</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4,088</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4,383</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: 1991, 1993, and 1996 Client Baseline Studies. Data analyzed at the parent level (Client Profile Form).

*Table 6a. Parent's Current Employment Status*

**Relationship to Children**

<b>1991</b>	<u><b>Mother</b></u>		<u><b>Father</b></u>	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	10	1	10	1
No	703	36	330	17
Yes	1,249	64	1,578	82
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,962</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1,918</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>1993</b>	<u><b>Mother</b></u>		<u><b>Father</b></u>	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	89	4	101	5
No	801	39	405	20
Yes	1,178	57	1,514	75
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,068</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,020</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>1996</b>	<u><b>Mother</b></u>		<u><b>Father</b></u>	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	130	6	141	7
No	727	33	297	14
Yes	1,366	61	1,722	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,223</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,160</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: 1991, 1993 and 1996 Client Baseline Study. Data analyzed at the parent level (Client Profile Form).

**Table 7. Parent's Monthly Income**

	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	540	12
\$800 or above	2,536	58
Below \$800	1,307	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,383</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 7a. Parent's Monthly Income:  
Relationship to Children**

	<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	236	11	304	14
\$800 or above	1,139	51	1,397	65
Below \$800	848	38	459	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,223</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,160</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the parent level (Client Profile Form).

**Table 8. Parent's Education**

	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	283	6
Some high school or less	483	11
High school diploma/GED only	1,209	28
Some college	1,462	33
College degree	946	22
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,383</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 8a. Parent's Education:  
Relationship to Children**

	<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	139	6	144	7
Some high school or less	276	12	207	10
High school diploma/GED only	566	25	643	30
Some college	784	35	678	31
College degree	458	21	488	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,223</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,160</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the parent level (Client Profile Form).

**Table 9. Multiproblem Families**

	<i>N</i>	%
None	1,273	49
One	543	21
Multiple	772	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Counselor Report Form).

**Table 10. Concerns About Parental Behavior  
Towards Children and Other Parent Raised in Session**

<i>Concerns Raised</i>	<i>%</i>
Child neglect	16
Physical abuse	7
Sexual abuse	3
Parental abduction	6
Substance abuse	30
Domestic violence	30
Maligning partner	23
Harassing partner	21
Stalking	5
No show for visitation	13
Visitation Prevented	26

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Counselor Report Form).



*Table 11. Domestic Violence Temporary Restraining Orders*

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Missing	129	5
No	958	40
Yes	1,318	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,405</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Client Profile Form).

**Table 12. Parent's Concerns About Future Violence**

	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	368	8
Very	763	17
Somewhat	503	11
Slightly	588	13
Not concerned	2,161	49
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,383</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 12a. Parent's Concerns About Future Violence:  
Relationship to Children**

	<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	177	8	191	9
Very	542	24	221	10
Somewhat	335	15	168	8
Slightly	368	17	220	10
Not Concerned	801	36	1,360	63
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,223</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,160</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the parent level (Client Profile Form).

**Table 13. Age of Children**

**Families With Children < 5 Years**

	<i>N</i>	%
No	1,296	54
Yes	1,109	46
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,405</b>	<b>100</b>

**Families With Children 5–12 Years**

	<i>N</i>	%
No	923	38
Yes	1,482	62
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,405</b>	<b>100</b>

**Families With Children 13 Years and Up**

	<i>N</i>	%
No	1,946	81
Yes	459	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,405</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Client Profile Form).

**Table 14. Families with Multiple Child-Related Issues**

	<i>N</i>	%
None	965	37
One	825	32
Multiple	798	31
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Counselor Report Form).

**Table 14a. Multiple Child-Related Issues**

<i>Emotional Adjustment</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Sole issue	182	7
With other issues	505	20
Not an issue	1,901	73
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

<i>Safety</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Sole issue	170	7
With other issues	311	12
Not an issue	2,107	81
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

<i>Age Appropriateness</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Sole issue	161	6
With other issues	254	10
Not an issue	2,173	84
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

<i>Behavioral Problems</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Sole issue	48	2
With other issues	295	11
Not an issue	2,245	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 14a. Multiple Child-Related Issues (*continued*)**

<i>Developmental Progress</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Sole issue	26	1
With other issues	209	8
Not an issue	2,353	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

<i>Difficulty With Transitions</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Sole issue	40	2
With other issues	206	8
Not an issue	2,342	90
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

<i>Refuses to Visit</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Sole issue	63	2
With other issues	176	7
Not an issue	2,349	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

<i>Medical Needs</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Sole issue	22	1
With other issues	151	6
Not an issue	2,415	93
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Counselor Report Form).

**Table 15. Report to Child Protective Services**

	Year					
	<u>1991</u>		<u>1993</u>		<u>1996</u>	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Missing	90	4	81	4	110	5
No	1,506	74	1,524	70	1,677	70
Yes	450	22	542	25	604	25
Don't know	-	-	26	1	14	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,046</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,173</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,405</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1991, 1993, and 1996 Client Baseline Studies*. Data analyzed at the family level (Client Profile Form).

**Table 16. Child Witnessed Violence**

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Missing	42	2
No	1,368	57
Yes	995	41
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,405</b>	<b>100</b>

Data source: *1996 Client Baseline Study*. Data analyzed at the family level (Client Profile Form).