



PASSCODE²
PARENTING

Why Reunification Often Fails

Practical Strategies to Improve Outcomes for Children and Families

A systems-focused discussion for family-law judges and lawyers

Presented by: Peta Kerr, Parent Coach & Parent Coordinator &

Kaitlin Kushan, MSW, LISW, Reunification Interventionist

Important Framing

“Reunification” is not a diagnosis—and it is not a one-size-fits-all remedy

- A parent-child contact problem may involve multiple, overlapping causes.
- Child resistance or refusal can arise in the context of relational rupture, conflict exposure,
- developmental needs, safety concerns, trauma, parenting deficits, or family-system dynamics.
- **The first task is formulation, not labeling.**
- A clinically appropriate intervention may include—not always lead to—resumed contact.

Learning Objectives

By the end of this program, participants will be able to:

1. Recognize recurring reasons reunification referrals fail.
2. Distinguish a contact problem from an unresolved safety, trauma, or parenting-capacity problem.
3. Use practical pre- and post-decree strategies to improve referral readiness.
4. Draft clearer orders, retainers, and role boundaries for court-involved therapeutic work.
5. Measure progress in ways that protect children from an “all-or-nothing” definition of success.

The Central Proposition

Reunification most often fails before the first session

Failure risks are often built into the referral when there is:

- No shared definition of the problem;
- No adequate screening for safety or readiness;
- An unclear, overbroad, or internally inconsistent order;
- A mismatch between the intervention and the family's needs;
- Undefined roles and information-sharing rules; or
- No plan for parallel parent work, transitions, and accountability.

Case Introduction

Family 1

Mild-Moderate

Mom, Dad, two boys 11 & 6

3 months lapse

Unsubstantiated abuse
allegations

Supervised visits ordered

Review date scheduled

Family 2

Severe

Mom, Dad, two girls 14 &
12

18 months lapse

Unsubstantiated abuse
allegations, charges of
stalking & harassment

No orders

No review date scheduled

Why Reunification Fails: Six Predictable Failure Points

The common breakdowns:

- 1.Misformulation:** treating every refusal as the same phenomenon.
- 2.Safety blind spots:** minimizing coercion, violence, abuse, substance use, or trauma.
- 3.Premature contact:** asking a child to engage before adults create the conditions for emotional and physical safety.
- 4.Parent non-readiness:** expecting relationship repair without behavior change, accountability, or skill-building.
- 5.System fragmentation:** competing professionals, unclear authority, and inconsistent messaging.
- 6.Outcome rigidity:** equating success only with immediate, unrestricted contact.

Misformulation: The “Single Story” Problem

What goes wrong

- Professionals begin with a conclusion rather than a differential formulation.
- Adult narratives are substituted for a careful understanding of the child’s experience.
- A child’s resistance is treated as either dispositive or irrelevant.
- The family’s current functioning is obscured by historic litigation narratives.

Better practice

- Start with a **multi-hypothesis assessment**.
- Ask: *What has happened? What is happening now? What conditions must change?*
- Reassess formulation as new information emerges.

Safety and Trauma: “Do No Further Harm” Is Operational

Before ordering or beginning reunification work, identify and address:

- Current or historical intimate-partner violence, coercive control, stalking, or intimidation;
- Child maltreatment concerns or credible safety allegations;
- Substance misuse, untreated serious mental-health symptoms, or acute instability;
- The child’s trauma triggers and capacity for regulated participation;
- Whether exchanges, communications, or litigation conduct are escalating risk.

Practice point: substantiated findings, unsubstantiated allegations, and clinical caution

- **Substantiated abuse or violence findings** require careful attention to protection, accountability, treatment needs, and whether any contact can be safely structured. A reunification intervention is not a substitute for a safety plan, protective order, or child-protection response.
- **An unsubstantiated allegation is not the same as a finding that the allegation was false.** It may mean that the investigating entity did not reach its required evidentiary threshold, did not have jurisdiction, or could not corroborate the concern on the information available.
- Conversely, an allegation alone should not be treated as an adjudicated fact or as the sole explanation for a contact problem.
- The court, counsel, and interventionist should be precise about the source and status of information: allegation, agency determination, agreed fact, judicial finding, clinical observation, or unresolved concern.

The Readiness Gap

Reunification cannot be ordered into existence

Readiness domain	Question for the court and counsel
Child	Can the child participate without undue emotional or physical risk? What supports are needed?
Reconnecting parent	Can the parent listen, regulate, acknowledge impact, and avoid pressuring the child?
Other parent	Can the parent listen, regulate, acknowledge impact, and avoid pressuring the child?
Co-parenting system	Are exchanges and communications sufficiently structured to contain conflict?
Providers	Is there a coordinated team with defined roles and appropriate competence?
Court process	Does the order create clear authority, expectations, review points, and consequences?

