

RESEARCH REPORT

The Parenting Hearings Programme Pilot: Evaluation

Technical Report



MINISTRY OF
JUSTICE
Tāhū o te Ture

The Parenting Hearings Programme Pilot: Evaluation

Technical Report

**Trish Knaggs and Anne Harland
Research, Evaluation and Modelling Unit**

September 2009

Published September 2009

Ministry of Justice
PO Box 180
Wellington 6140
New Zealand
www.justice.govt.nz

ISBN 978-0-478-29073-X
2009 © Crown Copyright

Contents

Tables	5
Appendix 1: Evaluation methodology	7
Appendix 2: Information sheet	13
Appendix 3: Participant Consent Form	15
Appendix 4: Interview Guide – Court Staff	17
Appendix 5: Interview guide – Judges	21
Appendix 6: Interview Guide – Lawyers (including Lawyer for the Child)	25
Appendix 7: Interview Guide – Report Writers	29
Appendix 8: Letter – interview with PHP parent	33
Appendix 9: Interview Guide – PHP Parents	35
Appendix 10: Letter PHP Parents’ postal survey	39
Appendix 11: PHP parents’ postal survey	41
Appendix 12: Letter non-PHP parents’ postal survey	47
Appendix 13: Non-PHP parents’ postal survey	49
Appendix 14: Reminder postcard parents’ postal survey	53
Appendix 15: Lawyers’ internet survey	55
Appendix 16: First reminder lawyers’ internet survey	63
Appendix 17: Second reminder lawyers’ internet survey	65
Appendix 18: Recontact reminder lawyers’ internet survey	67
Appendix 19: Recontact lawyers’ internet survey	69
Appendix 20: Results for the internet survey of lawyers	71

Tables

Table A1.1:	Number of interviews at each PHP court	10
Table A1.2:	Backgrounds of people interviewed	10
Table A1.3:	Response rate for lawyers' internet survey	11
Table A1.4:	Response rate for parents' surveys	11
Table A20.1:	Length of time practising family law at the Family Court	71
Table A20.2:	Whether acted as Lawyer for Child in the Family Court	71
Table A20.3:	Whether acted as Lawyer to Assist the Court in the Family Court	71
Table A20.4:	Number of cases involved with in various roles	71
Table A20.5:	Whether been involved in any final PHP hearings	71
Table A20.6:	Whether suitable cases are generally being referred to PHP at the court	72
Table A20.7:	Whether ever been involved in a PHP cases they considered not suitable for PHP	72
Table A20.8:	Number of cases involved in considered not suitable	72
Table A20.9:	Whether attempted to have any of these cases(s) removed from / not entered into PHP	72
Table A20.10:	Rating of suitability of cases for PHP	73
Table A20.11:	Clarity of role of Lawyer for Child under PHP	74
Table A20.12:	Extent participation of child(ren) differs in PHP process to non-PHP process	74
Table A20.13:	Whether have enough time as Lawyer for Child to prepare for PHP cases	74
Table A20.14:	Whether role as Lawyer for Child different under PHP and non-PHP systems	75
Table A20.15:	Whether Lawyer for Child briefs are more restricted in their directions for PHP than non-PHP cases	75
Table A20.16:	Rating of effectiveness of the PHP process	76
Table A20.17:	Comparison of effectiveness of the PHP process to the usual non-PHP process	77
Table A20.18:	Level of agreement/disagreement with statements	78
Table A20.19:	Rating of PHP overall as a new process in the Family Court	79
Table A20.20:	Whether PHP should be continued in the pilot areas at the end of the pilot	79
Table A20.21:	Whether PHP should be extended nationally	79
Table A20.22:	Whether urgent interim hearings in the non-PHP system would provide the same benefits as PHP Preliminary Hearings	80

Appendix 1: Evaluation methodology

Exploratory work

Early exploratory work which was undertaken prior to the evaluation, helped identify people to interview, questions to include in the interview schedules, and aspects of PHP to be examined in the statistical analysis. This preliminary work involved visits to two court sites, discussions with a range of key personnel and stakeholders, and reading background material. Once this phase was complete and key issues for examination had been identified the evaluation commenced.

Statistical analysis of Case Management System (CMS) data

The statistical analysis sought to:

- 1 Describe the characteristics of the cases that are entered onto PHP – demographics, previous history, outcomes, service provision (eg social worker reports)
- 2 Make suitable comparisons with non PHP cases in both pilot and non pilot sites regarding timeliness, service provision, outcomes and durability.

Before any analysis could begin, we had to choose a unit of measure. Based on previous work, we decided to use a 'case' as the measure. A 'case' is defined as the activity in the Family Court (applications, outcomes) for a particular family group within a specified time. Each case has a start date and an end date. These are determined by when an application is first filed, and when all applications are disposed.

All care of children applications were split into cases. For the study, only cases that had start or end dates between 1 November 2006 and 4 August 2008 were used. The first date is when PHP was introduced, and the second date is when the analysis started in earnest.

Definitive statements on the effect of PHP versus non-PHP are not possible, because a comparison group could not be modelled.

Multivariate regression

A Multivariate Linear Regression model was developed in order to find the variables which were associated with the overall rating of the Parenting Hearings Programme as a new process in the Family Court.

The answer for Q9 in the lawyers' Internet survey was taken as the response variable. Q9 is "as a new process in the Family Court, how would you rate the Parenting Hearings Programme overall?".

The dataset was recoded so that all 'don't know' and 'not applicable' responses were collated into a neutral category and assigned a value between the scores for positive and negative responses on the scale.

A wide range of variables, based on questions asked in the survey, was tested for inclusion into the regression model. Q10 ('do you think that PHP should be continued in the areas in which it has been running at the end of the pilot') and Q11 ('and do you think that the PHP should be extended nationally') were not included as independent variables.

The selection criteria for independent variables were set at 5% significance.

Dependant Variable (Measure of Satisfaction with Process):

Q9 As a new process in the Family Court, how would you rate the Parenting Hearings Programme overall?

Very good / quite good / neutral / quite poor / very poor

Results – 1 Independent variables selected using a 5% significance criterion:

This table provides a list of variables, significant at the 5% level, that contribute most to the model R-Squared value, in decreasing order of magnitude.

Summary of Forward Selection								
Step	Variable Entered	Label	Number Vars In	Partial R-Square	Model R-Square	C(p)	F Value	Pr > F
1	Q6_12	Q6_12	1	0.6344	0.6344	81.4729	201.27	<.0001
2	Q8_18	Q8_18	2	0.0935	0.7278	33.5031	39.49	<.0001
3	Q7_10	Q7_10	3	0.0398	0.7676	14.2430	19.51	<.0001
4	Q8_23	Q8_23	4	0.0289	0.7965	0.7746	16.07	0.0001
5	Q8_10	Q8_10	5	0.0176	0.8141	-6.6264	10.60	0.0015
6	Q3_12	Q3_12	6	0.0103	0.8245	-10.157	6.54	0.0119
7	Q1A	Q1A	7	0.0079	0.8324	-12.383	5.19	0.0247

Regression Model

The numbers in this table under the column labelled ‘**Parameter Estimate**’, demonstrate the nature of the relationship (positive or negative) between the dependant variable (Q9), and the independent variables, significant at the 5% level, selected by the model.

Parameter Estimates							
Variable	Label	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	t Value	Pr > t	Standardized Estimate
Intercept	Intercept	1	-0.38180	0.13347	-2.86	0.0051	0
Q1A	Q1A	1	0.13173	0.05784	2.28	0.0247	0.11313
Q3_12	Q3_12	1	0.10862	0.03907	2.78	0.0064	0.13466
Q6_12	Q6_12	1	0.26007	0.05968	4.36	<.0001	0.27779
Q7_10	Q7_10	1	0.12773	0.03982	3.21	0.0018	0.15415
Q8_10	Q8_10	1	0.08118	0.02770	2.93	0.0041	0.12494
Q8_18	Q8_18	1	0.15079	0.03992	3.78	0.0003	0.24300
Q8_23	Q8_23	1	0.11549	0.03545	3.26	0.0015	0.17016

An R-Sq value of **0.8324** was reported.

Key informant interviews

Interviews were conducted with 105 key people who had some involvement with PHP and included:

- Family Court judges
- Family Court staff
- lawyers
- parents
- s132 and s133 Care of Children Act 2004 report writers (psychologists and Child, Youth and Family social workers)
- community group representatives.

Table A1.1: Number of interviews at each PHP court

Site	Number of interviews
Auckland	16
Rotorua	13
Tauranga	20
Palmerston North	14
Wellington	22
Dunedin	20
Total	105

Table A1.2: Backgrounds of people interviewed

	Number of interviews
Judges	12
Parents	30
Court staff	18
Lawyers	40
Report writers	13
Community group representatives	2
Total	105

Interviews were semi-structured (see interview schedules later in this volume). Nine people were interviewed over the phone, with the other interviews being face-to-face. Apart from 18, all interviews were audio-taped and transcribed. Once themes had been developed, the transcripts were analysed using the qualitative text analysis programme, NVIVO.

Of the 30 parents interviewed, 12 were male and 18 female. The age range was:

- parents aged 20 to 29
- 11 aged 30 to 39
- 14 aged 40 to 49
- aged 60 years and over.

Most (17) indicated they were New Zealand European, three Māori and three indicated both New Zealand European and Māori. Three stated they were Australian, and other ethnic groups indicated were Cook Island Māori, Irish, Sri Lankan and New Zealand European / French.

Initial findings were discussed with several key stakeholders to help the evaluation team place the findings in perspective. These interviews were not recorded and are not directly reported in this document.

Internet survey of lawyers involved in PHP

Information from exploratory work and stakeholder interviews helped develop an Internet survey which was emailed to 451 Family Court lawyers in the six sites. Lawyers who had been involved in PHP were invited to complete the survey (see later in this volume for survey materials, and response rates).

The Internet survey was administered by Consumer Link.

Response rate

Table A1.3: Response rate for lawyers' Internet survey

	Number	%
Total survey invitations emailed out	451	
Ineligible:		
• Not involved in a PHP case	68	
• Incorrect / invalid email address	33	
Total eligible / potentially eligible	350	100
• Clicked email link then closed browser	19	5
• Clicked email link but did not complete	35	10
• Did not click email link	173	49
• Refusal / Not participating in survey	5	1
Completed surveys	118	34

A response rate of 34% was achieved for the lawyers' Internet survey.

Postal survey of PHP and non-PHP parents

A survey was developed for two groups of parents, those who had experienced PHP and those who had no experience of PHP but had been involved in the Family Court process.

This postal survey was administered by Consumer Link.

Response rate

Table A1.4: Response rate for parents' surveys

	PHP parents		Non-PHP parents	
	No.	%	No.	%
Total questionnaires sent	157	100	150	100
Returned 'Gone no address' 'Does not live here' etc	21	13	15	10
Contact made to state they are not responding	2	1	1	1
No response	101	64	105	70
Completed surveys	33	21	29	19

Response rates of 21% for parents in the PHP pilot at the Auckland court and 19% for a non-PHP comparison group were achieved. As these rates are lower than is desirable, this survey data was treated as indicative only.

Evaluation Advisory Group

An Evaluation Advisory Group provided support for the evaluation and the evaluation team. This Group included a judge, a representative from the Family Law Section of the NZ Law Society, and Ministry of Justice policy, operational and research team members.

Ethics and safety

All those who were interviewed or who completed the postal or internet surveys, did so on the basis of informed consent. See later in this volume for information sheets, informed consent sheets, and other information provided to participants about the evaluation.

Measures were introduced to address safety concerns associated with interviewing parents whose cases might have been too 'volatile' in terms of serious current or ongoing issues including family violence. These included court staff checking names of potential participants in order to identify those which should not be approached for an interview due to the above issues. Parents were also made aware that their participation was voluntary, and that they could stop the interview at any point. The interview team conducted as many interviews as possible in pairs.

The evaluation proposal was reviewed by the Justice Sector Research Group.

Appendix 2: Information sheet



Evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme Pilot

Information Sheet

The Ministry of Justice is currently evaluating the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot (PHP).

The evaluation will look at how the programme operates and whether it is meeting its objectives. This information will contribute to decisions about the future of the Parenting Hearings Programme.

As part of the evaluation, interviews are being conducted with key people involved in the programme: Judges, court staff, lawyers, specialist report writers, and parents/guardians involved in PHP cases.

You have been identified as someone who would be able to provide us with an insight into Parenting Hearings and we would appreciate you taking the time to be interviewed. We expect the interview will take around an hour.

Participation is voluntary. You don't have to take part if you don't want to. You don't have to answer all of the questions. You can also stop the interview at any time.

If you agree to take part in the study:

- We will ask about your experience of, and views on the Parenting Hearings Programme.
- You can decide whether or not your interview can be taped and whether or not we quote your comments in the report.
- All the information you provide is confidential to the research team.
- The findings will be incorporated into a report due early 2009. Your information will be combined with information from other participants. We will not use your name or any descriptor that enables you to be identified. A summary of the report findings will also be available.

Your assistance with this project is appreciated.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE STUDY - please contact:

Anne Harland
Senior Research Adviser
Research, Evaluation and Modelling Unit
Ministry of Justice
PO Box 180, WELLINGTON
(Phone number)
(Email address)

Trish Knaggs
Senior Research Adviser
Research, Evaluation and Modelling Unit
Ministry of Justice
PO Box 180, WELLINGTON
(Phone number)
(Email address)

Appendix 3: Participant consent form



Evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme Pilot

Participant Consent Form

- I have read and understood the information sheet provided about this study, and/or the interviewer explained to me the purpose of the research.
- I understand that my participation in this interview is voluntary.
- I have the right to refuse to answer any question or to stop the interview at anytime and withdraw my answers, without having to explain why.
- I understand that what I say will be kept confidential by the researchers and will only be used for research purposes. My name will not be used in any research reports and nothing will be published that might identify me.
- I understand that if I have any further questions I can contact one of the researchers listed on the information sheet.
- I agree to the interview being recorded YES / NO
- I agree to some of my comments being quoted in the report, provided that I cannot be identified YES / NO
- I would like to receive an edited copy of my interview transcript YES / NO
- I would like to receive a summary of the key findings from this study YES / NO

If you would like a copy of the interview transcript and/or a summary of the key findings, please record your address below.

Declaration:

I, _____ agree to be interviewed for this evaluation.

Signed: _____(Participant) Date: ___/___/___

Signed: _____(Researcher) Date: ___/___/___

Appendix 4: Interview guide – court staff

Evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme Pilot

Introduction and informed consent (5 minutes)

Explain project – run through Information Sheet and Consent Form.
Ensure a response is recorded for each item on Consent Form sheet.
Respondents won't be named in the report, won't be able to be identified.

Respondent's opinion is important so we have a full understanding of PHP from different perspectives.

We are getting information from a number of different sources – interviews, surveys and analysis of quantitative Family Court data. Does the respondent have any questions about the evaluation or the interview?

Background (5 minutes) Roles and responsibilities / tasks undertaken within the Family Court – both past and present. Length of history with Family Court. Extent of involvement with PHP pilot. Interaction with other court staff, judges, lawyers as regards PHP.

The stages of the PHP process (10 minutes)

First of all I would like to ask you about your perspective on how cases go through the different stages of the PHP process at your court. We will get into more detail about each of the stages later in the interview, and I will specifically be asking you questions about the scheduling of cases. Please let me know when there are differences in the process between Track A and Track B cases.

So firstly, thinking about how cases get onto the Judge's PHP list in the first place, how does that happen and what is your opinion as to how well that is working?

Check – whether non-PHP judges are appropriately referring cases to PHP.

Check – whether judges are delaying entering cases onto Judge's PHP list and state what the parties need to do before entering the list.

Do some cases settle before the Judge's PHP list? What types of cases? Is this happening appropriately? Do these cases appear in CMS?

Why are some cases entered onto the programme in CMS and subsequently removed (ie go to Judge's list, entered onto programme but subsequently removed)? Is this an administrative error, or are cases really removed after they have been entered, and if so, why?

And of the cases on the Judge's PHP list, about what proportion go on to the Preliminary Hearing? What are the reasons that some don't go forward, are the right ones going through?

And approximately what proportion of cases go from Preliminary Hearings to Final Hearings? What sort of cases and issues? Is this appropriate/working well? Are Final Hearings different under PHP to non-PHP? How?

And, just to get your overview of the PHP pilot before we get into specific areas about PHP, have you seen any changes in the PHP process since the pilot started in late 2006? What are these changes? Were the changes needed, did they improve PHP?

Process issues – scheduling (15 minutes) I'm now going to ask some specific questions about the PHP process, what you think works well and what could be improved.

One of the big issues is how courts have managed the scheduling of resources for the PHP pilot. How has this worked for you? Have there been any problems? Have they been resolved? How have they been resolved? Are there differences for Track A and Track B cases?

Check: clarify issues at different stages of the process – Judge's list, Preliminary hearing, Final Hearing

Check: Judicial resource availability issues and clarify whether this is specific to PHP

Check: court room availability

What changes would you like to see with the PHP in terms of scheduling in your court?

Check: any comments about extending the PHP pilot to other courts and perceived advantages and disadvantages of this. What are the specific issues for the docket system (in Auckland) and the cluster court (Wellington)

And do you think the PHP pilot has had any impact on non-PHP cases going through the court? What have these been? How could/have they been resolved?

Check: clarify issues at different stages of the process– Judge's list, Preliminary hearing, Final Hearing

Other process issues (10 minutes) And now some more general questions about the PHP process.

The timeframe that has been set for PHP cases, both between the Judge's PHP list and the Preliminary Hearing, and between the preliminary and Final Hearing. What is your opinion of how workable that timeframe is? What does it mean for Judge's sitting time, how is this managed? Is the timeframe realistic – under what circumstances might it not be?

Check – are there problems with getting everything done in the shorter time frame? Is a shorter timeframe always the best approach? Are there implications for the timeframe of non-PHP cases? Has there been resistance from others (report writers, Lawyer for Child, lawyers)?

Do the judges at this court want the parents to go through the Parenting Through Separation course before they attend the Preliminary Hearing? Are there any issues about timing, getting the parents on to the course in that time? What is the judges' approach? How do the parents feel about it?

Do PHP hearings take less time than non-PHP hearings? How is this different for the Preliminary hearing and the Final Hearing?

Some people have said that there is variation between PHP judges in the way they do things, but others have said that this is no different to non-PHP cases. What is your opinion about this? Is the amount of variation for PHP any different to non-PHP? Why? If there is variation, what issues does it cause?

Are there any particular issues with cases that involve family violence?

Have you been given the information about the PHP pilot that you need to do your job? What information, if any, has not been made available? Has this changed over time?

What else can you tell me about the PHP process from your perspective, or any comments you have heard about it from others?

Overall (10 minutes)

We have almost finished the interview and now I would like you to think generally about what works well with the Parenting Hearings Programme and what doesn't.

First of all, what are the benefits or advantages of the PHP?

Check: benefits for all parties involved (especially children and parents), any comments about the outcome of PHP and whether parents are in a better position to deal with future parenting issues.

And what are the disadvantages or issues with the PHP? Do you have any suggestions as to how PHP could be improved? Check: how are these problems, and who are these problems for. How can they be addressed / have they been addressed?

Should PHP be extended nationally?

In your opinion, what is the most important thing that would improve the way these sorts of cases are dealt with by the courts?

Finally (5 mins) is there anything we haven't covered that you'd like to tell me about the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot?

End Thank you very much for the time you have spent talking to me today. It has been really helpful to get your perspective on how the PHP pilot is working in your court.

Check that responses on Consent Form are recorded. Reassure respondent that responses are confidential.

Appendix 5: Interview guide – judges

Evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme Pilot

Introduction and informed consent (5 mins)

Explain project – run through Information Sheet and Consent Form.
Ensure a response is recorded for each item on Consent Form sheet.
Respondents won't be named in the report, won't be able to be identified.

Respondent's opinion is important so we have a full understanding of PHP from different perspectives. Will ask both about the theoretical or legal aspects and how PHP works in practice. We will cover both process and outcomes.

We are getting information from a number of different sources – interviews, surveys and analysis of quantitative Family Court data.

Does the respondent have any questions about the evaluation or the interview?

Background (5 minutes)

Whether been involved in PHP pilot since the beginning (November 2006). Number of years has been a Family Court Judge.

The stages of the PHP process (10 minutes)

First of all I would like to ask you about your perspective on how cases go through the different stages of the PHP process. We will get into more detail about issues at each of the stages later in the interview. Please let me know when there are differences in the process between Track A and Track B cases.

So firstly, thinking about how cases get onto the Judge's PHP list in the first place, how does that happen and what is your opinion as to how well that is working? What is the process for Track A? For Track B? What types of case go on to Track B – are long standing complex cases included?

Check – whether non-PHP judges are appropriately referring cases to PHP.
Check whether delay entering cases onto list and state what the parties need to do before entering the list.

Do some cases settle before the Judge's PHP List? What types of cases? Is this happening appropriately?

And of the cases on the Judge's PHP list, about what proportion go on to the Preliminary Hearing? What are the reasons that some don't go forward, is this appropriate in your opinion?

And approximately what proportion of cases go from Preliminary Hearings to Final Hearings? What sort of cases and issues? Is this appropriate/working well? Are Final Hearings different under PHP to non-PHP? How?

And, just to get your overview of the PHP pilot before we get into specific areas about PHP, have you seen any changes in the PHP process since the pilot started in late 2006? What are these changes? Were the changes needed, did they improve the PHP?

Process issues (10 mins)

I'm now going to ask some specific questions about the PHP process, what you think works well and what could be improved. I will ask you about outcomes later in the interview.

First, the timeframe that has been set for PHP cases, both between the Judge's List and the Preliminary Hearing, and between the preliminary and Final Hearing. What is your opinion of how workable that timeframe is? Is it realistic – under what circumstances might it not be? Check – are there implications for 'getting things right' in the shorter timeframe? Is a shorter timeframe always the best approach? Are there implications for the timeframe of non-PHP cases? Differences between Track A and Track B cases.

How (if at all) does the Parenting Through Separation course fit into the PHP process? Check: if want parties to attend before Preliminary Hearing, what impact does this have on the timing? How is this dealt with by the judge? How 'encouraging' are they of attendance at the course?

Has your understanding of your role changed over the time of the pilot? Where have you got your information about what your role is?

Thinking now about the children, how much do they participate in the process? In what ways do they participate? In your opinion, is their participation at the appropriate level? Check: extent to which judge speaks to children involved – by age of child. Is involvement or participation different to non-PHP cases?

Still thinking about process rather than outcome, how satisfied do you think parents and children are going through the PHP process compared to the non-PHP process? What do you believe are the advantages and disadvantages for them?

Is PHP less adversarial in practice than non-PHP?

Does PHP suit one type of case (in terms of difficulty) better than another type? Which level of difficulty?

Outcome issues (10 minutes)

I would like to spend some time now thinking about the outcome of the PHP, rather than issues about the process. In considering outcomes, it would be helpful if you could compare cases you know of that have been through PHP with similar cases that have not.

Overall, what is your opinion about the outcome of the PHP cases you have been involved with? Have they been the best outcomes under the circumstances?

Check: fairness of outcome.

Check: what about the outcome achieved specifically at Preliminary Hearings? At Final Hearings?

Do you think the same outcome would have been achieved under the other system? What is it about PHP that makes a difference (whether positive or negative) to the outcome?

Does the PHP process focus the parents on future parenting behaviours? How?

What impact does the Parenting Through Separation course have on parenting behaviours? How important is this course?

Check: situation where one parent has been on the course, the other hasn't.

Do you believe the outcome of the PHP process is a more lasting outcome than non-PHP? Why?

Check: Whether varies by type of application(s)

How satisfied / accepting of the outcome do you think parents and children are with the outcomes achieved under PHP compared to non-PHP cases? Check: perceptions of impact of PHP on children.

Natural justice (10 minutes)

Note: issues may have been raised and discussed earlier in the interview. Check that all aspects have been covered and opinions are clear.

Note: if natural justice is mentioned, ensure the meaning of this is clarified, and check if any issues are theoretical or practical.

In your opinion, under PHP do the parents have the opportunity to have their say, do they feel heard?

Check: is this different to similar non-PHP cases? Does it vary by stage of PHP process?

Do you have any concerns about procedural issues? Are you aware of any concerns that have been expressed by others? What is your opinion of the concerns?

Check: are these concerns theoretical or do they relate to actual practice? At what point specifically in the process?

What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages of the judge being able to be directive in terms of what issues are to be covered at the PHP hearings?

Check: does PHP reduce the amount of material that is introduced? Is it reduced appropriately?

To what extent do you believe everyone is aware of what is happening at the hearings and throughout the process? If more information / education required? Who requires it?

Do you consider that there are any issues for specific groups:

- Unrepresented litigants – are the issues any different for PHP cases or are they the same as non-PHP?
- Disparity in articulateness – what are the issues where there is a disparity between parties in terms of how articulate they are and their ability to speak for themselves.
- Different cultures – how responsive is the PHP process to people of different cultures? Are some cultural groups more or less likely and/or willing to speak for themselves in a court?

Issues relating to family violence cases (5 minutes)

We are getting towards the end of the interview, and this next topic is about PHP cases that involve family violence or allegations of family violence.

Firstly, how are applications for orders under the DV Act dealt with for PHP cases? Is there a difference in the actual timeframe for DV orders under PHP and non-PHP?

Some people have commented on issues that specifically relate to cases of family violence under PHP – the speed of the process and the parents talking more for themselves. We would like to hear what you think about this.

First, the speed of the process. What are the advantages and disadvantages of a faster process in cases of family violence. Check – is it a concern that parties are put together into court too quickly to attempt to resolve parenting issues when family violence is a recent issue.

What are your thoughts and experiences about parents talking for themselves in the hearing, rather than through their lawyer, when there are issues of family violence?

Overall (5 minutes) We have almost finished the interview and now I would like you to think generally about what works well with the Parenting Hearings Programme and what doesn't.

First of all, what are the benefits or advantages of the PHP? Check: benefits for all parties involved (especially children and parents), any comments about the outcome of PHP and whether parents are in a better position to deal with future parenting issues.

And what are the disadvantages or issues with the PHP? Do you have any suggestions as to how PHP could be improved? Check: how are these problems, and who are these problems for. How can they be addressed / have they been addressed?

Should PHP be extended nationally?

In your opinion, what is the most important thing that would improve the way these sorts of cases are dealt with by the courts?

Finally (5 minutes) is there anything we haven't covered that you'd like to tell me about the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot?

End Thank you very much for the time you have spent talking to me today. It has been really helpful to get your perspective on how the PHP pilot is working.

Check that responses on Consent Form are recorded. Reassure respondent responses are confidential.

Appendix 6: Interview guide – lawyers (including lawyer for the child)

Evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme Pilot

Introduction and informed consent (5 mins)

Explain project – run through Information Sheet and Consent Form.
Ensure a response is recorded for each item on Consent Form sheet.
Respondents won't be named in the report, won't be able to be identified.

Respondent's opinion is important so we have a full understanding of PHP from different perspectives. Will ask both about the theoretical or legal aspects and how PHP works in practice. We will cover both process and outcomes.

We are getting information from a number of different sources – interviews, surveys and analysis of quantitative Family Court data.

Does the respondent have any questions about the evaluation or the interview?

Background (5 minutes)

Length of history with Family Court. Extent of involvement with both PHP and non-PHP cases. Whether involvement includes acting as Lawyer for the Child, if so, extent of that involvement.

The stages of the PHP process (5 minutes)

First of all I would like to ask you about your perspective on how cases go through the different stages of the PHP process. We will get into more detail about issues at each of the stages later in the interview. Please let me know when there are differences in the process between Track A and Track B cases.

So firstly, thinking about how cases get onto the Judge's PHP list in the first place, how does that happen and what is your opinion as to how well that is working? Check – whether non-PHP judges are appropriately referring cases to PHP. Check – whether judges are delaying entering cases onto Judge's PHP list and state what the parties need to do before entering the list. Check – whether some settle before the Judge's PHP list.

And of the cases on the Judge's PHP list, about what proportion go on to the Preliminary Hearing? What are the reasons that some don't go forward, is this appropriate?

And approximately what proportion of cases go from Preliminary Hearings to Final Hearings? What sort of cases and issues? Is this appropriate/working well? Are Final Hearings different under PHP to non-PHP? How?

And, just to get your overview of the PHP pilot before we get into specific areas about PHP, have you seen any changes in the PHP process since the pilot started in late 2006? What are these changes? Were the changes needed, did they improve the PHP?

Process issues (15 mins)

I'm now going to ask some specific questions about the PHP process, what you think works well and what could be improved. I will ask you about outcomes later in the interview.

First, the timeframe that has been set for PHP cases, both between the Judge's list and the Preliminary Hearing, and between the preliminary and Final Hearing. What is your opinion of

how workable that timeframe is (both as lawyer for parties and Lawyer for the Child)? Is it realistic – under what circumstances might it not be? Check – are there implications for ‘getting things right’ in the shorter timeframe? Is a shorter timeframe always the best approach? Are there implications for the timeframe of non-PHP cases? Differences between Track A and Track B cases.

Do the judges at this court want the parents to go through the Parenting Through Separation course before they attend the Preliminary Hearing? Are there any issues about timing, getting the parents on to the course in that time? What is the judges’ approach? How do the parents feel about it? What do you think about the course?

If appropriate: I will ask about your role, both as a lawyer for parties and a Lawyer for the Child.

[Firstly] as a lawyer for parties, is your role throughout the PHP process clear? Do you know what is expected of you? Has your understanding changed over the time of the pilot? Has your role changed over time? Where have you got your information from? Do you think more formal training is needed?

[And] as a Lawyer for the Child, is your role throughout the PHP process clear? Do you know what is expected of you? Has your understanding changed over the time of the pilot? Has your role changed over time? Where have you got your information from? Do you think more formal training is needed?

If lawyer for child: How is the role of Lawyer for the Child different for PHP cases compared to non-PHP cases?

Thinking now about the children, how much do they participate in the process? Is it different to non-PHP cases? Is it at the appropriate level?

Some people have said that one of the issues is that there is variation between judges, but others have said that this is no different to non-PHP cases. What is your opinion about this? If there is variation, what issues does it cause, and how is it different in PHP cases?

Still thinking about process rather than outcome, how satisfied do you think your clients (parents and child if lawyer for child) are going through the PHP process compared to the non-PHP process? What do you believe are the advantages and disadvantages for them?

Is PHP less adversarial in practice than non-PHP? Does it suit one type of case (in terms of difficulty) better than another type? Which level of difficulty?

Outcome issues (10 minutes) I would like to spend some time now thinking about the outcome of the PHP, rather than issues about the process. In considering outcomes, it would be helpful if you could compare cases you know of that have been through PHP with similar cases that have not.

Overall, what is your opinion about the outcome of the PHP cases you have been involved with? Have they been the best outcomes under the circumstances? Check: fairness of outcome. Check: what about the outcome achieved specifically at Preliminary hearings? At Final Hearings?

Do you think the same outcome would have been achieved under the other system? What is it about PHP that makes a difference (whether positive or negative) to the outcome?

Does the PHP process focus the parents on future parenting behaviours? How?

Do you believe the outcome of the PHP process is a more lasting outcome than non-PHP?
Why?

Check: Whether varies by type of application(s)

How satisfied do you think your clients (parents and child(ren) if lawyer for child) are with the outcomes achieved under PHP compared to non-PHP cases? Check: perceptions of impact of PHP on children

Natural justice (10 minutes) Note: issues may have been raised and discussed earlier in the interview. Check that all aspects have been covered and opinions are clear. Note: if natural justice is mentioned, ensure the meaning of this is clarified, and check if any issues are theoretical or practical.

In your opinion, under PHP do the parents have the opportunity to have their say, do they feel heard?

Check: is this different to similar non-PHP cases? Does it vary by stage of PHP process?

Do you have any concerns about procedural issues? Check: are these concerns theoretical or do they relate to actual practice? At what point specifically in the process?

What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages of the judge directing what issues are to be covered at the PHP hearings? Check: does PHP reduce the amount of material that is introduced? Is it reduced appropriately? Probe any comments about the Judge's increased control over proceedings for positive or negative perceptions.

To what extent are your clients aware of what is happening at the hearings and throughout the process? Is more information / education required? Are you always sure of what is happening and will happen next?

What are the issues for specific groups:

- Unrepresented litigants – are the issues any different for PHP cases or are they the same as non-PHP?
- Disparity in articulateness – what are the issues where there is a disparity between parties in terms of how articulate they are and their ability to speak for themselves.
- Different cultures – how responsive is the PHP process to people of different cultures? Are some cultural groups more or less likely and/or willing to speak for themselves in a court?

Issues relating to family violence cases (5 minutes)

We are almost at the end of the interview, and this next topic is about PHP cases that involve family violence or allegations of family violence.

Firstly, how are applications for orders under the DV Act dealt with for PHP cases? Is there a difference in the actual timeframe for DV orders under PHP and non-PHP?

Some people have commented on issues that specifically relate to cases of family violence under PHP – the speed of the process and the parents talking more for themselves. We would like to hear what you think about this.

First, the speed of the process. What are the advantages and disadvantages of a faster process in cases of family violence. Check – is it a concern that parties are put together into court too quickly to attempt to resolve parenting issues when family violence is a recent issue.

What are your thoughts and experiences about parents talking for themselves in the hearing, rather than through their lawyer, when there are issues of family violence?

Overall (5 minutes) We have almost finished the interview and now I would like you to think generally about what works well with the Parenting Hearings Programme and what doesn't.

First of all, what are the benefits or advantages of the PHP? Check: benefits for all parties involved (especially children and parents), any comments about the outcome of PHP and whether parents are in a better position to deal with future parenting issues.

And what are the disadvantages or issues with the PHP? Do you have any suggestions as to how PHP could be improved? Check: how are these problems, and who are these problems for. How can they be addressed / have they been addressed? Is PHP more appropriate for some types of cases than others (eg interim urgent matters)?

Should PHP be extended nationally?

In your opinion, what is the most important thing that would improve the way these sorts of cases are dealt with by the courts?

Finally (5 minutes) is there anything we haven't covered that you'd like to tell me about the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot?

End Once we have spoken to a few people from the pilot sites throughout the country we are going to send a questionnaire to all lawyers who have been involved in PHP cases. The questions we ask will be based on what we have learnt during the interviews. We would appreciate it if you would answer the survey even though you have done this interview as there will be some topics or questions that we have not covered in today's interview.

Check that responses on Consent Form are recorded. Reassure respondent that responses are confidential.

Thank you very much for your time

Appendix 7: Interview guide – report writers

Evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme Pilot

Introduction and informed consent (5 minutes)

Explain project – run through Information Sheet and Consent Form.
Ensure a response is recorded for each item on Consent Form sheet.
Respondents won't be named in the report, won't be able to be identified.

Respondent's opinion is important so we have a full understanding of PHP from different perspectives. Will ask both about the theoretical or legal aspects and how PHP works in practice. We will cover both process and outcomes.

We are getting information from a number of different sources – interviews, surveys and analysis of quantitative Family Court data.

Does the respondent have any questions about the evaluation or the interview?

Background (5 minutes)

Type of involvement and reports written for the Family Court. Length of time writing reports for Family Court. Extent of involvement with both PHP and non-PHP cases.

Involvement in the PHP process (10 minutes)

First of all, can you please tell me at what stage you get involved with PHP cases and what your role is? Is this different for Track A and Track B cases?
Check: whether role and stage at which involved is appropriate in their opinion
Check: whether role varies by judge
Check: whether role and stage at which involved is different for non-PHP cases

To what extent do you attend the PHP hearings? Is this any different to non-PHP cases?
Check: - if different – why do you think that is?

Have there been PHP cases you have been appointed to that you were previously involved with before it became a PHP case? Are there any issues with that?

Have you noticed any changes in the PHP process since the pilot started in late 2006? What were these changes? Were the changes needed, did they improve the PHP?

Process issues (15 mins)

I'm now going to ask some specific questions about the PHP process, what you think works well and what could be improved. I will ask you about outcomes later in the interview.

First, the timeframe that has been set for PHP cases, both between the Judge's List and the Preliminary Hearing, and between the preliminary and Final Hearing. What is your opinion of how workable that timeframe is as a report writer? Is it realistic – under what circumstances might it not be? Is the timeframe realistic for the other parties involved?
Check – are there implications for 'getting things right' in the shorter timeframe? Is a shorter timeframe always the best approach? Are there implications for the timeframe of non-PHP cases?

As a report writer, is your role throughout the PHP process clear? Do you know what is expected of you? Has your understanding changed over the time of the pilot? Has your role

changed over time? Where have you got your information from? Do you think more formal training is needed?

How is the role of specialist report writer different for PHP cases compared to non-PHP cases?

Check – are the briefs more specific and a smaller number of issues covered? What was expected in this regard at the start of the pilot? What has actually happened? Can a specialist report writer reduce either the total amount of work required or the amount of work required to write the report if the direction is more specific?

Thinking now about the children, how much do they participate in the process? In what ways do they participate? In your opinion, is their participation at the appropriate level?

Check: extent to which judges speak to children involved – by age of child.

Check: Is involvement or participation by children different to non-PHP cases?

Some people have said that one of the issues is that there is variation between judges, but others have said that this is no different to non-PHP cases. What is your opinion about this? If there is variation, what issues does it cause, and how is it different in PHP cases?

Still thinking about process rather than outcome, how satisfied do you think parents and children are going through the PHP process compared to the non-PHP process? What do you believe are the advantages and disadvantages for them?

Is PHP less adversarial in practice than non-PHP? Does it suit one type of case (in terms of difficulty) better than another type? Which level of difficulty?

Outcome issues (10 minutes)

I would like to spend some time now thinking about the outcome of the PHP, rather than issues about the process. In considering outcomes, it would be helpful if you could compare cases you know of that have been through PHP with similar cases that have not.

To what extent do you know what the outcome is of the cases you have been involved with? If you do not attend the hearing, how do you hear about the outcome?

Overall, what is your opinion about the outcome of the PHP cases you have been involved with? Have they been the best outcomes under the circumstances?

Check: fairness of outcome.

Check: what about the outcome achieved specifically at Preliminary hearings? At Final Hearings?

Do you think the same outcome would have been achieved under the other system? What is it about PHP that makes a difference (whether positive or negative) to the outcome?

Does the PHP process focus the parents on future parenting behaviours? How?

Do you believe the outcome of the PHP process is a more lasting outcome than non-PHP? Why?

Check: whether varies by type of application(s)

How satisfied do you think parents and children are with the outcomes achieved under PHP compared to non-PHP cases?

Check: perceptions of impact of PHP on children

Natural justice (10 minutes)

Note: issues may have been raised and discussed earlier in the interview. Check that all aspects have been covered and opinions are clear.

Note: if natural justice is mentioned, ensure the meaning of this is clarified, and check if any issues are theoretical or practical.

In your opinion, under PHP do the parents have the opportunity to have their say, do they feel heard?

Check: is this different to similar non-PHP cases? Does it vary by stage of PHP process?

Do you have any concerns about procedural issues?

Check: are these concerns theoretical or do they relate to actual practice? At what point specifically in the process?

What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages of the judge directing what issues are to be covered at the PHP hearings?

Check: does PHP reduce the amount of material that is introduced? Is it reduced appropriately?

Probe any comments about the Judge's increased control over proceedings for positive or negative perceptions.

To what extent are the parents (and children if appropriate) aware of what is happening at the hearings and throughout the process? Is more information / education required?

Are you always sure of what is happening and will happen next?

What are the issues for specific groups:

- Unrepresented litigants – are the issues any different for PHP cases or are they the same as non-PHP?
- Disparity in articulateness – what are the issues where there is a disparity between parties in terms of how articulate they are and their ability to speak for themselves.
- Different cultures – how responsive is the PHP process to people of different cultures? Are some cultural groups more or less likely and/or willing to speak for themselves in a court?

Issues relating to family violence cases (5 minutes)

We are almost at the end of the interview, and the last topic is about PHP cases that involve family violence or allegations of family violence.

Firstly, how are applications for orders under the DV Act dealt with for PHP cases? Is there a difference in the actual timeframe for DV orders under PHP and non-PHP?

Some people have commented on issues that specifically relate to cases of family violence under PHP – the speed of the process and the parents talking more for themselves. We would like to hear what you think about this.

First, the speed of the process. What are the advantages and disadvantages of a faster process in cases of family violence.

Check – is it a concern that parties are put together into court too quickly to attempt to resolve parenting issues when family violence is a recent issue.

What are your thoughts and experiences about parents talking for themselves in the hearing, rather than through their lawyer, when there are issues of family violence?

Overall (5 minutes) We have almost finished the interview and now I would like you to think generally about what works well with the Parenting Hearings Programme and what doesn't.

First of all, what are the benefits or advantages of the PHP?

Check: benefits for all parties involved (especially children and parents), any comments about the outcome of PHP and whether parents are in a better position to deal with future parenting issues.

And what are the disadvantages or issues with the PHP? Do you have any suggestions as to how PHP could be improved?

Check: how are these problems, and who are these problems for. How can they be addressed / have they been addressed?

Should PHP be extended nationally?

In your opinion, what is the most important thing that would improve the way these sorts of cases are dealt with by the courts?

Finally (5 mins) is there anything we haven't covered that you'd like to tell me about the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot?

End Thank you very much for the time you have spent talking to me today. It has been really helpful to get your perspective on how the PHP pilot is working.

Check that responses on Consent Form are recorded. Reassure respondent that responses are confidential.

Appendix 8: Letter – interview with PHP parent

XXXXXXX XXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXX

(date)

Dear XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX

EVALUATION OF THE PARENTING HEARINGS PROGRAMME

The Ministry of Justice is currently evaluating the Family Court Parenting Hearings Programme. The evaluation will look at how the programme operates and whether it has improved the way cases in the Family Court are dealt with.

You are one of a number of people who have been to a Preliminary Hearing or a Final Hearing under the Parenting Hearings Programme, and have been chosen to be contacted for an interview.

The researchers responsible for this project, Anne Harland and Felicity Leahy, will be conducting the interviews and writing up the results of the research. They will make sure that your answers will be kept completely confidential.

We realise that we are asking you to remember a situation that may have been very difficult for you. However, we believe that to hear from people who have experienced the programme is the best way to learn about what is working well and what can be improved.

(Name) who is working with us on this project will contact you in the next few days to give you more information about the evaluation and ask if you would like to set up a time to be interviewed.

I would appreciate you helping us with this research as we value your experiences and opinions.

Yours sincerely

Appendix 9: Interview guide – PHP parents

Evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme Pilot

Note: timings are indicative only and reflect the priority that will be given to various sections. The interviewers will have some background information about the case to provide context for the interview (dates of PHP hearings, applications made, history of case etc).

Introduction and informed consent (5 mins) Explain project – run through Information Sheet and Consent Form. Ensure a response is recorded for each item on Consent Form sheet.

Respondents won't be named in the report, won't be able to be identified.

Respondent's opinion is important so we have a full understanding of PHP from different perspectives. No-one other than the evaluation team will know who has agreed to be interviewed and responses will be kept confidential.

We are getting information from a number of different sources – interviews, surveys and analysis of quantitative Family Court data. Does the respondent have any questions about the evaluation or the interview?

Background (5 minutes) Background about their court case and stages it has been through (counselling, mediation, hearings) and applications made. Involvement with both PHP and non-PHP processes.

Note: if recall is inaccurate, in order to ensure the respondent is referring to the PHP process, background information about the case may be referred to (eg, thinking about the hearing you went to in March this year...)

PHP – Judge's List (5 minutes) Before the Preliminary Hearing there would have been a time your case was discussed at the court and the Judge decided that you would then have a Preliminary Hearing. It would not have taken very long. Were you at that? Was your ex-partner? Your lawyers? Was a Lawyer for Child appointed?

What happened at this session? Did you speak, did your partner speak? What issues were discussed? What did the Judge say, did he or she make any orders?

Did the Judge decide what could be talked about at the Preliminary Hearing and what couldn't be talked about? What did you think about that?

PHP – Preliminary hearing(s) (10 minutes) Did you have one or more Preliminary Hearings? What were the issues being discussed at each of them?

What was the process – were you asked to say what you wanted to at the start of the hearing? Was your ex-partner?

Did you have a chance to say what you wanted to? Did you feel comfortable talking in front of your ex-partner / in front of the Judge and court? (Note: the interviewer will be aware of any orders relating to domestic violence before the interview.)

Did you have a lawyer? Did your lawyer speak for you? Were you or your lawyer given the opportunity to ask your ex-partner questions?

Did your ex-partner have a lawyer? Did the lawyer speak or your ex-partner? Did either of them ask you questions?

Was there a Lawyer for the Child at the hearing(s)? What did they do? Did they ask questions of you or your ex-partner?

Did the Judge ask you questions? Your ex-partner?

Did the Judge decide what could be talked about and what couldn't be talked about? What did you think about that? Did it help?

What happened at the hearing(s)? What was decided?

Did you feel safe at the hearing?

Did you feel that the best arrangement had been made? Did you feel that you and your ex-partner were encouraged to come to an agreement? How was that done? Did it work? Do you think you would have been able to come to an agreement without the Judge there, at counselling for example?

PHP – Final hearings(s) (5 minutes) Did you have a Final Hearing? What were the issues being discussed?

What was the process – were you asked to say what you wanted to at the start of the hearing? Was your ex-partner?

Did you have a chance to say what you wanted to? Did you feel comfortable talking in front of your ex-partner / in front of the Judge and court?

Did you have a lawyer? Did your lawyer speak for you? Were you or your lawyer given the opportunity to ask your ex-partner questions?

Did your ex-partner have a lawyer? Did the lawyer speak or your ex-partner? Did either of them ask you questions?

Was there a Lawyer for the Child at the hearing(s)? What did they do? Did they ask questions of you or your ex-partner?

Did the Judge ask you questions? Your ex-partner?

What happened at the hearing(s)? What was decided?

Did you feel safe at the hearing?

Before your cases became a PHP case had you been to other hearings that were not PHP hearings? How were they different or similar to the PHP preliminary / Final Hearing?

Having your say (5 minutes) Thinking about the PHP process overall, do you think you had a good chance to say what you wanted to say? Were you able to tell your side of the story? Do you think that the Judge really heard what you said?

Timeliness (5 minutes) Under the PHP process some things are much quicker than under the other system. What did you think about how long things took? Did things happen too quickly, too slowly, or at about the right speed for you?

Check: at different stages, compared to non-PHP if experienced.

Information and knowledge (5 minutes) Did you always know what was happening and what you were supposed to do? Who told you what was happening and what you had to do?

Had you seen the PHP DVD? Was it helpful?

Had you been to the Parenting Through Separation course? Was it helpful?

Your children (5 minutes) I now have a couple of questions about your child(ren) and whether they were involved in the court processes. What ages are your children? Did they speak to the Lawyer for Child? Did they speak to the Judge? Was their Lawyer there at the time? Did they tell you anything about this – what did they think about it?

Do you think it was a good idea or not that they spoke to their Lawyer / the Judge? For what reasons do you think this?

The future (5 minutes) Do you think that going through the PHP process has helped you and your ex-partner work out how to talk about parenting issues in the future? Do you think you both have a better understanding of what to do?

If been through non-PHP: Is this any different to the other system? How is it different? Which is better? Why?

Overall (5 minutes) Note: this question may not work for all respondents – it requires an understanding of the Parenting Hearings Programme.

We have almost finished the interview and now I would like you to think generally about what you think works well about the Parenting Hearings Programme and what doesn't.

First of all, what are the benefits or advantages of the PHP? And what are the disadvantages or issues with the PHP? Should PHP be extended nationally?

Finally (5 minutes) is there anything we haven't covered that you'd like to tell me about the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot?

Ask respondent to complete demographics form.

End Thank you very much for the time you have spent talking to us today. It has been really helpful to get your perspective on how the Parenting Hearings Programme is working.

Check that responses on Consent Form are recorded. Reassure respondent that responses are confidential.

Appendix 10: Letter - PHP parents' postal survey



PARENTING HEARINGS PROGRAMME PILOT EVALUATION

You recently had a case in the Family Court involving the arrangements for the care of your child(ren). The Ministry of Justice is carrying out an evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme (PHP) pilot to see how well it is working.

All parents and caregivers who had a Parenting Hearings Programme case heard at the Auckland Family Court are being sent a survey. Some parents and caregivers who had cases which did not enter the Parenting Hearings Programme are also being asked to complete a survey. You were part of the PHP pilot which is why we have sent you this survey.

We are very keen to hear about your views and experiences of the Parenting Hearings Programme and would be very grateful if you would take the time to complete the attached survey. The survey should only take 15 minutes to complete. Please return the survey in the enclosed postage paid envelope by 8th October 2008. If you lose the envelope please post the survey to Mickayla Vickers, Consumer Link, PO Box 33679, Takapuna, NORTH SHORE CITY 0740.

You are completely free to choose whether or not you complete the survey. The Family Court will not know whether you have taken part, and participation will have no effect on your court case or any future contact with the Family Court.

The information that you provide will be kept confidential and individual responses will only be seen by researchers. The results will be used in an evaluation report on the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot. All the responses to the survey will be gathered together and reported as numbers and percentages, no individual data will be reported. We may use some quotes but nothing that could allow you to be identified.

The number on the bottom of the survey will enable us to send reminders to people who have not completed the survey. When analysing the survey data the researchers may also use this number to link your views to what happened in the court process. Again, no individual data will be reported.

We would really appreciate it if you would take the time to complete this survey. The findings from this research will contribute to our understanding of parents' and caregivers' experience with PHP.

If you would like to receive a summary of the results of the full evaluation please complete the enclosed form. These forms will be kept separate from the surveys. The results of the evaluation should be available in early 2009.

Thank you for your help.

Appendix 11: PHP parents' postal survey

PARENTING HEARINGS PROGRAMME PILOT EVALUATION

Survey for Parenting Hearings Programme Parents and Caregivers

You recently had a case at the Auckland Family Court involving arrangements for the care of your child(ren).

On 12/05/08 your case was entered into the Parenting Hearings Programme (PHP) pilot. This survey asks for your views and experiences of the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot, and also asks you to compare these with any other experience you may have had with the Family Court.

BEFORE COURT

- Q1** In your recent Family Court case did you have a lawyer?
- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No, I represented myself (go to Question 4) |
|------------------------------|--|
- Q2** Did your lawyer explain the Parenting Hearings Programme to you?
- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 4) |
|------------------------------|--|
- Q3** How helpful was the explanation?
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> Not that helpful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quite helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all helpful |
- Q4** Did you see the DVD about the Parenting Hearings Programme?
- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 7) |
|------------------------------|--|
- Q5** How useful was the DVD in preparing you for the Parenting Hearings Programme (PHP) hearing?
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very useful | <input type="checkbox"/> Not that useful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quite useful | <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all useful |
- Q6** If you indicated that the DVD was “not that useful” or “not at all useful” can you please tell us why that was?
- Q7** Did you see the pamphlet about the Parenting Hearings Programme?
- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 10) |
|------------------------------|---|
- Q8** How useful was the pamphlet in preparing you for the Parenting Hearings Programme hearing?
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very useful | <input type="checkbox"/> Not that useful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quite useful | <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all useful |
- Q9** If you indicated that the pamphlet was “not that useful” or “not at all useful” can you please tell us why that was?
- Q10** Did you attend the Parenting through Separation information sessions?
- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 12) |
|------------------------------|---|
- Q11** How useful were the Parenting Through Separation sessions in helping you to negotiate arrangements for the child(ren)?
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very useful | <input type="checkbox"/> Not that useful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quite useful | <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all useful |

HEARINGS/MEETINGS WITH THE JUDGE

Q12 Once your case was entered into the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot did you have a hearing at the Family Court with a Judge? This includes any short meeting that you may have had with a Judge at the court.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, one hearing	<input type="checkbox"/>	No (go to the next section at Question 24a)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, more than one hearing		

Q13a At the hearing(s) to what extent did you feel that you had the opportunity to say what you wanted to?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Completely	<input type="checkbox"/>	Only partially
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mostly	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not at all

Q13b If you 'only partially' or did 'not at all' feel you had the opportunity to say what you wanted to, what made you feel that way?

Q14 At any of the Parenting Hearings Programme hearings did you talk directly with the Judge?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

Q15a To what extent did you feel that you were listened to by the Judge?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Completely	<input type="checkbox"/>	Only partially
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mostly	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not at all

Q15b If you 'only partially' or did 'not at all' feel you were listened to by the Judge, what made you feel that way?

Q16a How many of the important things to do with the care of the children were dealt with?

<input type="checkbox"/>	All of them	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some of them
<input type="checkbox"/>	Most of them	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of them

Q16b If you answered that only 'some' or 'no' important issues were dealt with, what important issues weren't dealt with?

Q17 Did your lawyer do most of the talking for you?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Didn't have a lawyer
--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------	----------------------

Q18 Thinking back to the hearings, what do you think would be the best option for you?

<input type="checkbox"/>	My lawyer talks instead of me	<input type="checkbox"/>	I talk instead of my lawyer
<input type="checkbox"/>	Both my lawyer and I talk	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not have a lawyer

Q19 Do you think you could have asked your lawyer any questions during the hearing if you wanted to?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Definitely yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Probably no
<input type="checkbox"/>	Probably yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Definitely no
<input type="checkbox"/>	Didn't have a lawyer		

Q20a Did the Judge make suggestions for settling your case?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No (go to Question 21a)
--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	-------------------------

Q20b Do you feel you could have asked for time to discuss these suggestions with your lawyer before responding?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Definitely yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Probably no
<input type="checkbox"/>	Probably yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Definitely no
<input type="checkbox"/>	Didn't have a lawyer		

Q21a At any of the Parenting Hearings Programme hearings when you gave evidence were you cross-examined by your ex-partner's lawyer (or your ex-partner if they were self-represented)?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 22)
------------------------------	---

Q21b How did you feel about the cross-examination?

<input type="checkbox"/> It wasn't a bad experience	<input type="checkbox"/> Quite a bad experience	<input type="checkbox"/> A very bad experience
---	---	--

Q22 At any of the hearings when your ex-partner gave evidence were they cross-examined by your lawyer (if you had one)?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I didn't have a lawyer
------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Q23a At the time you were having the court hearing(s), were you worried at all about your personal safety?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 24a)
------------------------------	--

Q23b If you did have concerns about your personal safety, how safe or unsafe did you feel during the court hearing?

<input type="checkbox"/> A little unsafe	<input type="checkbox"/> Very unsafe
--	--------------------------------------

Q23c If you felt unsafe at the court hearing, what made you feel unsafe?

PARENTING HEARINGS PROGRAMME PROCESS AS A WHOLE

Now thinking of the process as a whole from the time your case was entered into the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot.

Q24a What do you think about the speed of the Parenting Hearing Programme Family Court process overall?

<input type="checkbox"/> Far too fast	<input type="checkbox"/> A little too slow
<input type="checkbox"/> A little too fast	<input type="checkbox"/> Far too slow
<input type="checkbox"/> About right	

Q24b Why do you think that?

Q25 To what extent do you feel that overall you understood the Parenting Hearings Programme process and that you knew what was happening?

<input type="checkbox"/> Completely	<input type="checkbox"/> Only partially
<input type="checkbox"/> Mostly	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all

Q26a Were there any issues raised at the Parenting Hearings Programme court hearing(s) that you felt should have been followed-up but were not?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	-----------------------------

Q26b If yes, please tell us what type of issues these were?

CHILDREN

Q27 Did the Family Court appoint a lawyer to represent your child(ren)?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 30a)
------------------------------	--

Q28 Did the lawyer for your child(ren) meet with your child(ren)?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	-----------------------------

Q29 How helpful was the lawyer for child(ren) in the process of arranging for the care of the child(ren)?

<input type="checkbox"/> Very helpful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not that helpful
<input type="checkbox"/> Quite helpful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all helpful

Q30a Did your child(ren) meet with the Judge?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know
--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------	------------

Q30b If they did meet with the Judge, how useful was it for them to do that?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Very useful	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not that useful
<input type="checkbox"/>	Quite useful	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not at all useful

OUTCOME(S)

Q31 Did you and your ex-partner come to any agreement about the care of your child(ren) or did the Judge decide?

<input type="checkbox"/>	We came to an agreement – no court order was made	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Judge decided and made a court order not by consent
<input type="checkbox"/>	We came to an agreement – a court order was made by consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	No agreement was reached and no court order was made
<input type="checkbox"/>	The judge proposed an outcome and we agreed so an order was made by consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know

Q32 If you came to an agreement, do you think that the Parenting Hearings Programme Family Court process helped you come to an agreement about the arrangements for the care of the children?

<input type="checkbox"/>	It helped a lot	<input type="checkbox"/>	It did not help
<input type="checkbox"/>	It helped a little	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did not come to an agreement

Q33 Did you attend any hearing(s) where only some of the issues were resolved and other issues were to be decided at a later hearing?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know
--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------	------------

Q34 How satisfied were you with the outcome of the case?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Very satisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>	Quite dissatisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	Quite satisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Dissatisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied		

Q35 Do you think that having gone through the Parenting Hearings Programme Family Court process this will help you in the future to work out arrangements for the care of your child(ren).

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, definitely	<input type="checkbox"/>	No, probably not
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, probably	<input type="checkbox"/>	No, definitely not

PREVIOUS FAMILY COURT EXPERIENCE

If your recent Family Court case started a long time before it was placed on the Parenting Hearings Programme or if you have had a previous Family Court case involving the care of children we would like you to compare that previous experience with your experience of the Parenting Hearings Programme process.

Q36 Did you have Family Court experience before you went on the Parenting Hearings Programme?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No (go to Question 38)
--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	------------------------

Q37 Compared to my previous Family Court experience I think that **on the Parenting Hearings Programme...**

Please tick the box you think best fits what you think for each of these statements

	Much Better	A little Better	The same	A little Worse	Much Worse	Don't know
... the speed of the process was...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... I was able to say what I wanted at court...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... at the court hearings I was listened to...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... at the court hearings the important issues were covered...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... the needs of my child(ren) were taken into account ...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... I understood what was happening at the court hearing(s)...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ANYTHING ELSE?

Q38 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your experience of the Parenting Hearings Programme?

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

This information will be used to show the range of people who have completed a survey.

Q40 What is your gender?

<input type="checkbox"/> Male	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Q41 What age group do you belong to?

<input type="checkbox"/> Under 20 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 40 – 49 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 20 – 29 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 50 – 59 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 30 – 39 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 60 years and over

Q42 Which ethnic group do you belong to? *Please tick the box or boxes which apply to you..*

<input type="checkbox"/> New Zealand European	<input type="checkbox"/> Tongan
<input type="checkbox"/> Māori	<input type="checkbox"/> Niuean
<input type="checkbox"/> Samoan	<input type="checkbox"/> Chinese
<input type="checkbox"/> Cook Island Māori	<input type="checkbox"/> Indian
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (such as Dutch, Japanese, Tokelauan). Please state:	

Thank you very much for completing this survey and helping with the evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot.

PARENTING HEARINGS PROGRAMME PILOT EVALUATION

If you would like a summary of the key findings please record your address below and include this page in the reply envelope.

Appendix 12: Letter - non-PHP parents' postal survey



Parenting Hearings Programme Pilot Evaluation

The Ministry of Justice is evaluating the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot to see how well it is working. Although you were not part of this pilot, you were recently involved in a Family Court case relating to the care arrangements for your child(ren).

So that we can compare the experiences of people who were on the programme and those who were not, we are very keen to hear about your views and experiences of the Family Court. We would appreciate you taking the time to complete the attached survey. The survey should only take 15 minutes to complete. Please return the survey in the enclosed postage paid envelope by **8th October 2008**. If you lose the envelope please post the survey to: Mickayla Vickers, Consumer Link, PO Box 33679, Takapuna, NORTH SHORE CITY 0740.

You are completely free to choose whether or not you complete the survey. The Family Court will not know whether you have taken part, and participation will have no effect on your court case or any future contact with the Family Court.

The information that you provide will be kept confidential and individual responses will only be seen by researchers. The results will be used in an evaluation report on the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot. All the responses to the survey will be gathered together and reported as numbers and percentages, no individual data will be reported. We may use some quotes but not anything that could allow you to be identified.

The number on the bottom of the survey will enable us to send reminders to people who have not completed the survey. When analysing the survey data the researchers may also use this number to link your views to what happened in the court process. Again, no individual data will be reported.

We would really appreciate it if you would take the time to complete this survey. The findings from this research will contribute to our understanding of parents' and caregivers' experience with the Family Court.

If you would like to receive a summary of the results of the full evaluation please complete the enclosed form. These forms will be kept separate from the surveys. The results of the evaluation should be available in early 2009.

Thank you for your help.

Appendix 13: Non-PHP parents' postal survey

Parenting Hearings Programme Pilot Evaluation

Survey for parents and caregivers who were not part of the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot

You were recently involved in a case at the Auckland Family Court relating to arrangements for the care of your child(ren). This survey asks for your views and experiences of this recent engagement with the Family Court.

BEFORE COURT

- Q1** In your recent Family Court case did you have a lawyer?
 Yes No, I represented myself (go to Question 4)
- Q2** Did your lawyer explain the Family Court process to you?
 Yes No (go to Question 4)
- Q3** How helpful was the explanation?
 Very helpful Not that helpful
 Quite helpful Not at all helpful
- Q4** Did you attend the Parenting through Separation information sessions?
 Yes No (go to Question 6)
- Q5** How useful were the Parenting Through Separation sessions in helping you to negotiate arrangements for the child(ren)?
 Very useful Not that useful
 Quite useful Not at all useful

HEARINGS/MEETINGS WITH THE JUDGE

- Q6** Did you have a hearing at the Family Court with a Judge? This includes any short meeting that you may have had with a Judge at the court.
 Yes, one hearing No (go to the next section at Question 24a)
 Yes, more than one hearing
- Q7** At the hearing(s) to what extent did you feel that you had the opportunity to say what you wanted to?
 Completely Only partially
 Mostly Not at all
- Q8** If you 'only partially' or did 'not at all' feel you had the opportunity to say what you wanted to, what made you feel that way?
- Q9** At any time did you talk directly with the Judge?
 Yes No
- Q10** To what extent did you feel that you were listened to by the Judge?
 Completely Only partially
 Mostly Not at all
- Q11** If you 'only partially' or did 'not at all' feel you were listened to by the Judge, what made you feel that way?
- Q12** How many of the important things to do with care of the children were dealt with?
 All of them Some of them
 Most of them None of them

Q13 If you answered that only 'some' or 'no' important issues were dealt with, what important issues weren't dealt with?

Q14 Did your lawyer speak on your behalf at the hearing(s)?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I didn't have a lawyer
------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Q15 Thinking back to the hearings, what do you think would be the best option for you?

<input type="checkbox"/> My lawyer talks instead of me	<input type="checkbox"/> I talk instead of my lawyer
<input type="checkbox"/> Both my lawyer and I talk	<input type="checkbox"/> Not have a lawyer

Q16 Do you think you could have asked your lawyer any questions during the hearing if you wanted to?

<input type="checkbox"/> Definitely yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Probably no
<input type="checkbox"/> Probably yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Definitely no
<input type="checkbox"/> Didn't have a lawyer	

Q17 Did the Judge make suggestions for settling your case?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 19)
------------------------------	---

Q18 Do you feel you could have asked for time to discuss these suggestions with your lawyer before responding?

<input type="checkbox"/> Definitely yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Probably no
<input type="checkbox"/> Probably yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Definitely no
<input type="checkbox"/> Didn't have a lawyer	

Q19 At any of the hearings when you gave evidence were you cross-examined by your ex-partner's lawyer (or your ex-partner if they were self-represented)?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 22)
------------------------------	---

Q20 How did you feel about the cross-examination?

<input type="checkbox"/> It wasn't a bad experience	<input type="checkbox"/> Quite a bad experience	<input type="checkbox"/> A very bad experience
---	---	--

Q21 At any of the hearings when your ex-partner gave evidence were they cross-examined by your lawyer (if you had one)?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I didn't have a lawyer
------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Q22 At the time you were having the court hearing(s), were you worried at all about your personal safety?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 24a)
------------------------------	--

Q23a If you did have concerns about your personal safety, how safe or unsafe did you feel during the court hearing?

<input type="checkbox"/> A little unsafe	<input type="checkbox"/> Very unsafe
--	--------------------------------------

Q23b If you felt unsafe at the court hearing, what made you feel unsafe?

FAMILY COURT PROCESS AS A WHOLE

Now thinking of the process as a whole from the time you went to the Family Court

Q24a What do you think about the speed of the Family Court process overall?

<input type="checkbox"/> Far too fast	<input type="checkbox"/> A little too slow
<input type="checkbox"/> A little too fast	<input type="checkbox"/> Far too slow
<input type="checkbox"/> About right	

Q24b Why do you think that?

Q25 To what extent do you feel that overall you understood the Family Court process and that you knew what was happening?

<input type="checkbox"/> Completely	<input type="checkbox"/> Only partially
<input type="checkbox"/> Mostly	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all

Q26a Were there any issues raised at the Family Court hearing(s) that you felt should have been followed-up but were not?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	-----------------------------

Q26b If yes, please tell us what type of issues these were?

CHILDREN

Q27 Did the Family Court appoint a lawyer to represent your child(ren)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No (go to Question 30a)
--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	-------------------------

Q28 Did the lawyer for your child(ren) meet with your child(ren)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

Q29 How helpful was the lawyer for child(ren) in the process of arranging for the care of the child(ren)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Very helpful	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not that helpful
<input type="checkbox"/>	Quite helpful	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not at all helpful

Q30a Did your child(ren) meet with the Judge?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know
--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------	------------

Q30b If they did meet with the Judge, how useful was it for them to do that?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Very useful	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not that useful
<input type="checkbox"/>	Quite useful	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not at all useful

OUTCOMES

Q31 Did you and your ex-partner come to any agreement about the care of your child(ren) or did the Judge decide?

<input type="checkbox"/>	We came to an agreement – no court order was made	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Judge decided and made a court order not by consent
<input type="checkbox"/>	We came to an agreement – a court order was made by consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	No agreement was reached and no court order was made
<input type="checkbox"/>	The judge proposed an outcome and we agreed so an order was made by consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know

Q32 If you came to an agreement, do you think that the Family Court process helped you come to an agreement about the arrangements for the care of the children?

<input type="checkbox"/>	It helped a lot	<input type="checkbox"/>	It did not help
<input type="checkbox"/>	It helped a little	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did not come to an agreement

Q33 Did you attend any hearing(s) where only some of the issues were resolved and other issues were to be decided at a later hearing?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know
--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------	------------

Q34 How satisfied were you with the outcome of the case?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Very satisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>	Quite dissatisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	Quite satisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Dissatisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied		

Q35 Do you think that having gone through the Family Court process this will help you in the future to work out arrangements for the care of your child(ren)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, definitely	<input type="checkbox"/>	No, probably not
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, probably	<input type="checkbox"/>	No, definitely not

ANYTHING ELSE?

Q36 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your experience of the Family Court?

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

This information will be used to show the range of people who have completed a survey

Q37 What is your gender?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Male	<input type="checkbox"/>	Female
--------------------------	------	--------------------------	--------

Q38 What age group do you belong to?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Under 20 years	<input type="checkbox"/>	40 – 49 years
<input type="checkbox"/>	20 – 29 years	<input type="checkbox"/>	50 – 59 years
<input type="checkbox"/>	30 – 39 years	<input type="checkbox"/>	60 years and over

Q39 Which ethnic group do you belong to? *Please tick the box or boxes which apply to you.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	New Zealand European	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tongan
<input type="checkbox"/>	Māori	<input type="checkbox"/>	Niuean
<input type="checkbox"/>	Samoan	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chinese
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cook Island Māori	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indian
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (such as Dutch, Japanese, Tokelauan). Please state:		

Thank you very much for completing this survey and helping with the evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot.

PARENTING HEARINGS PROGRAMME PILOT EVALUATION

If you would like a summary of the key findings please record your address below and include this page in the reply envelope.

Appendix 14: Reminder postcard parents' postal survey



The Ministry of Justice would like to thank you if you have already completed the Parenting Hearings Programme survey. If you would still like to complete the survey we would be grateful if you could return it to us by 13th October. If you would like another copy of the survey sent to you please contact Mickayla Vickers at Consumer Link on 09 919 3042.

Appendix 15: Lawyers' internet survey

Email:

Subject line: **Evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme pilot**

Dear (name)

This is a short survey that asks about your views on the Family Court Parenting Hearings Programme pilot. It is your opportunity to have your say and we would appreciate you taking the time to let us know what you think.

This survey is part of an evaluation of the Parenting Hearings Programme (PHP) pilot being undertaken by the Ministry of Justice. The pilot began on 1 November 2006 and it is planned to run for two years. The findings from this evaluation of the pilot will provide input into decisions about the future of the Parenting Hearings Programme.

The Ministry of Justice has commissioned Consumer Link to host the survey, and to provide the Ministry with the data.

We would really appreciate your response before XX

This is a survey of all lawyers who have been involved in a Parenting Hearings Programme case, either as a counsel for one of the parties, as a Lawyer for the Child, or as a Lawyer to Assist the Court. Please confirm whether you have ever been involved in a PHP case.

Yes, have been involved in PHP – next screen

No, have not been involved in PHP – ‘thank you for your interest but we only want to survey lawyers who have been involved in a PHP case’.

Kind regards
Rosemary Cals
Survey Project Manager
Consumer Link

Survey Introduction page:

There are a number of phases in the evaluation of the PHP pilot. Ministry of Justice researchers have visited each of the six pilot areas, and spoken to a range of people involved with the PHP pilot, including lawyers. This survey aims to find out how many lawyers agree or disagree with the opinions and attitudes expressed during these interviews.

The survey is going to all lawyers who have been involved with PHP cases and we would really appreciate you taking the time to complete the survey as the more people who respond the more sure we can be about our findings.

- It should only take you 10 to 15 minutes to complete the survey.
- Your responses are completely confidential – your contact details are kept in a separate data file to your responses and they will not be matched at any point.
- The information provided in this survey will be aggregated and used in the final report.
- Findings will be presented nationally and by court area.
- Should quotes be used they will not be identifiable.
- Participation in the survey is completely voluntary, however this is your opportunity to have your say about the PHP and we would very much appreciate you taking the time to complete it.

Once you are ready to start the survey, please use the arrow below.

- Every page of the survey will have an arrow at the bottom to allow you to move forward once you have completed that page.
- You will find that you cannot return to a previous page.
- If you need to leave the survey before the end, you can return to the point at which you left the survey by returning to the original email message and clicking 'Yes, have been involved in PHP' again.
- If you have any queries about the survey operation, please contact Rosemary Cals at Consumer Link (rosemary.cals@consumerlink.co.nz) or phone 0508 787839 (freephone).
- If you have any queries about the survey, please contact _____

Survey

Demographics/descriptors

D1 First of all, how long have you been practising family law at the Family Court?

- Up to 2 years
- Over 2 to 5 years
- Over 5 to 10 years
- Over 10 to 20 years
- Over 20 years

D2 Have you acted as Lawyer for the Child in the Family Court? Yes No

D3 Have you acted as Lawyer to Assist the Court in the Family Court? Yes No

D4 How many PHP cases have you been involved with as counsel for parties?

If D2 = yes:

D5 How many PHP cases have you been involved with as Lawyer for the Child?

If D3 = yes:

D6 How many PHP cases have you been involved with as Lawyer to Assist the Court?

	Counsel for parties D4	Lawyer for Child D5	Lawyer to Assist the Court D6
None			
One to five cases			
Six to ten cases			
11 to 20 cases			
More than 20 cases			

D7 Have you been involved in any final PHP hearings? Yes No If Yes, how many approximately?

Suitability of cases on PHP

Q1a In general, are suitable cases being referred to PHP at the court?

Please only think about cases that are eligible by originating at one of the pilot courts or, in Auckland's case, in the PHP docket.

Definitely yes, probably yes, probably no, definitely no, don't know If no:

Q1b Which of the statements best describes the situation?

- I think that some suitable cases do not go into PHP
- I think that some unsuitable cases do go into PHP
- I think both of these situations happen

Q2a Have you ever been involved in a PHP case that you considered was not suitable for PHP?
Yes / no (Go to Q3)

Q2b About how many PHP cases have you been involved in that you considered were not suitable for PHP? (Please give your best estimate.) Number: ____

Q2c Why did you consider these cases not suitable for PHP?

Q2d Did you attempt to have any of these case(s) removed from PHP or not entered into PHP in the first place? Yes / no (Go to Q3)

Q2e About how many of them did you attempt to have removed from PHP or not entered into PHP? (Please give your best estimate.) Number:____

Q2f And about how many of these case(s) were removed from PHP? (Please give your best estimate.) Number:____

Q2g Overall, how easy was it to have it/them removed?
Very easy / quite easy / quite difficult / very difficult / don't know

Q3 Please indicate how suitable you generally consider each of the following types of cases is for PHP.

Very suitable, quite suitable, not that suitable, not at all suitable, don't know

Statements will be randomised

- Where there are allegations of serious family violence and there **have been** applications for protection orders
- Where there are allegations of serious family violence but there have **not** been applications for protection orders
- Where there are allegations of less serious or "minor" family violence
- Where there are allegations of child physical abuse
- Where there are allegations of child sexual abuse
- Where there are allegations of child psychological abuse
- Relocation (within the same New Zealand island)
- Relocation (to other New Zealand island or Australia)
- Relocation overseas (other than Australia)
- Where one or both of the parties have significant mental health issues
- Where there are issues of drug and/or alcohol addiction
- **All cases** except where there are strong counter indications
- Cases that are relatively simple and straightforward
- Long term intractable cases
- Urgent cases
- Cases that have not settled following conciliation (ie counselling and/or mediation)
- Care and Protection cases where CYF is a party to the proceedings

Q4a Other than what is listed in the previous question, are there any other types of cases that you think are NOT suitable for PHP? Yes / no If Yes:

Q4b What are they?

Q4c Other than those listed in Question 3, are there any other types of cases that you think ARE suitable for PHP? Yes / no If Yes:

Q4d What are they?

If respondent has been a Lawyer for Child in any PHP cases (D5 = one or more):

Q5a How clear is your role as Lawyer for Child under PHP? (Very clear, quite clear, not that clear, not at all clear)

Q5b How, if at all, does the extent the child/children participate in the PHP process generally differs to the non-PHP system? (Much more participation in PHP, a little more participation in PHP, about the same, a little less participation in PHP, much less participation in PHP)

Q5c Thinking only about your role as Lawyer for Child, do you have enough time to prepare for PHP cases (definitely yes, probably yes, probably no, definitely no):

- Before the Judge's List
- Before the Preliminary Hearing

If D7 = yes (ie involved in Final Hearing):

- Before the Final Hearing

Q5d Is your role as Lawyer for Child different under PHP and non-PHP systems? (Very different, quite different, not that different, not at all different)

Q5e Are the Lawyer for Child briefs that you receive for PHP cases generally more restricted in their directions than the briefs you receive for non-PHP cases? (Yes, much more restricted / yes, a little more restricted / no different / no, a little less restricted / no, a lot less restricted)

Effectiveness of the PHP process

Q6 Please rate how **effective** you think the PHP process is at the following things.

