

PARENT READINESS SCALE

The Parent Readiness Scale is a 9 item 5-point scale for use for practitioners working with divorcing parents. The scale is a non-standardized tool intended to assist practitioners to identify potential parent readiness to receive direct or indirect input from their children related to the development of a parenting plan. The scale is designed to identify ratings from low to high. Higher overall ratings may indicate a parent's ability to include his/her children as part of the planning process. Low scores may indicate a lack of ability to include his/her children. After interviewing the parents, rate each parent on the following areas:

1. Parent Differentiation From Child:

(Level of emotional/psychological involvement or over-involvement)

Low

1

2

Moderate

3

4

High

5

Parent represents child's views as reflective of own views. May block hearing child or can't separate child issues from own issues.

Parent is intermittently able to view child's views as different to own. Parent can accept some differences - some openness to view child as separate to self.

Parent can hold child's views as separate to own and invites child to share views. Parent is willing to consider child's views even if different to own views.

P1

P2

2. Parent Insight:

(Ability to examine one's own conscious thoughts and feelings)

Low

1

2

Moderate

3

4

High

5

Parent demonstrates limited understanding of self and impact of self on others. Limited ability to identify feelings/thoughts related to self. High projection and blame for own feeling states.

Parent intermittently identifies self-related behaviors/feelings. Some shifting of blame from self to other. Some ability to hold a view of self, separate to other.

Parent is able to identify self-related thoughts and behaviors and owns these. Can identify role she/he plays in family dynamics.

P1

P2

3. Parent Sensitivity:

(Ability to attune to the child's signals, interpret them correctly and satisfy them promptly)

Low

1

2

Moderate

3

4

High

5

Parent cannot identify child's cues (experience and/or feelings) and does not view circumstances from the point of view of the child. Parent does not stop hurtful/dismissive behavior even when child attempts to inform parent of needs. Parent does not respond in an emotional and/or physically soothing manner.

Parent intermittently identifies and feels for and responds to the child. Can at times of lower stress of child and identify how their child feels and is impacted. Can at times sensitively respond emotionally and /or physically to the child.

Parent consistently identifies child cues and needs and responds promptly with high levels of warmth and physical and/or emotional care.

P1

P2

4. Level of Disengagement:

(Ability of each party to focus on the parenting role versus the historical couple relationship)

Low

1

2

Moderate

3

4

High

5

Little to no dis-engagement. Parents focused on past relationship issues and un-met needs from the other. Little to no ability to focus on parenting or parenting role as different to coupling role. Continuation of couple relationship through conflict.

Intermittent focus on past couple relationship. Can focus on parenting role when re-directed. Can focus on parenting when stress is lowered.

Parent is able to focus on parenting role and regardless of past couple issues, parent consistently stays focused on parenting issues.

P1

P2

5. Value of Role of Other Parent:

(The degree to which the parent treats the other parent's role as significant and important)

Low		Moderate		High	
1	2	3	4	5	
Parent does not view the other as necessary or important. May use own past as example. One parent views the other as absent during marriage and therefore unnecessary re: having a significant role. This view is regardless of child pt. of view.		Intermittent focus on value of role of other parent. When issues between the parents are calm, parents are generally able to support and value the role of the other.		Parent views role of other parent as significant and important to the relational and the developmental well-being of the child.	

P1

P2

6. Problem Solving Ability:

(Parent ability to address day-to-day parenting issues)

Low		Moderate		High	
1	2	3	4	5	
Parent has difficulty problem-solving minor and major issues related to parenting planning. Even with assistance, parent has difficulty identifying and/or implementing solutions.		Intermittent ability to solve minor/major issues. Parent often needs assistance related to option development and direction for follow-through.		Parent regularly solves problems. Creative with solutions and does not need assistance. Open to ideas when necessary.	

P1

P2

7. Parent Ability to Self-Regulate:

(Parent's ability to initiate, inhibit or modulate his/her emotional state of behavior in a given situation)

Low		Moderate		High	
1	2	3	4	5	
High reactivity behaviorally and emotionally. Parent name calls, yells, becomes physically threatening or intimidating. Parent may be easily emotionally upset (i.e., crying) or shut down and becomes inaccessible to further conversations. Needs assistance to stop or calm self. May have trouble calming even with assistance.		Intermittent emotional and behavioral reactivity. Can recover reasonably quickly with assistance and at times without assistance.		Parent consistently manages emotions/behaviors even when upset without assistance.	

P1

P2

8. Parent Ability to Take A Neutral Stance Re Other Parent:

(Degree to which one parent uses supportive referencing towards the other parent)

Low		Moderate		High	
1	2	3	4	5	
During discussions the parent uses negative referencing both subtle and obvious when referring to the other parent. This may be observed through stories told by one parent about how he/she handled a situation with the children, other 3rd parties or during session in front of the other parent. Parent rationalized negative statements.		Intermittent use of negative referencing. Negative views of the other parent are easily redirected and/or corrected. The children are generally not present for the negative comments.		No negative referencing of the other parent to any parties.	