A Better Referral Question

- ❖ **Replace: “Can this therapist make the child visit?”**
- ❖ **With: “What conditions and interventions are necessary for safe, durable relationship repair?”**

A good referral identifies:

- The court’s current orders and decision-making authority;
- The clinical purpose and limits of the service;
- Present safety concerns and pending investigations, if any;
- The parties’ required parallel work;
- Communication and records-release boundaries;
- How and when the court will receive permissible status information;
- A defined opportunity to reassess the plan.

Pre-Decree Strategy: Build the Foundation Before the Final Order

What counsel can do during pendency

- Obtain focused assessment information early; **do not wait for entrenched refusal.**
- Seek temporary orders that reduce child exposure to adult conflict.
- Separate legal fact-finding from therapeutic intervention; do not ask the therapist to resolve contested allegations.
- Build predictable exchange, communication, and scheduling structures.
- Request parent-specific services when the parent-specific barrier is known.
- Avoid turning routine therapy updates into litigation weapons.

Case Update

Family 1

Supervised visits have continued with no safety/supervision concerns

Child/Parent contact increases

Court reviews

CPS referral made by individual child therapist

Family 2

Children continue to resist contact

Some meaningful dialogue between children and parent

Children continue to obtain more medical diagnosis

Children are pulled from school due to diagnosis'

No reviews

Post-Decree Strategy: Treat Entrenchment as a System Emergency

When contact has already deteriorated:

- Act promptly, but do not confuse speed with force.
- Establish an interim structure that reduces uncertainty and conflict.
- Use a phased plan with observable milestones rather than a binary “reunified/not reunified” outcome.
- Address obstructive conduct and relationship-damaging behavior while preserving due process.
- Coordinate the parenting plan, therapeutic plan, school issues, and logistics.
- Schedule early judicial review to correct drift, mixed messages, or noncompliance.

Select a Qualified Reunification Interventionist

The provider's competence and role definition are central to the outcome

Look for demonstrated competence in:

- Court-involved family systems, child development, and high-conflict dynamics;
- Screening for safety, trauma, coercive control, substance use, and parenting-capacity concerns;
- Parent-child contact problems, phased contact planning, and parallel parent work;
- Maintaining neutrality, clear boundaries, and appropriate coordination with counsel and the court; and
- Knowing when the intervention should pause, be modified, or be referred for a different service.

Why call it an intervention rather than simply “therapy”?

- The work may include clinical treatment, but it is also a **court-connected, goal-defined process** involving multiple participants, structured contact, and a defined role in the case.
- It is **not confidential in the same way as ordinary individual therapy**: the order and informed-consent documents may define releases, limited progress reporting, communications, records access, and the provider’s response to safety concerns.
- The label does **not** mean that the child or parents have no confidentiality. It means confidentiality, privilege, and reporting expectations must be explained **precisely at the outset** and tailored to the governing law, court order, and provider’s ethical duties.
- The provider should not become a fact finder, custody evaluator, advocate, or enforcement arm of either party.

The Court Order Is Part of the Intervention

Orders that help	Orders that hinder
State the purpose, scope, and provider role	Say only “the parties shall participate in reunification therapy”
Identify who must participate and what each must do	Place all responsibility on the child or one parent
Define, releases, permitted communications, and reporting limits	Leave confidentiality and reporting expectations vague
Establish a phased plan or authorize clinical pacing within guardrails	Mandate an inflexible end result by a fixed date without review
Provide review dates and a process for obstacles	Require the provider to “report violations” without role clarity
Coordinate with existing parenting provisions	Conflict with the parenting plan or other pending orders

Model Components for a Reunification Referral/Order

A practical drafting checklist

1.Purpose: assessment, stabilization, contact restoration, relationship repair, or another defined purpose.

2.Provider qualifications: court-involved family work and relevant risk/trauma competence.

3.Participants: child, each parent, stepparents/partners, or other family members as clinically indicated.

4.Parallel obligations: parent coaching, individual therapy, substance treatment, parenting education, or co-parenting work when appropriate.

5.Information protocol: releases, permissible records, limits on ex parte contact, and status-report content.

6.Contact plan: starting point, progression criteria, supervision if ordered, transportation/exchange details, and contingency plan.

7.Review mechanism: early status review; procedure for impasse, missed sessions, or material safety concerns.

8.Fees and access: allocation, payment timing, insurance issues, and measures to prevent financial noncompliance from stopping care.

The Lawyer's Role: Advocate Without Escalating the Child's Burden

Counsel can improve the odds by:

- Giving the provider accurate, organized, and proportionate information.
- Identifying specific barriers rather than submitting an unfiltered litigation archive.
- Preparing the client for participation, accountability, and behavior change.
- Explaining that treatment disclosures have limits and are not trial-preparation tools.
- Discouraging pressure on the child to choose sides or carry adult messages.
- Seeking focused enforcement and support measures rather than reflexive escalation.

Counsel should avoid:

- Recruiting a therapist as an expert witness through the back door;
- Equating a missed clinical milestone with bad faith without context;
- Using a child's statement as a litigation slogan; and
- Treating a therapeutic process as proof of a favored legal narrative.

Parallel Parent Work: The Often-Missing Intervention

Contact repair requires adults to do adult work

Reconnecting parent goals

- Regulate before responding;
- Demonstrate reliability and predictability;
- Listen without demanding agreement;
- Acknowledge the child's experience without litigating facts in the session;
- Avoid pressuring the child to show affection, loyalty, or rapid progress.

Other parent goals

- Support attendance and reduce loyalty pressure;
- Avoid denigration, interrogation, coaching, and adult disclosures;
- Follow communication and transition protocols;
- Allow the child space to form and repair relationships safely.

Shared goals

- Keep the child out of adult conflict;
- Use neutral, structured communication;
- Protect routines, school, and supportive relationships.

PASSCODE²
PARENTING

Measure Progress Without Setting the Family Up to Fail

Domain	Early indicators	Later indicators
Safety and regulation	Reduced escalation; reliable safety plan; child can participate	Sustained emotional and physical safety across settings
Parent behavior	Attendance; skills practice; reduced defensiveness	Consistent repair, accountability, and child-focused responses
Child experience	Increased predictability; reduced anticipatory distress	Greater comfort, agency within safe boundaries, and relationship flexibility
Contact	Tolerates indirect or structured contact	Progresses at a clinically appropriate pace toward the ordered plan
System functioning	Professionals give consistent messages	Durable routines; fewer crisis filings; workable communication

Parent-Child Contact Problems

Prompt action matters—but the formulation must remain evidence-informed

- In parent-child contact problems, **prolonged uncertainty and repeated litigation delays can deepen avoidance, polarization, mistrust, and family distress.**
- If alienation is alleged, do not treat the allegation itself as the diagnosis or the remedy. Determine what is driving the contact problem through a careful, safety-informed assessment.

Delay Has a Cost

- Delay should not mean inaction: use early case management, a defined interim structure, timely provider selection, and scheduled judicial review.
- Speed should not mean force: new safety information, trauma symptoms, or credible concerns require reassessment and an appropriately tailored response.
- The court should identify what must happen **now** to prevent further relational deterioration while the facts and clinical needs are clarified.

A practical response to delay

Clarify the barrier

→ establish protective and predictable interim conditions → initiate the matched intervention → monitor observable progress → promptly adjust the plan if it is not working.

The Practical “Do / Don’t” List

Do:

- **Do** assess before prescribing.
- **Do** screen and re-screen for safety and trauma.
- **Do** match the intervention to the barrier.
- **Do** require parallel adult work.
- **Do** make orders specific, coordinated, and reviewable.
- **Do** measure incremental progress.
- **Do** protect the child from adult conflict and therapeutic role confusion.

24

Don’t:

- **Don’t** use one label as the whole case formulation.
- **Don’t** confuse a court order with readiness.
- **Don’t** require therapy to perform legal fact-finding.
- **Don’t** use treatment as discovery or a litigation weapon.
- **Don’t** set rigid end points that disregard safety and clinical data.
- **Don’t** wait through prolonged drift without a structured reassessment.

PASSCODE²
PARENTING

Case Conclusion

Family 1

Children & Parent continue
to increase time together

Supervision removed

Coparenting work has
begun

Collaborative meetings
discussing SPP have
begun

Trial date is set

Family 2

Parent stopped
transporting

Children refused contact

Volatile text messages
begun

Parent cannot afford
services

Encouraged to sign over
parenting rights – losing
battle

No court review

Closing: A Better Question for Every Case

Instead of asking: "How do we make this child reunify?"

Ask: "What does this family need—legally, clinically, and structurally—to make safe and durable relationship repair possible?"

Three closing takeaways

- 1. Formulate broadly; label cautiously.**
- 2. Sequence safety, stabilization, and skill-building before expecting durable contact.**
- 3. Use clear orders, coordinated roles, parallel parent work, and early review to prevent predictable failure.**

Selected Resources

- [AFCC and NCJFCJ Joint Statement on Parent-Child Contact Problems](#)
- [AFCC Guidelines for Court-Involved Therapy](#)
- [Singh & Mader, “Reunification, Reconsidered” \(2025\)](#)
- [Smith, “Family-Based Therapy for Parent-Child Reunification” \(2016\)](#)
- [Cabrera et al., “Parent Engagement and Reunification,” meta-analysis \(2019\)](#)
- [Contact Refusal by Children Following Acrimonious Separation \(2012\)](#)

THANK YOU

www.passcodetoparenting.com

petakerr@passcodetoparenting.com
kaitlinkushan@passcodetoparenting.com

P²

PASSCODE

TO PARENTING