Very effective, quite effective, not that effective, not at all effective, don't know, not applicable

Statements will be randomised

- Helping parents work out arrangements for the future care of their child(ren)
- Providing a less adversarial process overall for the parties
- Providing a less adversarial experience at the court hearings
- Appropriately limiting the issues that are addressed
- Allowing the parties to feel that they have had their say
- Providing a timeframe that is appropriate for the parents
- Providing a timeframe that is appropriate for the child(ren)
- Appropriately limiting cross examination
- Encouraging the participation of children
- Appropriately limiting the information in the affidavits
- Resulting in long lasting solutions without the parties coming back to court
- Resulting in fair and appropriate outcomes
- Ensuring that specialist psychological reports are requested when appropriate
- Ensuring that social work reports are requested when appropriate
- Ensuring that drug and alcohol tests are undertaken when appropriate

Q7 And please rate how **effective** you think the PHP process is at the following things **in comparison to** the usual non-PHP process.

Much more effective, a little more effective, about the same, a little less effective, a lot less effective, don't know, not applicable

Statements will be randomised in same order as Q6

- Helping parents work out arrangements for the future care of their child(ren)
- Providing a less adversarial process overall for the parties
- Providing a less adversarial experience at the court hearings
- Appropriately limiting the issues that are addressed
- Allowing the parties to feel that they have had their say
- Providing a timeframe that is appropriate for the parents
- Providing a timeframe that is appropriate for the child(ren)
- Appropriately limiting cross examination
- Encouraging the participation of children
- Appropriately limiting the information in the affidavits
- Resulting in long lasting solutions without the parties coming back to court
- Resulting in fair and appropriate outcomes
- Ensuring that specialist psychological reports are requested when appropriate
- Ensuring that social work reports are requested when appropriate
- Ensuring that drug and alcohol tests are undertaken when appropriate

Attitudes and opinions – agree/disagree scale

Q8 Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements that have been made about the Parenting Hearings Programme.

Please rate whether you strongly agree, slightly agree, neither agree nor disagree, slightly disagree or strongly disagree with each statement.

(Other options allowed “does not apply” and “don’t know”)

Note: when asked to compare the PHP process with the non-PHP court process, please consider similar types of cases.

Statements will be randomised

- I believe that parties are generally more satisfied with the PHP **process** than with the non-PHP court process
- I believe that parties are generally more satisfied with the **outcome** from the PHP process than with the outcome from non-PHP court process
- When I did my first PHP case I had sufficient information about the PHP process
- I understand what the PHP process is
- I have received enough information about PHP from the Ministry of Justice and the Family Court
- I have received enough information about PHP from all sources
- I have received sufficient training about PHP
- The dvd about the PHP process is very helpful for the parties
- I am clear about my role as lawyer for the parties in PHP cases
- I know what the judges expect of me when I represent parties in PHP cases
- The guidelines I have received about the PHP pilot are clear
- I am confident that I can prepare my clients for PHP hearings
- PHP cases are harder for me than non-PHP cases because I don’t know what my role as a lawyer is going to be in the Preliminary Hearing
- There is sufficient time allowed at Preliminary Hearings
- I generally have sufficient time to prepare for the Judge’s list
- I generally have sufficient time to prepare for the Preliminary Hearing
- I believe that it is useful for the parties to be able to speak directly to the judge
- The PHP process is a fair and appropriate process
- There is a lack of consistency between judges that impacts negatively on the PHP **process**
- There is a lack of consistency between judges that impacts negatively on PHP **outcomes**
- The PHP process pressures people too much to come to an agreement
- The PHP process overly limits the issues that can be raised
- The PHP process appropriately allows for flexibility in dealing with cases
- I am given the opportunity to cross examine when necessary
- I am given the opportunity to raise any issues of interest that are not raised by my client

If D7 = yes (ie involved in Final Hearing):

- There is sufficient time allowed at Final Hearings
- I generally have sufficient time to prepare for the Final Hearing
- PHP cases are harder for me than non-PHP cases because I don’t know what my role as a lawyer is going to be in the Final Hearing

If been Lawyer for Child in PHP cases (D5 = 1 or more):

- I know what the judges expect of me when I represent children in PHP cases

Overall

Q9 As a new process in the Family Court, how would you rate the Parenting Hearings Programme overall? Very good / quite good / neutral / quite poor / very poor

Q10 Do you think that PHP should be continued in the areas in which it has been running at the end of the pilot? Definitely yes, probably yes, probably no, definitely no, don't know

Q11 And do you think that the PHP should be extended nationally?
Definitely yes, probably yes, probably no, definitely no, don't know

Q12a For similar types of cases, would urgent interim hearings in the non-PHP system provide the same benefits as PHP Preliminary Hearings?
Definitely yes, probably yes, probably no, definitely no, don't know

Q12b Why do you think that?

Any concerns

Q13 Can you please tell me if you have any philosophical concerns about the Parenting Hearings Programme. Yes / no If Yes:

Q14 Can you record exactly what those concerns are, and the extent to which you have experienced EACH concern in the PHP cases you have dealt with.

Set up so each concern is recorded separately, and scale is 'experienced it very often / experienced it quite often / experienced it not that often / experienced it rarely / experienced it never'

Suggestions for improvement

And finally, can you please think about what changes, if any, you believe should be made to improve the Parenting Hearings Programme. Please think about your recommendations in terms of both small or practical changes to its operation and also changes that are more significant in terms of the design or functioning of the PHP.

Q15a First of all, what are the small or practical operational changes that you would suggest should be made so that the PHP operates more effectively? 'No changes required' tick box

Q15b And what are the more significant or 'big picture' changes that you would suggest so that the PHP operates more effectively? 'No changes required' tick box

Thank you very much for your comments. Your input is appreciated.

Appendix 16: First reminder lawyers' internet survey



Dear \$FNAME\$,

We recently sent you an invitation to participate in a survey about the **Parenting Hearings Programme (PHP)** which we are conducting on behalf of the Ministry of Justice.

We would really like to include your opinions in this research. This is your opportunity to have your say on PHP and we would appreciate you taking the time to let us know what you think.

The survey should only take around 10 minutes to complete. If you have already completed this survey please disregard this e-mail.

This survey must be completed by **8th October 2008**.

Please click on the link below when you are ready to start the survey. Most of the time you will just need to click the button that best fits your answers. There are a few places where you can type in some words. Please use the "Next" arrow at the bottom of each screen to move forward. If you can't see the "Next" arrow, please scroll down until it comes into view.

Please do not use the "Forward" and "Back" buttons on your browser because this may terminate the interview. If you need to leave the survey just close your browser. When you are ready to continue (allow at least 5 minutes after closing down) then please use the link below and you should be back to the place where you stopped.

This is a survey of lawyers who have been involved in a Parenting Hearings Programme case, either as counsel for one of the parties, as a Lawyer for the Child, or as a Lawyer to Assist the Court. Please confirm whether you have ever been involved in a PHP case.

Please confirm whether you have ever been involved in a PHP case.

[Yes, have been involved in PHP](#)

[No, have not been involved in PHP](#)

Kind Regards Rosemary Cals Survey Project Manager Consumer Link

Please [click here](#) if you don't want to receive any more emails about this particular survey.

Please [click here](#) if you don't want to receive any more emails about any research or survey.

Appendix 17: Second reminder lawyers' internet survey



Dear \$FNAMES\$,

We recently invited you to participate in a survey for the evaluation of the **Parenting Hearings Programme (PHP)** which we are conducting on behalf of the Ministry of Justice. We had asked you to complete the survey by the end of today, but some people have asked if they can have a bit more time to complete the survey.

We have extended the deadline to the end of **13th October 2008**.

We would really like to include your opinions in this research. This is your opportunity to have your say on PHP and we would appreciate you taking the time to let us know what you think. The survey should take only 10 to 15 minutes to complete. If you have already taken part in this survey please disregard this e-mail.

When you are ready to start the survey, please click on the link below. Most of the time you will just need to click the button that best fits your answers. There are a few places where you can type in some words. Please use the "Next" arrow at the bottom of each screen to move forward. If you can't see the "Next" arrow, please scroll down until it comes into view.

Please do not use the "Forward" and "Back" buttons on your browser because this may terminate the interview. If you need to leave the survey just close your browser. When you are ready to continue (allow at least 5 minutes after closing down) then please use the link below and you should be back to the place where you stopped.

This is a survey of lawyers who have been involved in a Parenting Hearings Programme case, either as counsel for one of the parties, as a Lawyer for the Child, or as a Lawyer to Assist the Court. Please confirm whether you have ever been involved in a PHP case.

Please confirm whether you have ever been involved in a PHP case.

Yes, have been involved in PHP

No, have not been involved in PHP

Kind Regards Rosemary Cals Survey Project Manager Consumer Link

Please [click here](#) if you don't want to receive any more emails about this particular survey.

Please [click here](#) if you don't want to receive any more emails about any research or survey.

Appendix 18: Recontact reminder lawyers' internet survey

✖

Dear \$FNAME\$,

Thanks for participating in our recent research. We would be grateful if you would respond to our earlier email. Unfortunately we had a problem with two of the questions, and it did not allow a 0 (zero) response although that was a valid answer. We would appreciate it if you could take a minute to answer the following question.

You said that you have been involved in \$Q2B\$ PHP cases that you considered were not suitable for PHP and that you attempted to have some of these cases removed from PHP or not entered into PHP in the first place.

We would really appreciate your response before the 23rd October 2008.

About how many of them did you attempt to have removed from PHP or not entered into PHP? (Please give your best estimate.)


0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Kind Regards Rosemary Cals Survey Project Manager Consumer Link

Please [click here](#) if you don't want to receive any more emails about this particular survey.

Please [click here](#) if you don't want to receive any more emails about any research or survey.

Appendix 19: Recontact lawyers' internet survey



Dear \$FNAME\$,

Thanks for participating in our recent research but unfortunately we had a problem with two of the questions, and it did not allow a 0 (zero) response although that was a valid answer. We would appreciate it if you could take a minute to answer the following question.

You said that you have been involved in \$Q2B\$ PHP cases that you considered were not suitable for PHP and that you attempted to have some of these cases removed from PHP or not entered into PHP in the first place.

We would really appreciate your response before the 20th October 2008.

About how many of them did you attempt to have removed from PHP or not entered into PHP? (Please give your best estimate.)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Kind Regards Rosemary Cals Survey Project Manager Consumer Link

Please [click here](#) if you don't want to receive any more emails about this particular survey.

Please [click here](#) if you don't want to receive any more emails about any research or survey.

Appendix 20: Results for the Internet survey of lawyers¹

Section 1: Demographics

Table A20.1: Length of time practising family law at the Family Court

Number of years	No.	%
Up to 2 years	3	3
Over 2 to 5 years	13	11
Over 5 to 10 years	23	19
Over 10 to 20 years	43	36
Over 20 years	36	31
Total	118	100

Table A20.2: Whether acted as Lawyer for Child in the Family Court

	No.	%
Yes	71	60
No	47	40
Total	118	100

Table A20.3: Whether acted as Lawyer to Assist the Court in the Family Court

	No.	%
Yes	58	49
No	60	51
Total	118	100

Table A20.4: Number of cases involved with in various roles

	Counsel for parties		Lawyer for the Child		Lawyer to Assist the Court	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	13	11	20	28	50	86
One to five cases	80	68	38	54	8	14
Six to ten cases	17	14	11	15	0	0
11 to 20 cases	5	4	2	3	0	0
More than 20 cases	3	3	0	0	0	0
Respondents involved in each role	118	100	71	100	58	100

Table A20.5: Whether been involved in any final PHP hearings

	No.	%
Yes	76	64
No	42	36
Total	118	100

¹ Due to rounding the percentages in the tables may not add to the totals or sub-totals.

Section 2: Suitability of cases on PHP

Table A20.6: Whether suitable cases are generally being referred to PHP at the court

	No.	%
Definitely yes	30	25
Probably yes	67	57
Total yes	97	82
Probably no	8	7
Definitely no	3	3
Total no	11	9
Don't know	10	8
Total	118	100

Note: Of the 11 who stated that suitable cases are not generally being referred, when asked, 8 stated that both some suitable cases do not go into PHP and some unsuitable cases do go into PHP and 3 stated that some unsuitable cases do go into PHP.

Table A20.7: Whether ever been involved in a PHP cases they considered not suitable for PHP

	No.	%
Yes	42	36
No	76	64
Total	118	100

Table A20.8: Number of cases involved in considered not suitable

	No.	%
One	18	43
Two	17	41
Three – Five	6	14
Eight	1	2
Respondents who considered PHP case(s) not suitable	42	100

Table A20.9: Whether attempted to have any of these cases(s) removed from / not entered into PHP

	No.	%
Yes	16	38
No	26	62
Respondents who considered PHP case(s) not suitable	42	100

Note: Of the 16 who attempted to have case(s) removed, 4 said that it was easy to have them removed, 11 that it was difficult and 1 did not know.

Table A20.10: Rating of suitability of cases for PHP

	Very Suitable	Quite suitable	Total suitable	Not that suitable	Not at all suitable	Total not suitable	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Where there are allegations of serious family violence and there have been applications for protection orders	8	22	30	23	44	67	3
Where there are allegations of serious family violence but there have not been applications for protection orders	8	25	33	33	31	64	3
Where there are allegations of less serious or "minor" family violence	15	51	66	17	14	31	3
Where there are allegations of child physical abuse	7	14	20	30	47	77	3
Where there are allegations of child sexual abuse	7	3	9	22	64	86	4
Where there are allegations of child psychological abuse	3	21	25	32	39	71	4
Relocation (within the same New Zealand island)	22	36	58	24	16	40	2
Relocation (to other New Zealand island or Australia)	15	26	42	25	30	54	4
Relocation overseas (beyond Australia)	14	17	31	20	46	66	3
Where one or both of the parties have significant mental health issues	6	12	18	32	44	76	6
Where there are issues of drug and/or alcohol addiction	9	38	47	27	22	49	3
All cases except where there are strong counter indications	11	36	47	16	19	36	17
Cases that are relatively simple and straightforward	68	24	92	3	4	8	1
Long term intractable cases	23	36	59	12	24	36	5
Urgent cases	48	32	81	6	8	14	6
Cases that have not settled following conciliation (ie counselling and/or mediation)	32	47	80	12	5	17	3
Care and Protection cases where CYF is a party to the proceedings	5	20	25	25	39	64	11

Base: All respondents (n=118)

Section 3: Lawyer for Child

Table A20.11: Clarity of role of Lawyer for Child under PHP

	No.	%
Very clear	11	22
Quite clear	24	47
Total clear	35	69
Not that clear	14	27
Not at all clear	2	4
Total not clear	16	31
Respondents who have acted as Lawyer for Child in PHP case(s)	51	100

Table A20.12: Extent participation of child(ren) differs in PHP process to non-PHP process

	No.	%
Much more participation in PHP	1	2
A little more participation in PHP	9	18
More participation in PHP	10	20
About the same	31	61
A little less participation in PHP	7	14
A lot less participation in PHP	3	6
Less participation in PHP	10	20
Respondents who have acted as Lawyer for Child in PHP case(s)	51	100

Table A20.13: Whether have enough time as Lawyer for Child to prepare for PHP cases

	Before the Judge's List		Before the Preliminary Hearing		Before the Final Hearing	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Definitely yes	6	12	7	14	9	27
Probably yes	29	57	33	65	21	64
Total yes	35	69	40	78	30	91
Probably no	14	27	10	20	2	6
Definitely no	2	4	1	2	1	3
Total no	16	31	11	22	3	9
Respondents involved in each stage	51	100	51	100	33	100

Table A20.14: Whether role as Lawyer for Child different under PHP and non-PHP systems

	No.	%
Very different	0	0
Quite different	12	24
Total different	12	24
Not that different	34	67
Not at all different	5	10
Total not different	39	76
Respondents who have acted as Lawyer for Child in PHP case(s)	51	100

Table A20.15: Whether Lawyer for Child briefs are more restricted in their directions for PHP than non-PHP cases

	No.	%
Yes, much more restricted	0	0
Yes, a little more restricted	18	35
Total more restricted	18	35
No different	32	63
No, a little less restricted	1	2
No, a lot less restricted	0	0
Total less restricted	1	2
Respondents who have acted as Lawyer for Child in PHP case(s)	51	100

Section 4: Effectiveness of the PHP process

Table A20.16: Rating of effectiveness of the PHP process

	Very effective	Quite effective	Total effective	Not that effective	Not at all effective	Total not effective	Don't know / Does not apply
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1 Helping parents work out arrangements for the future care of their child(ren)	21	58	80	15	3	19	2
2 Providing a less adversarial process overall for the parties	35	42	77	19	3	21	2
3 Providing a less adversarial experience at the court hearings	32	42	74	16	5	21	5
4 Appropriately limiting the issues that are addressed	30	48	78	14	6	19	3
5 Allowing the parties to feel that they have had their say	42	35	76	11	7	18	6
6 Providing a timeframe that is appropriate for the parents	29	51	80	13	3	16	4
7 Providing a timeframe that is appropriate for the child(ren)	42	42	83	9	2	11	6
8 Appropriately limiting cross examination	28	45	73	12	8	20	7
9 Encouraging the participation of children	8	30	37	33	9	42	20
10 Appropriately limiting the information in the affidavits	20	42	62	25	8	34	4
11 Resulting in long lasting solutions without the parties coming back to court	14	36	51	14	3	17	32
12 Resulting in fair and appropriate outcomes	14	58	73	13	8	21	6
13 Ensuring that specialist psychological reports are requested when appropriate	12	30	42	30	8	38	20
14 Ensuring that social work reports are requested when appropriate	8	36	45	25	10	35	20
15 Ensuring that drug and alcohol tests are undertaken when appropriate	8	26	34	24	9	33	33

Base: All respondents (n=118)

Table A20.17: Comparison of effectiveness of the PHP process to the usual non-PHP process

	Much more effective	A little more effective	Total more effective	About the same	A little less effective	A lot less effective	Total less effective	Don't know / Does not apply
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1 Helping parents work out arrangements for the future care of their child(ren)	25	37	62	25	3	3	7	7
2 Providing a less adversarial process overall for the parties	34	36	70	20	3	2	4	5
3 Providing a less adversarial experience at the court hearings	35	40	75	14	5	1	6	5
4 Appropriately limiting the issues that are addressed	41	37	78	13	2	4	6	3
5 Allowing the parties to feel that they have had their say	36	31	67	14	6	8	14	5
6 Providing a timeframe that is appropriate for the parents	42	39	81	10	3	2	4	4
7 Providing a timeframe that is appropriate for the child(ren)	46	36	81	9	1	2	3	7
8 Appropriately limiting cross examination	36	34	69	17	5	3	8	5
9 Encouraging the participation of children	8	18	25	45	8	3	11	19
10 Appropriately limiting the information in the affidavits	26	38	64	24	2	3	4	8
11 Resulting in long lasting solutions without the parties coming back to court	12	16	28	26	5	3	8	37
12 Resulting in fair and appropriate outcomes	14	20	35	42	10	4	14	9
13 Ensuring that specialist psychological reports are requested when appropriate	7	14	21	43	10	5	15	20
14 Ensuring that social work reports are requested when appropriate	6	17	23	44	8	4	12	21
15 Ensuring that drug and alcohol tests are undertaken when appropriate	6	13	19	42	8	3	10	30

Base: All respondents (n=118)

Section 5: Attitudes and opinions about PHP

Table A20.18: Level of agreement/disagreement with statements

	Strongly agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Slightly disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree	Don't know / Does not apply
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1 I believe that parties are generally more satisfied with the PHP process than with the non-PHP court process	24	25	48	26	6	4	10	15
2 I believe that parties are generally more satisfied with the outcome from the PHP process than with the outcome from non-PHP court process	15	25	41	30	9	4	14	16
3 When I did my first PHP case I had sufficient information about the PHP process	19	31	50	11	25	12	37	2
4 I understand what the PHP process is	44	41	85	8	4	3	7	1
5 I have received enough information about PHP from the Ministry of Justice and the Family Court	31	37	69	9	14	7	21	1
6 I have received enough information about PHP from all sources	27	26	53	22	18	6	24	1
7 I have received sufficient training about PHP	19	27	47	23	18	11	29	2
8 The DVD about the PHP process is very helpful for the parties	41	36	76	11	6	3	9	3
9 I am clear about my role as lawyer for the parties in PHP cases	26	37	64	12	14	3	18	7
10 I know what the judges expect of me when I represent parties in PHP cases	18	31	49	16	23	7	30	5
11 The guidelines I have received about the PHP pilot are clear	25	33	58	19	16	5	21	2
12 I am confident that I can prepare my clients for PHP hearings	41	30	70	6	10	8	18	6
13 PHP cases are harder for me than non-PHP cases because I don't know what my role as a lawyer is going to be in the Preliminary Hearing	6	36	42	22	16	17	33	3
14 There is sufficient time allowed at Preliminary Hearings	15	39	54	17	17	8	25	3
15 I generally have sufficient time to prepare for the Judge's list	36	42	78	12	6	2	8	3
16 I generally have sufficient time to prepare for the Preliminary Hearing	29	42	70	11	9	7	16	3
17 I believe that it is useful for the parties to be able to speak directly to the judge	61	30	91	4	3	2	4	1
18 The PHP process is a fair and appropriate process	23	34	57	19	11	12	23	2
19 There is a lack of consistency between judges that impacts negatively on the PHP process	19	31	49	22	8	3	12	17
20 There is a lack of consistency between judges that impacts negatively on PHP outcomes	18	28	46	29	5	6	11	14
21 The PHP process pressures people too much to come to an agreement	12	32	44	18	19	15	35	3
22 The PHP process overly limits the issues that can be raised	20	25	46	23	20	9	30	2
23 The PHP process appropriately allows for flexibility in dealing with cases	29	33	62	19	9	6	15	3
24 I am given the opportunity to cross examine when necessary	31	28	59	11	14	6	20	9
25 I am given the opportunity to raise any issues of interest that are not raised by my client	13	33	46	23	13	7	19	12
26 *There is sufficient time allowed at Final Hearings	16	33	49	21	17	8	25	5
27 *I generally have sufficient time to prepare for the Final Hearing	33	42	75	13	7	4	11	1
28 *PHP cases are harder for me than non-PHP cases because I don't know what my role as a lawyer is going to be in the Final Hearing	5	28	33	29	17	17	34	4

Base: All respondents (n=118)

*Base: Respondents involved in a Final Hearing (n=76)

Section 6: Overall

Table A20.19: Rating of PHP overall as a new process in the Family Court

	All respondents		Number of years practising family law at the Family Court*					
	No. %		Up to 10 years No. %		Over 10 to 20 years No. %		Over 20 years No. %	
Very good	35	30	11	28	11	26	13	36
Quite good	48	41	20	51	18	42	10	28
Total good	83	70	31	79	29	67	23	64
Neutral	21	18	6	15	6	14	9	25
Quite poor	9	8	1	3	6	14	2	6
Very poor	5	4	1	3	2	5	2	6
Total poor	14	12	2	5	8	19	4	11
Total	118	100	39	100	43	100	36	100

* Caution should be taken when interpreting results due to small sample sizes

Table A20.20: Whether PHP should be continued in the pilot areas at the end of the pilot

	All respondents		Number of years practising family law at the Family Court*					
	No. %		Up to 10 years No. %		Over 10 to 20 years No. %		Over 20 years No. %	
Definitely yes	51	43	20	51	14	33	17	47
Probably yes	41	35	15	38	18	42	8	22
Total yes	92	78	35	90	32	74	25	69
Probably no	8	7	2	5	3	7	3	8
Definitely no	10	8	1	3	5	12	4	11
Total no	18	15	3	8	8	19	7	19
Don't know	8	7	1	3	3	7	4	11
Total	118	100	39	100	43	100	36	100

* Caution should be taken when interpreting results due to small sample sizes

Table A20.21: Whether PHP should be extended nationally

	All respondents		Number of years practising family law at the Family Court*					
	No. %		Up to 10 years No. %		Over 10 to 20 years No. %		Over 20 years No. %	
Definitely yes	41	35	17	44	11	26	13	36
Probably yes	46	39	15	38	20	47	11	31
Total yes	87	74	32	82	31	72	24	67
Probably no	6	5	3	8	1	2	2	6
Definitely no	14	12	2	5	7	16	5	14
Total no	20	17	5	13	8	19	7	19
Don't know	11	9	2	5	4	9	5	14
Total	118	100	39	100	43	100	36	100

* Caution should be taken when interpreting results due to small sample sizes

Table A20.22: Whether urgent interim hearings in the non-PHP system would provide the same benefits as PHP Preliminary Hearings

	All respondents		Number of years practising family law at the Family Court*					
	No. %		Up to 10 years No. %		Over 10 to 20 years No. %		Over 20 years No. %	
Definitely yes	20	17	6	15	8	19	6	17
Probably yes	61	52	22	56	21	49	18	50
Total yes	81	69	28	72	29	67	24	67
Probably no	26	22	7	18	11	26	8	22
Definitely no	5	4	1	3	1	2	3	8
Total no	31	26	8	21	12	28	11	31
Don't know	6	5	3	8	2	5	1	3
Total	118	100	39	100	43	100	36	100

* Caution should be taken when interpreting results due to small sample sizes



Corp 400

ISBN 978-0-478-29073-X

newzealand.govt.nz