P1

P2

9. Ability to Place Child's Needs Over Parent Needs:

(Degree to which the parent can actively identify and appropriately meet their child's needs)

Low		Moderate		High	
1	2	3	4	5	
Parent has no ability or cannot agree to and/or follow-through with actions that are good for the child but may not be as convenient or good for him/her. Even with assistance, the parent does not shift in his/her position.		Intermittent ability to agree to and follow-through with actions that are good for the child even if it is deemed not as good for the parent. Parent, with assistance may change his/her position to accommodate the child.		High levels of accommodation of child needs noted with little to no external assistance necessary.	

P1

P2

Total PRS Score Parent 1

P1

Total PRS Score Parent 2

P2

If one parent has a high PRS score, and the other does not, the practitioner must proceed with caution and use his/her skills in finding safe ways to include children's input.

Low PRS

Score 1- 18

Caution re: directly including children. Use indirect methods of including children.

Moderate PRS

Score 19- 36

May include children via a Child Specialist or if practitioner has skill-set he/she may include children in a more direct manner as part of the process.

High PRS

Score 36-45

Parent readiness is high. May include children in the process without concern of harm. Practitioner must still utilize skills when Including children. (

PLEASE NOTE

The PRS is intended to assist practitioner judgement with respect to the parent capacity to engage with the voice of their child at a particular point in time.

It is not intended for distribution to clients, nor for any form of client feedback.

REFERENCES

- AFCC Task Force on Parenting Coordination. (2003). Parenting coordination: Implementation issues. *Family Court Review*, 41, 533–564.
- Ballard, R. H., Holtzworth-Monroe, A., Applegate, A. G., D'Onofrio, B. M., & Bates, J. E. (2013). A randomized controlled trial of child-information mediation. *Psychology, Public, Policy, and Law*, 19, 271–278.
- Banks, C. (2009). Lawyers and family dispute resolution practitioners: Achieving the child-focused ideal in practice. *Family Relationships Quarterly*, 12, 6–9.
- Bell, F., Cashmore, J., Parkinson, P., & Single, J. (2012). Choosing child-inclusive mediation. *Australasian Dispute Resolution Journal*, 23, 253–264.
- Bell, F., Cashmore, J., Parkinson, P., & Single, J. (2013). Outcomes of child-inclusive mediation. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*, 27, 116–142.
- Birbaum, R. (2009, June). *The voice of the child in separation/divorce mediation and other alternative dispute resolution processes: A literature review*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/fl-lf/divorce/vcsdm-pvem/pdf/vcsdm-pvem.pdf>
- Boshier, P. (2006). Involving children in decision making: Lessons from New Zealand. *Australian Journal of Family Law*, 20, 145–153.
- Butler, I., Scanlon, L., Robinson, M., Douglas, G., & Murch, M. (2002). Children's involvement in their parents' divorce: Implications for practice. *Children & Society*, 16, 89–102.
- Cashmore, J., & Parkinson, P. (2009). Children's participation in family law disputes: The views of children, parents, lawyers, and counselors. *Family Matters*, 82, 15–21.
- Coates, C., Deutsch, R., Starnes, H., Sullivan, M., & Sydlik, B. (2004). Parenting coordination for high-conflict families. *Family Court Review*, 42, 246–262.
- Dolgopol, U. (1993). A child's right to be heard - Are we ready to listen? Paper to the First World Congress on Family Law and Children's Rights, Sydney, Australia.
- Dunn, J., & Deater-Deckard, K. (2001). *Children's views of their changing families*. York, UK: York.
- Emerson, M., & Britton, D. (2008, November). *Involving children in family dispute resolution*. Legalwise Seminars. Retrieved from <http://www.brisbanemediations.com.au/reports/Involving%20Children%20in%20Family%20Dispute%20Resolution.f.pdf>
- Fisher, T., & Pullen, J. (2003). Children and the shadow of the law. *Journal of Family Studies*, 9, 81–105.
- Goldson, J. (2006). *Hello, I'm a voice, let me talk: Child-inclusive mediation in family separation*. Auckland, New Zealand: Center for Child and Family Policy Research, Auckland University. Retrieved from <http://www.familiescommission.govt.nz/download/innovativepractice-goldson.pdf>
- Graham, A., & Fitzgerald, R. (2010). Progressing children's participation: Exploring the potential of a dialogical turn. *Childhood*, 17, 343–359.
- Graham, J., & Whitehead, M. (2014). 25 years of family mediation in Australia. *Children Now Conference Proceedings: Family Mediation in Canada, Yesterday Today and Tomorrow*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada.