

**Risk assessment protocol
to evaluate the risk of harm to
children caused by
Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP)
(including recommended intervention strategies)**

Published by
Family Conflict Resolution Services
Box 61027 Maple Grove P.O., Oakville, Ontario Canada L6J 7P5
Tel (905) 829-0407 Fax (905) 829-1571
Website: <http://familyconflict.freeyellow.com>

Release Date: July 1, 2005

Table of Contents

Section 1

Introduction, background and founding principles

Section 2

Application and risk assessment process

Section 3

Benefits of the risk assessment protocol

Section 4

The risk of harm to child assessment report

Section 5

Recommended intervention strategies

Section One

Introduction – background – founding principles

The risk assessment protocol outlined in this document has been developed jointly through the efforts of Family Conflict Resolution Services, a non-profit, community based organization, along with caring family-health and legal professionals. Concerned members of the public and organizations from the community at large have also contributed to the development of the materials contained in this document. All of the various items in this document which are listed as HAP behaviours, factors, influences or indicators have been gathered from interviews with hundreds of parents and children who have relayed their experiences in the court system and the problems they have experienced when dealing with a parent or other family members considered as engaging in Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP). Many interviews were videotaped (when possible) as part of an ongoing research into Hostile-Aggressive Parenting and its effect on children and families.

This document has been developed specifically out of the need to address the growing problems facing families dealing with the family court system when it comes to custody rights and the parenting time of children. There is a growing public dissatisfaction in the way in which the court deals with conflict between parents and addresses the issue of custody and parenting time. Many children are expressing significant dissatisfaction in the way in which custody and parenting time is being decided upon in the family court system. Many children complain about their wishes being disregarded by assessors and the courts.

This protocol is intended to be used as a tool by those familiar with Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP), and to assist those persons to assess with reasonable accuracy and consistency, the level of risk of harm to a child, teenager or young adult due to Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP) when families are being affected by separation and/or divorce. Also included are recommended intervention strategies based on the assessed level of risk of harm to the child. This protocol document was developed as a follow-up to the companion document “Understanding and Effectively Dealing with Hostile-Aggressive Parenting” which deals with the general subject of HAP in greater depth. A copy of the companion HAP document “Effectively Dealing with Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP)” may be downloaded from the Family Conflict Resolution website at <http://familyconflict.freeyellow.com>

The procedures and recommended intervention strategies contained in this document can, with the meaningful support from the court, legal and health care professionals and others in the community, help to provide a consistent and effective approach to dealing with Hostile-Aggressive Parenting. This document also provides concise guidelines as to what specific conditions should be met in order to consider a parent as being “unfit” which would warrant removal of all parental rights by the courts. Throughout this document the word “parent” shall be considered synonymous with the word “guardian”. A guardian can include grandparents, extended family members, babysitters and to any other person who may be involved in caring and rearing of the child who is the focus of the conflict.

This document and the accompanying checklist forms should be used for the evaluation of any person who may have the role of caregiver to a child where HAP behaviours have been identified as a concern and potential risk to the child. It must be emphasized, however, that the procedures

outlined in this protocol deal primarily with the decision-making, custodial status and parenting time of a child. Although the risk factors outlined in this document would be considered as being a major component of a custody evaluation, if this risk assessment protocol is being used as part of an assessment to determine the residency placement of a child, it must be emphasized that the other factors relating to the best interest of the child must also be considered.

Public input invited

At the time of printing, this document was still being circulated to members of the public as well as to recognized legal and health care professionals for their feedback and comment. All comments and suggestions received will be reviewed by the Documents Review Committee for inclusion in future releases of this document. All comments and suggestions from any source are most welcomed and encouraged. Should you have any questions or wish to provide comment on the contents of document then please forward your comments in writing to:

Family Conflict Resolution Services
P.O. Box 61027 Maple Grove Post Office
Oakville, Ontario
Canada L6J 7P5
Attn: Documents Review Committee
or by E mail: Program Coordinator, Mr. Vernon Beck: vernonbeck@cogeco.ca

© 2002 - 2005, All rights reserved

Readers are welcome to copy this draft document for their personal use, including use in individual court cases. Permission will be granted without charge to all readers who may wish to copy and distribute multiple copies of this draft document for educational, discussion or not for profit purposes, providing a prior request in writing is forwarded to the Document Review Committee by regular mail or by E mail to the program's coordinator.

Now available for 2005 - Risk assessments for parents and risk assessment training for professionals

Risk assessments done by trained representatives of our organization using the procedure outlined in this document is now available for those parents in Ontario who may be involved in the family court system and who have children being adversely affected by HAP. If you are interested in having a risk assessment conducted for submission in your family court matter please contact us for further information. If you are a professional who would like to be trained to provide risk assessment reports in court cases involving Hostile-Aggressive Parenting to clients in your area, then training is also available upon request.

Founding Principles

This document, *“Risk Assessment Protocol for Evaluating the Risk of Harm to Children and Youth Caused by Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP)”* and the recommended intervention strategies forming part of this document were developed to encompass sensible, necessary and basic principles which function to best serve the interests of the child, the child’s immediate family, extended family and the community as a whole. The established principles upon which this document has been founded are:

- 1) That all concerned extended family members of a child families, not just parents, are recognized stakeholders in protecting the child best interest and well-being of the child and as such, that all concerned extended family member should have ready access to all information that is relative to the best interest of the child so that the parents and extended family will be best able to protect the child.
- 2) That Hostile-Aggressive Parenting is a major cause of short term and long term harm to children of separations or divorce and exposure of children to Hostile-Aggressive Parenting is an undesirable influence that is not in the best interest of the child.
- 3) That the principles of fundamental Justice in family law are best served by investigative and risk assessment processes relating to custody and parenting time that are based on sound reason and common sense, transparency and applied with an element of reasonable discretion which will in combination, yield consistent and predictable outcomes with the least possible margin of error and harm to any child.
- 4) That harm to children from Hostile-Aggressive Parenting is significantly lessened when parents have been fully informed about the risk assessment process, its impact on their children and the consequences to the parents should parents engage in Hostile-Aggressive Parenting.
- 5) Upon separation and after, that every child is acknowledged to possess certain inalienable rights which are outlined in “The Rights of Children”. The rights and protections of the child shall be given the highest priority above all other considerations.
- 6) Upon separation and after, that both parents should be provided the opportunity to parent their child within a fair and just parenting arrangement, which provides the opportunity for the child to have a meaningful, and if possible, an equal relationship with each involved parent within in a safe and loving environment.
- 7) Upon separation and after, that each parent must be given the fair and equal opportunity to demonstrate their capability and willingness to parent his/her child, along with contributing to aspects and issues which represent the best interests of the child.
- 8) That the parenting styles of parents do vary between households and that a parent’s custody rights shall not be decided solely on the criteria of which parent is the better parent of the two but based on each individual parent’s ability and willingness to meet minimum parenting standards as established by the friends, the family and the community in which the child is a part of.
- 9) That changing circumstances and/or the passage of time should provide parents the

opportunity to re-establish custody status of their child should their custody status and/or parenting time have been previously suspended or made less equal to the other parent due to Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP).

- 10) That families experiencing conflict during separation and divorce can benefit from ongoing support from the community until such a time that as they are able to develop a working relationship between themselves that is in the best interests of their children.
- 11) That parental conduct which promotes cooperation and openness between parents, as well as encourages the other parent's participation in parenting of the child, is a significant factor in eliminating conflict and emotional stress which is in the best interest of all members of the family.
- 12) That a child's friends, as well as stability with school and familiar community are important social factors that must be carefully considered during times of separation and divorce.
- 13) That conflict within a family is not an isolated incident that affects only those in the immediate family, but indirectly impacts other members of the community as a whole and as such may require the community as a whole to help solve.
- 14) That families experiencing conflict will benefit by a process that resolves their conflicts in the most non-adversarial manner possible.
- 15) That meaningful and effective positive motivators based on rewarding parents for good behaviour, as well as enforcement control procedures to deal with consequences for bad behaviour, will inspire parents to comply willingly with the goals and objectives of reducing conflict and Hostile-Aggressive Parenting.
- 16) That positive parental role models, both male and female, play a vital part in the mental, emotional and spiritual growth of the child.
- 17) That the role of parent is a privilege that each parent must be allowed to maintain through their demonstration of parenting skills that recognize the needs of the child and the importance that both parents play in their children's lives.
- 18) That a child's care and upbringing should be the primary responsibility of the natural parents, providing this is consistent with the best interests of the child.
- 19) Should a child's natural parents be unable or unwilling to fulfill their duties as parents or should it be determined that it is not in the best interest of the child to be cared for by the natural parents, then the opportunity to care for the child should first be made available to the child's extended family, then the community (adoption or permanent placement) and then the state (foster care or interim placement), in that order of priority.

The Rights of Children

The members of the review committee overseeing the development of this risk assessment protocol believe that the physical and emotional well-being of the youngest, most precious members of our community must be protected by society. Below is a summary of the “Rights of Children” which has been included in this document as a guide to the fair and just treatment of children affected by separation and divorce. The Rights of Children document indicated below is one of the principal documents found in “*The family Assistance and Parent Support Program*”, which was an earlier program developed by Family Conflict Resolution Services. All those who use this risk assessment protocol should apply it in a manner that would be consistent with the basic rights of children as listed here.

- 1) **THE RIGHT to be treated as an important human being, with unique feelings, ideas and desires and not as a source of argument between parents.**
- 2) **THE RIGHT to a sense of security and belonging derived from being a part of a stable home, school and community environment.**
- 3) **THE RIGHT to flourish in an environment that is free of negative social influences such as drugs, alcohol, crime, disrespect, bigotry, exploitation and neglect.**
- 4) **THE RIGHT to a continuing relationship with both parents and their extended families, based on a fair and just arrangement that will provide the opportunity to have a meaningful relationship with both parents, which includes the freedom to receive and express love for both.**
- 5) **THE RIGHT to have “listening parents” who work cooperatively in the best interest of the child as well as all members of the family.**
- 6) **THE RIGHT to express love and affection for each parent without having to stifle that love because of fear of disapproval by the other parent.**
- 7) **THE RIGHT to know that their parents’ decision to separate or divorce is not their responsibility.**
- 8) **THE RIGHT to continuing care and guidance from both parents, where they can be educated in mind, nourished in spirit, developed in body and surrounded by unconditional love.**
- 9) **THE RIGHT to honest answers to questions about their changing family relationships.**
- 10) **THE RIGHT to know and appreciate what is good in each parent without one parent degrading the other.**
- 11) **THE RIGHT to a relaxed, secure relationship with both parents without being placed in a position to manipulate one parent against the other.**

- 12) **THE RIGHT to have parents who will not undermine the child's time with the other parent by suggesting tempting alternatives or by threatening to withhold activities or parenting time as a punishment for the child's wrongdoing.**
- 13) **THE RIGHT to be able to experience regular and consistent parental contact and the right to know the reason for not having regular contact.**
- 14) **THE RIGHT to be a child, to be insulated from parental conflicts and problems.**
- 15) **THE RIGHT to be taught, according to their developing levels, to understand values, to assume responsibility for their actions, and to cope with the consequences of their choices.**
- 16) **THE RIGHT to be able to participate in their own destiny and to be taught about their family's culture and history.**
- 17) **THE RIGHT to be able to contact any parent or any member of either parent's extended family without unreasonable objection or interference from either parent.**
- 18) **THE RIGHT to be listened to by legal authorities and to have their age appropriate wishes and preferences made known to any court of law.**
- 19) **The RIGHT to be supported and cared for, both financially and emotionally, by one's own parents and extended family as the first option before the involvement of any government or other third party.**
- 20) **THE RIGHT to be assisted by competent third parties whose responsibility it is to protect or advocate for children and to be provided this assistance by the parties without prejudice or bias in favor of, or against, either of the parents.**

Section 2

Application of this protocol and the risk assessment process

Application of this risk of harm assessment protocol

This risk assessment protocol was intended to be used to provide a reliable and consistent measure of the risk of harm to a child caused by Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP). Although this assessment protocol can be used at almost any stage of a family's development, it has been specifically developed for application to families just before, during or after the high conflict separation and/or divorce, those times when HAP is usually most prevalent and where children most at risk of harm by parental behaviour.

In a normally functioning family, HAP will not be present to any great extent, although some minor conflict between parents and extended families over the upbringing of children can be found in most reasonably functioning families. Some conflict within a family unit can be considered normal and healthy and it part of normal human interaction. Children, themselves, learn coping skills by observing how parents interact and how parents and extended family members resolve conflicts within the family. Early signs of HAP can be observed to some extent even years before a family breaks up and these early signs of HAP may intensify over time if the family does not seek counselling to resolve its difficulties.

However, as the normal functioning of a family begins to deteriorate and show strains during the times when it approaches a point of breaking up, HAP will make its first noticeable, ugly appearance. HAP will enter its most observable and harmful stage once one of the parents has made the decision to leave the relationship and to pursue a course which ultimately will break-up the family. In most situations, HAP will be most intense once steps towards litigation have been taken.

Once one parent has entered the adversarial family court process and has obtained legal advice, HAP will usually escalate and become most intense. As possession of the children gives the "sole custodial" parent much power and control over the children and the other parent for a lifetime, getting the control and loyalty of the children is one of the first priorities of an HAP parent. HAP is the first stage of the process that HAP parent uses to get this power and control over the other parent.

One of the fundamental principles upon which this protocol has been developed is to recognize that parents are sometimes driven to excessive HAP behaviour for a number of apparent reasons which are outlined in the document "Effectively dealing with Hostile-Aggressive Parenting" The two most influential motivators for HAP are 1) power and control and 2) the fight for "sole custody" or "primary care". It is only natural for parents to want to be of equal status to another parent but the adversarial court system usually makes one parent the winner and one the loser.

It cannot be emphasized enough, that the emotional and physical well-being of children from broken families, is significantly impacted by the level of HAP exhibited by the parents and that it is of utmost importance the any intervention be based on principles which will reduce conflict. Fairness and the "opportunity" of equality play significant roles in addressing HAP for without those two principles being present, HAP cannot be successfully addressed.

Conducting the risk of harm evaluation

The process of conducting a comprehensive assessment of the risk of harm to a child evaluation because of HAP is not a difficult process. It can in many cases involve a review of documentary evidence as well as the review of evidence gathered from a number of direct and indirect collateral sources. Letters, E mails, testimony from children, tape recordings or testimony from other persons would all be considered as relevant sources of information which could be reviewed prior as part of the risk assessment process. In situations where information has not been previously gathered together for the evaluator, this process can take a considerable number of hours spread over days and weeks to properly complete by someone with a comprehensive understanding of the process itself.

Although the risk assessment protocol can be completed by a non-professional, persons who have thoroughly studied the process or who have received training in administering this risk assessment protocol and filling in the report sheet would certainly be able to complete the process in a much shorter period of time. For best results and best reception in the court system, parties would be advised to hire the services of a qualified counsellor, social worker, child or family advocate or other professional who can take parents through the process by an outside third party.

Evaluating the risk of harm using the procedures in this document has been based on a simple value system which assigns values on parenting behaviours and influences that on the basis of probability, would be considered harmful to a child. The risk of harm components are valued based on two main elements, the first being the various levels of severity of Hostile-Aggressive Parenting influences and risk indicators and the second element being the passage of time. HAP influences have been grouped into three major categories, those categories being 1) moderate; 2) severe; 3) critical. Additional risk indicators have been categorized as being either “high risk” or “familial.”

The higher the risk of harm to the child a particular behaviour is, the higher its point value. The highest risk value is 500 points and is assigned to any single behaviour considered as being “Critical” to a child’s emotional or physical safety and well-being. Using the procedure outlined in the risk assessment protocol document does not require the services of a health care or legal professional to evaluate, but only someone familiar with identifying HAP behaviours and properly filling in the appropriate evaluation forms.

Note for cases where Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS) is suspected:

In most cases, children are an important source of information about parental conduct seeing as they are the ones most usually affected by HAP. Input from the children about parental behaviour plays a role in determining the existence of harm to a child caused by HAP. Caution must be exercised when using this protocol where severe Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS) has been entrenched in the children and where children have developed a hatred or fear of one parent without being able to give reason or explanation or direct recollection of the cause of their feelings. In situations where severe PAS is present, a child may actually lie or assist the HAP parent to hide some of their behaviours which may make the HAP parent appear to be less of a risk of harm to the child which may distort the evaluation process in favour of the HAP parent. The possibility that PAS may be affecting the information being provided must be considered by the person conducting the risk assessment evaluation. Weight should be given to third party collateral information should it be suspected that a child may be less than truthful as a result of PAS.

Definitions

Throughout this document the following definitions and/or meanings shall apply:

- 1) “Subject parent” refers to the person who is being evaluated using this risk assessment protocol. In most cases this refers to the parent or step parent but can also refer to any guardian, family member or any other person who may have some control over the child and is exhibiting HAP behaviours towards another parent of the child.
- 2) “Child” or “subject child” shall be interpreted as follows:
 - a) Any person, who because of age or attendance at school, would be considered a dependant or partially dependant of one or more parents/guardians, and who would be considered dependant on the decision-making, parental guidance or financial support of another person over the age of majority. This could include any person up to the age of 25 who is still attending school and is dependant or partially dependant on one or more of his/her parents for support in relation to housing or finances.
 - b) Any child who would be considered as the subject of parent’s conflict in terms of custody or parenting time. In most cases this refers to a child which is living with one or both of the parents.
 - c) To refer to the plural, “children” where more than one child may be involved.
- 3) “Any child” refers to any child either inside or outside of the parent’s household irregardless if the child is a biological or non-biological child. For example an HAP parent may have seriously injured or threatened another child who is now not living in the household of the parent or who was the child of a neighbour. Even though this child may not be the subject of conflict, the parent’s behaviour with this child could be an indicator of the parent’s propensity to HAP with another child and therefore relevant in establishing the level of risk of harm relating to another child.
- 4) “Parental Alienation Syndrome” or PAS as it more often called, refers to a mental condition of a child in which the child refuses the other parent’s attempts to have a meaningful relationship with the child and the child’s reasons for refusing the relationship appear not to be based on logic or contrary to the facts in the case. (See evaluating PAS later in this publication)
- 5) Primary Care Parent – The parent who is designated on a Court Order or a consent Agreement to have more than 50% of the child’s parenting time with him/her.

The passage of time as a factor in evaluating risk of harm to the child

The element of the passage of time has been incorporated into the point system applied to the various categories of HAP behaviours and indicators. The more recently a parent’s behaviour has been noted, the more likely it is that the parent is to continue or to repeat the behaviour again. As time passes and there are no reoccurrences of a particular behaviour, it can be reasonably assumed that the hostile feelings and behaviours of a parent towards another parent or family member will be less of a risk to the child. During the development of this risk assessment protocol, it was also felt that some reasonable method of crediting a parent for good behaviour must be reflected in the point system, so that those parents who have overcome their problems with HAP could be recognized for their progress.

Generally, it was felt that three levels of time reference were appropriate, those being, a) within the past 24 months; b) within 24 to 72 months and; c) more than 72 months ago. A 24 month period of

time was felt a reasonable amount of time to allow a parent's hostile emotions to settle down and for the parent to get on with their life. The 24 month period of time allows parents who have successfully corrected their HAP behaviour to reduce their point score, thus placing their child at less risk of harm than when they were first evaluated. If a parent has managed to keep their HAP behaviours under control over 6 years, then the risk is reduced to a minimum although it is not eliminated completely. Mr. Bruce Rivers, the former Executive Director of the Children's Aid Society in Toronto, Ontario once stated before a public audience that it was widely recognized by his agency that past behaviour is a strong indicator of future behaviour, a view which is view held by many in the community.

It must be noted that some factors such as threats to kill a child or attempts to kidnap a child, the time factor has been expanded to also include the child's immediate situation. In some situations, parent's behaviour may be considered so harmful or potentially harmful to the child as to warrant immediate removal or police apprehension of a child from an HAP parent and placement of the child into an environment where he/she is not at an extreme or serious risk of harm.

The risk assessment process

Generally, the process of conducting a risk assessment of harm to a child by HAP involves five steps as outlined below:

Step One: Introduction and familiarization of process to participating parties

All of the major significant parties who have volunteered or who have been ordered to participate in the risk assessment evaluation process will be given a copy of the risk assessment report form and asked to review the report form on their own. Generally, the parties involved include parents and other concerned members of the child's family. All participants will be told to contact the risk assessment evaluator should he/she have any questions about the various behaviours and factors listed on the sheets while they review the report form. All participating parties should be advised that they should carefully go through the sheets and to conduct a "self evaluation" of the party being evaluated by checking off the applicable behaviours and risk factors that they feel are applicable in the case they are associated with. Parties should be advised by the evaluator that they should be able to provide as much collateral information as they can in support of the behaviours/indicators that they have indicated on their self evaluation copy of the report sheet. The parties should be told to gather any collateral information for the evaluator to review.

Step Two - Investigation by the risk assessment evaluator

After the participating parties have indicated that they have made themselves familiar with the information required and have gathered the required collateral information together, the evaluator will then commence the process of compiling the information in preparation of the completion of the final assessment report.

Once the risk assessment evaluator has gathered enough information to satisfy himself/herself that any one of the listed items on the evaluation sheet are applicable to the party being evaluated, the assessment evaluator will check the applicable items off on the final report form. The assessor should keep a detailed record of all the information and from what source it came from to support their decision to indicate whether a particular item on the report was applicable or not. In addition to information from the involved parties themselves, the risk assessment evaluator will also gather collateral information from whatever available sources there are such as:

- Interviews with the child
- Tape recordings
- Video tapes
- Police records
- Child Welfare protection records
- Financial records
- Court documents
- Assessment reports from other agencies
- Any third party testimony or information
- Information about witnesses
- Any other information available from any source, etc.

Step Three - Review of Assessor's interim report with the assessed parties

Once the assessment risk assessment evaluator has completed his/her interim assessment report, a copy of the interim report will be given to all participating parties for their review and comments. Participants should be allowed no less than 7 days to provide feedback and up to 30 days if matters are not considered urgent before the court. The purpose of the review is to allow any of the parties to review the risk evaluator's interim report and to discuss with the evaluator any areas they feel that an error or omission may have been made. Should the risk assessment evaluator feel that the complaints have merit then the report will be changed to reflect the changes. The risk assessment evaluator should be able to explain any of the conclusions they arrived at in their report based on the information he/she obtained during the risk assessment process.

Step four – Appeals process (Optional)

Should there be a dispute between the risk assessment evaluator and any of the involved parties concerning errors or omissions in the report and the parties are not able to come to a mutual agreeable understanding on the accuracy of the report, then the party who disputes the report will file a dispute to the report to an appeals tribunal (in areas where such a tribunal is available), clearly outlining the reasons for the dispute and supporting evidence/information in support of their complaint. If an appeals tribunal is not available in the area to rule on the validity of the report, then arguments to the report will be attached to the report and submitted as part of the report to the court.

Step five - Submission of assessor's final report

Once steps one to four have been completed, the risk assessment evaluator will issue a final report will be given to the parties and forwarded to the courts if matters are before the court.

Section 3

Benefits of using this risk of harm assessment Protocol

The *Risk of Harm to Children due to HAP risk assessment protocol* offers many benefits that current processes used in the family court system do not provide. Adoption of this risk assessment protocol to determine the risk of harm to children of divorce will result in numerous benefits that will be directly experienced by the following parties:

- **The Children**
- **The Parents**
- **The Extended Families**
- **The Community**
- **Legal and health care professionals**
- **The Justice System**

Creates a level playing field and the basis of parental education

Most current child custody and access evaluation processes are applied in secret without parents knowing what the assessor is supposed to be looking for when they conduct an assessment. Most of the process is a big mystery for most parents and ends up being a process in which the emphasis seems to be on exposing unsuspecting parents for their bad parenting and mistakes that they may have made in the past. Custody evaluators often refuse to disclose the methodology they use and often refuse to disclose the questions they used when gathering information. Most current processes rely on a system which is intended to keep parents unaware of what is going on and then trying to “catch” parents doing something wrong. Keeping parents in the dark creates an unfair playing field and pits parents against the system. Court decisions often being made based on old information from the past rather than more relevant, current information.

The application of this risk assessment protocol in an open manner creates a level playing field by allowing all parties involved in the caring and/or upbringing of a child the opportunity to know beforehand, exactly what behaviours are positive and which ones would be considered negative. Giving parents the opportunity of improving parental behaviour at the earliest possible time is in the best interest of a child and should be the utmost priority in any process. By making all parties fully aware of the risk assessment process itself, parents are given an excellent learning tool which will help them to improve on their parenting. The open and accountable process of this protocol ensures everyone is given an equal chance to improve on their parenting before and during an assessment which will significantly reduce conflict and hostilities at the earliest possible stage of family conflict.

Highest level of reliability and predictability in children’s outcomes

Most current child custody and access evaluation processes fail to address the child’s best interest in the most effective manner. Most processes currently in use have few written guidelines which define the best interest of the child is which results in various court making different decisions when the same or similar circumstances exist. Most present court processes rely heavily on discretion of the custody assessor or the judge to reach a final decision. As a result of there being no criteria

clearly defining the best interest of the child, current processes used in the court end up causing many children to be placed by Court Order into the care of parents who fail to act in the best interests of the child.

This protocol's framework provides the highest assurance that the child's best interests are ensured. This is accomplished by the use of an extensive, clearly defined list of criteria for measuring the risk of harm to a child because of HAP combined with an assessment process that ensures fairness and equality between parents. The protocol's clearly defined process ensures that consistency and predictability are reasonably assured under similar sets of circumstances involving different children from different families.

Provides a more transparent and accountable process

Currently, many parents and professionals complain about they perceive as secrecy and lack of accountability in the area of child custody assessments. Both government funded agencies involved with child custody assessment have few, if any, guidelines that workers are required to follow. Some agencies will openly declare that they will not allow interviews between workers and children to be interviewed nor will they allow third parties to be present when the child is being interviewed by a worker. Most will not even permit parents to know what questions are being asked of the children. Many children have reported that workers conducted child custody assessment have lied about what they have said to them.

This risk assessment protocol establishes a very transparent and accountable process by ensuring that all stakeholders are made aware of what information is gathered as part of the risk assessment evaluation. There should be no secret interviews where the questions and answers are not carefully documented and where requested, interviews should be audiotaped or videotaped for maximum accountability and transparency.

Provides a fairer and more accountable review process

One common complaint that is often heard from parents who have been the subject of child custody assessments is that the parents were often not allowed to review the custody assessment reports until just before or after the report was submitted into the court record. Many parents have reported that the custody evaluator's report contains serious errors, omissions and recommendation, if followed, would result in more harm to the child. Assessors, often overburdened with a number of cases, can make mistakes, get things mixed up and forget important and relevant information. Parents find that once a report is submitted to the court, correcting errors and omissions can be a very difficult, time consuming and expensive task. Those who may have written a report may also discourage any changes as this can be embarrassing.

The application of this risk assessment protocol will result in a much more fair and accountable review process by allowing parents and all those who are subject of the evaluation process the opportunity to fully review and understand the methodology of the report and to make changes and revisions to the report before any court proceedings, rather than afterwards.

Increased public support & respect relating to the administration of Justice

At present, there is growing unrest from the public about the way in which the family court system deals with determining the best interest of children. Complaints about bias and flawed assessment reports from various public and private custody assessment agencies. Parents and grandparent's rights groups, and anti-family court advocates are springing up in different parts of the country. This increase in contempt for the court system is the direct result of long-term conflict resulting in

severe emotional and financial impact on both parties and their families. Those who are fighting the court system are being joined by a growing number of friends and their families who have been affected in a negative manner by the current state of affairs in the court system. The public is becoming aware to a larger degree than ever before of the harm being done to children as a result of the court being unable to effectively determine the best interest of the child. The public is losing faith in the family court justice system to bring forth justice for our little ones.

The application of this risk assessment protocol will result in an increase in the public's support of the family court system as this protocol deals with the issue of Hostile-Aggressive Parenting in an easy to understand and effective process which all reasonable and fair-minded members of the Canadian general public would support. The process is transparent and those who conduct the assessments accountable.

Reduced risk of lawsuits against legal and health care professionals

Currently, lawsuits are becoming more common as parents and even children take professionals to court for errors in reports or for their conduct during the time that an assessment report was being generated. An increase in legal activity against professionals is happening because professionals are sometimes pressured into making reports favourable to those who referred clients to them. Sometimes a professional, rather than being truly objective in their reporting, rely on information from lawyers or others. As a result of this, mistakes are being made and children are put in situations that prove later on not to be in their best interests. Children who have suffered harm because of a professional's failure to protect them from HAP can launch a civil lawsuit against the professional when they become of legal age.

Because evaluating the harm to children is made through community-endorsed and supported procedure, chances of errors or omissions are greatly reduced. Professionals involved in the use of this protocol will be able to make better, more informed, decisions as a result of better information coming to them. Persons who may attempt to launch a lawsuit will have significantly lessened ability to succeed in a legal claim against a person who conducted an evaluation using this risk assessment protocol as a guide.

Reduced taxpayer's spending on Legal Aid and children's lawyer services

Significant taxpayer's funds are being spent by legal aid in unnecessary by contested custody battles. The financial resources of Legal Aid are stretched to the limit with many low income earners being denied its use. Free money from Legal Aid also serves as an incentive for people to litigate. This in the end is paid for by the taxpayers of the community. Often legal aid is an incentive for one party to litigate as the party receiving legal aid knows that it will cost him/her nothing, no matter what the expense to the public purse will be, or to the other parent.

This clearly defined criteria and procedures contained in this risk assessment protocol will significantly reduce the time and complexity of assessing the level of risk to a child and determining the child's best interest in the area of Hostile-Aggressive Parenting. Ultimately, this will significantly reduce expenses to Legal Aid and to children's lawyer agencies which are often government funded.

Summary report on the risk of harm to the child caused by Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP)

Name of person being evaluated (subject person)

Date Prepared

Prepared by

Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP) risk of harm to child assessment evaluation form

Date prepared:	Evaluator name:			
Evaluation date:	Note: Indicate approximate date that evaluation was based on if not the same as the preparation date			
Information about the party being evaluated				
Name	Date of Birth			
Street	Current age			
City, Town	Gender			
Postal Code				
Party's legal counsel	Phone No.			
Counsel's address				
Children Involved				
	Name of child	M/F	Date of Birth	Current Age
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
Sources of information				
Please indicate the sources of information (witnesses, reports, audio or video recordings, etc) upon which this risk of harm to child evaluation form was based. Use additional sheets if the space on this form is not sufficient.				

Instructions on completing the risk assessment protocol form

Step One

On the sheet marked “Part 1” of the risk assessment form, indicate all of the “moderate” HAP behaviours/indicators that have been noted during a third party investigation into HAP.

Step Two

On the sheet marked “Part 2” of the risk assessment form, indicate all of the “Severe” HAP influences that have been noted during a third party investigation into HAP.

Step Three

On the sheet marked “Part 3” of the risk assessment form, indicate all of the “Critical Risk influences” that have been noted during a third party investigation into HAP.

Step Four

On the sheet marked “Part 4” of the risk assessment form, indicate all of the “High risk indicators” that have been noted during a third party investigation into HAP.

Step Five

On the sheet marked “Part 5” of the risk assessment form indicate all of the additional risk indicators not directly associated with the parent’s current conduct or behaviour

Step Six

Using the summary sheet for the point totals and the accompanying evaluation categories, determine the level of risk of harm to the child.

Note:

Although the Risk Assessment Protocol form can be completed with a reasonable level of accuracy by anyone who has made objective observations of the subject parent, a higher level of accuracy will be obtained by a person who has received training in HAP and the information collection process used in this protocol.

Part 1

Identifying and evaluating “Mild to Moderate” HAP behaviours/indicators

The term, “mild to moderate HAP behaviours/indicators” refers to those behaviours/indicators of a parent or guardian which can be considered as causing emotional harm to a child but generally causing less harm to the child than the behaviours/indicators which are listed under the “severe” and “critical” category.

Instructions

In the boxes on the right side of the sheet, mark down the points assigned to any of the mild to moderate HAP behaviours listed below, where information gathered during an investigation into HAP would give reasonable grounds to support the conclusion that the listed behaviour has been identified as being present with the particular parent. If the listed HAP behaviour has not been noted during the assessment process or if the information is unknown then leave the box blank. More recent occurrences are considered as a higher risk factor. If some of the behaviours listed below have been present both before and after the time periods indicated, then check both boxes.

Item No.	Moderate HAP behaviours	Point Value	Points
1a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> denigrated another other parent in front of any child.	4	
1b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> denigrated another parent in front of any child.	2	
1c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> denigrated another parent in front of any child.	1	
2a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> failed to promote a normal and healthy telephone communication between the child and another parent and has taken measures which hinder a child’s communication with another parent.	4	
2b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> failed to promote a normal and healthy telephone communication between the child and another parent and has taken measures which hinder a child’s communication with another parent.	2	
2c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> failed to promote a normal and healthy telephone communication between the child and another parent and has taken measures which hinder a child’s communication with another parent.	1	
3a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , hung up the phone on a child or forced the child to hang up the phone when the child was in the middle of a telephone conversation with the other parent.	4	
3b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , hung up the phone on a child or forced the child to hang up the phone when the child was in the middle of a telephone conversation with the other parent.	2	
3c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> hung up the phone on a child or forced the child to hang up the phone when the child was in the middle of a telephone conversation with the other parent.	1	
4a	The subject parent has, <u>within the past 24 months</u> , undermined the <u>reasonable</u> parenting authority of the other parent by encouraging the child to defy the other parent’s authority and even encourage the child to do things which the other parent has reasonably deemed to be inappropriate for the child considering the child’s age and maturity. (Sometimes referred to as permissive parenting)	4	

4b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , undermined the <u>reasonable</u> parenting authority of the other parent by encouraging the child to defy the other parent's authority and even encourage the child to do things which the other parent has reasonably deemed to be inappropriate for the child considering the child's age and maturity. (Sometimes referred to as permissive parenting)	2	
4c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> undermined the <u>reasonable</u> parenting authority of the other parent by encouraging the child to defy the other parent's authority and even encourage the child to do things which the other parent has reasonably deemed to be inappropriate for the child considering the child's age and maturity. (Sometimes referred to as permissive parenting)	1	
5a	The subject parent has, <u>within the past 24 months</u> , been uncooperative, created unnecessary difficulties or delays, or has obstructed the child from seeing the other parent on special family occasions such as birthdays, family weddings, funerals, Mother's day, Father's day or other similar gatherings, etc.	4	
5b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , been uncooperative, created unnecessary difficulties or delays, or has obstructed the child from seeing the other parent on special family occasions such as birthdays, family weddings, funerals, Mother's day, Father's day or other similar gatherings, etc.	2	
5c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> been uncooperative, created unnecessary difficulties or delays, or has obstructed the child from seeing the other parent on special family occasions such as birthdays, family weddings, funerals, Mother's day, Father's day or other similar gatherings, etc.	1	
6a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , been uncooperative or unresponsive when it comes to working out summer and holiday schedules for children in a reasonable and timely fashion.	4	
6b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , been uncooperative or unresponsive when it comes to working out summer and holiday schedules for children in a reasonable and timely fashion.	2	
6c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> been uncooperative or unresponsive when it comes to working out summer and holiday schedules for children in a reasonable and timely fashion.	1	
7a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , taken the child to counsellors, doctors or other health care professionals on an <u>ongoing</u> basis regarding the child's behavioural or emotional problems without the prior knowledge, consent or participation of the other parent.	4	
7b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , taken the child to counsellors, doctors or other health care professionals on an <u>ongoing</u> basis regarding the child's behavioural or emotional problems without the prior knowledge, consent or involvement of the other parent.	2	
7c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> taken the child to counsellors, doctors or other health care professionals on an <u>ongoing</u> basis regarding the child's behavioural or emotional problems without the prior knowledge, consent or involvement of the other parent.	1	
8a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , been unwilling to involve a third party to act as a mediator, coordinator, or to have any other professionals involved in helping the parents to communicate and to co-parent the children effectively.	3	
8b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , been unwilling to involve a third party to act as a mediator, coordinator, or to have any other professionals involved in helping the parents to communicate and to co-parent the children effectively.	2	

8c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> been unwilling to involve a third party to act as a mediator, coordinator, or to have any other professionals involved in helping the parents to communicate and to co-parent the children effectively.	1	
9a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> been unwilling to participate in a family group conference or community justice process when he/she has been invited to do so by members of either of the child's extended family units.	3	
9b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> been unwilling to participate in a family group conference or community justice process when he/she has been invited to do so by members of either of the child's extended family units.	2	
9c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> been unwilling to participate in a family group conference or community justice process when he/she has been invited to do so by members of either of the child's extended family units.	1	
10a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> declined to participate in any kind of fair and equal parenting arrangement for the child or to even give such a plan a try on an interim basis, when such an arrangement is desired by the other parent and/or the child and when this has been proposed by the other parent.	3	
10b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> declined to participate in any kind of fair and equal parenting arrangement for the child or to even give such a plan a try on an interim basis, when such an arrangement is desired by the other parent and/or the child and when this has been proposed by the other parent.	2	
10c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> declined to participate in any kind of fair and equal parenting arrangement for the child or to even give such a plan a try on an interim basis, when such an arrangement is desired by the other parent and/or the child and when this has been proposed by the other parent.	1	
11a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , unilaterally arranged activities or planned events for the child for times when the child is supposed to be on the other parent's access time.	3	
11b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , unilaterally arranged activities or planned events for the child for times when the child is supposed to be on the other parent's access time.	2	
11c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> unilaterally arranged activities or planned events for the child for times when the child is supposed to be on the other parent's access time.	1	
12a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , attempted to entice or bribe the child to not want to go with the other parent during the other parent's scheduled parenting time with the child.	3	
12b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , attempted to entice or bribe the child to not want to go with the other parent during the other parent's scheduled parenting time with the child.	2	
12c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> attempted to entice or bribe the child to not want to go with the other parent during the other parent's scheduled parenting time with the child.	1	
13a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , not allowed or discouraged the child from having any pictures or memorabilia involving the other parent in the home or the child feels intimidated to have pictures kept in the subject parent's home, including the child's own room.	3	

13b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , not allowed or discouraged the child from having any pictures or memorabilia involving the other parent in the home or the child feels intimidated to have pictures kept in the subject parent's home, including the child's own room.	2	
13c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> not allowed or discouraged the child from having any pictures or memorabilia involving the other parent in the home or the child feels intimidated to have pictures kept in the subject parent's home, including the child's own room.	1	
14a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , refused to disclose important and relevant contact information to the other parent such as home address, phone numbers or place of employment, making it difficult for others, including the other parent to communicate with the subject parent.	3	
14b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , refused to disclose important and relevant contact information to the other parent such as home address, phone numbers or place of employment, making it difficult for others, including the other parent to communicate with the subject parent.	2	
14c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused to disclose important and relevant contact information to the other parent such as home address, phone numbers or place of employment, making it difficult for others, including the other parent to communicate with the subject parent.	1	
15a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> named the child at birth with the parent's surname contrary to the general prevailing customs of the country or contrary to the wishes of the other biological parent. (Generally applicable to married mothers in North America)	4	
15b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> named the child at birth with the parent's surname contrary to the general prevailing customs of the country or contrary to the wishes of the other biological parent. (Generally applicable to married mothers in North America)	2	
15c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> named the child at birth with the parent's surname contrary to the general prevailing customs of the country or contrary to the wishes of the other biological parent. (Generally applicable to married mothers in North America)	1	
16a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> threatened or intimidated the other parent by telling the other parent that they are going to unilaterally change the last name of the child in order to control, punish or denigrate the other parent.	3	
16b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> threatened or intimidated the other parent by telling the other parent that they are going to unilaterally change the last name of the child in order to control, punish or denigrate the other parent.	2	
16c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> threatened or intimidated the other parent by telling the other parent that they are going to unilaterally change the last name of the child in order to control, punish or denigrate the other parent.	1	
17a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> told the child that his/her last name will be changed to another last name from what the child has been using in what could be interpreted as an attempt to intimidate, humiliate, denigrate or to demonstrate control over the other parent and the child.	6	
17b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> told the child that his/her last name will be changed to another last name from what the child has been using in what could be interpreted as an attempt to intimidate, humiliate, denigrate or to demonstrate control over the other parent and the child.	4	

17c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago told the child that his/her last name will be changed to another last name from what the child has been using in what could be interpreted as an attempt to intimidate, humiliate, denigrate or to demonstrate control over the other parent and the child.	2	
18a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months unilaterally appointed an agency or person to provide significant and ongoing day care for the child without providing the other parent the opportunity to participate in the selection process for the day care provider.	3	
18b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago unilaterally appointed an agency or person to provide significant and ongoing day care for the child without providing the other parent the opportunity to participate in the selection process for the day care provider.	2	
18c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago unilaterally appointed an agency or person to provide significant and ongoing day care for the child without providing the other parent the opportunity to participate in the selection process for the day care provider.	1	
19a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months used third parties in preference to the other parent to care for the child when the child has been ill or not in school, regardless of the child's wishes or other parent's availability and willingness to care for the child at the time.	3	
19b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago used third parties in preference to the other parent to care for the child when the child has been ill or not in school, regardless of the child's wishes or other parent's availability and willingness to care for the child at the time.	2	
19c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago used third parties in preference to the other parent to care for the child when the child has been ill or not in school, regardless of the child's wishes or other parent's availability and willingness to care for the child at the time.	1	
20a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months , imposed themselves upon the other parent or family at family functions when they were not invited or welcomed.	3	
20b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago , imposed themselves upon the other parent or family at family functions when they were not invited or welcomed.	2	
20c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago imposed themselves upon the other parent or family at family functions when they were not invited or welcomed.	1	
21a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months , imposed themselves upon the other parent and the child during the other parent's personal access time with the child.	4	
21b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago , imposed themselves upon the other parent and the child during the other parent's personal access time with the child.	2	
21c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago imposed themselves upon the other parent and the child during the other parent's personal access time with the child.	1	
22a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months insisted that the other parent return the child precisely on time while not respecting these same rules themselves or has blown out of proportion the times when the other parent has been late for an exchange.	3	

22b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> insisted that the other parent return the child precisely on time while not respecting these same rules themselves or has blown out of proportion the times when the other parent has been late for an exchange.	2	
22c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> insisted that the other parent return the child precisely on time while not respecting these same rules themselves or has blown out of proportion the times when the other parent has been late for an exchange.	1	
23a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , not informed the other parent of <u>important</u> upcoming school activities, events, or holidays when the child's regular schedule at school may be changed.	4	
23b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , not informed the other parent of <u>important</u> upcoming school activities, events, or holidays when the child's regular schedule at school may be changed.	2	
23c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> not informed the other parent of <u>important</u> upcoming school activities, events, or holidays when the child's regular schedule at school may be changed.		
24a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , refused permission or has attempted to obstruct the other parent or other family members from attending special events at the school involving the child such as awards or special presentations where the child is participating.	4	
24b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused permission or has attempted to obstruct the other parent or other family members from attending special events at the school involving the child such as awards or special presentations where the child is participating.	2	
24c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused permission or has attempted to obstruct the other parent or other family members from attending special events at the school involving the child such as awards or special presentations where the child is participating.	1	
25a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , not informed the other parent in a timely fashion when the child has suffered injury which requires medical attention or has refused to permit the release of medical information to the other parent about the child.	3	
25b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> not informed the other parent in a timely fashion when the child has suffered injury which requires medical attention or has refused to permit the release of medical information to the other parent about the child.	2	
25c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> not informed the other parent in a timely fashion when the child has suffered injury which requires medical attention or has refused to permit the release of medical information to the other parent about the child.	1	
26a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , thrown out or destroyed pictures of the other parent and removed pictures of the other parent from photo albums. This often will include pictures that the child may have in his/her possession.	3	
26b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> thrown out or destroyed pictures of the other parent and removed pictures of the other parent from photo albums. This often will include pictures that the child may have in his/her possession.	2	

26c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago thrown out or destroyed pictures of the other parent and removed pictures of the other parent from photo albums. This often will include pictures that the child may have in his/her possession.	1	
27a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months , not properly informed or has supplied the school with false or misleading contact information about the other parent and family which would make it more difficult or inconvenient for the school to contact the other parent in the event of an emergency at school.	3	
27b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago not properly informed or has supplied the school with false or misleading contact information about the other parent and family which would make it more difficult or inconvenient for the school to contact the other parent in the event of an emergency at school.	2	
27c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago not properly informed or has supplied the school with false or misleading contact information about the other parent and family which would make it more difficult or inconvenient for the school to contact the other parent in the event of an emergency at school.	1	
28a	The subject parent has, within the past 24 months , acted in an unfriendly or rude manner with the new partner of the other parent without just cause or has rejected friendly efforts by the new partner to try to work cooperatively for the benefit of the children.	3	
28b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago acted in an unfriendly or rude manner with the new partner of the other parent without just cause or has rejected friendly efforts by the new partner to try to work cooperatively for the benefit of the children.	2	
28c	The subject parent has, more than 72 months (6 years) ago acted in an unfriendly or rude manner with the new partner of the other parent without just cause or has rejected friendly efforts by the new partner to try to work cooperatively for the benefit of the children.	1	
29a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months told the child that they cannot accommodate the child's request to make minor or temporary changes to the parenting arrangements and that only the court can change the parenting schedule.	4	
29b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago told the child that they cannot accommodate the child's wishes to make minor or temporary changes to the parenting arrangements and that only the court can change the parenting schedule.	2	
29c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago told the child that they cannot accommodate the child's wishes to make minor or temporary changes to the parenting arrangements and that only the court can change the parenting schedule.	1	
30a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months attempted to unreasonably interfere or to restrict a child's parenting time to another parent by claiming that the child is at risk with the other parent because of a fear of SARS, West Nile Virus or some other communicable disease.	4	
30b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago attempted to unreasonably interfere or to restrict a child's parenting time to another parent by claiming that the child is at risk with the other parent because of a fear of SARS, West Nile Virus or some other communicable disease.	2	
30c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago attempted to unreasonably interfere or to restrict a child's parenting time to another parent by claiming that the child is at risk with the other parent because of a fear of SARS, West Nile Virus or some other communicable disease.	1	

31a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> taken away or has prevented the child from carrying a cell phone which the other parent has obtained for the child and there would appear to be no reasonable reason to deny the child use of the cell phone.	4	
31b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> taken away or has prevented the child from carrying a cell phone which the other parent has obtained for the child and there would appear to be no reasonable reason to deny the child use of the cell phone.	2	
31c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> taken away or has prevented the child from carrying a cell phone which the other parent has obtained for the child and there would appear to be no reasonable reason to deny the child use of the cell phone.	1	
32a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> kept the child out from regular school activities as part of what would appear to be a strategy to keep the other parent from seeing or having contact with the child while the child is at school.	4	
32b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> kept the child out from regular school activities as part of what would appear to be a strategy to keep the other parent from seeing or having contact with the child while the child is at school.	2	
32c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> kept the child out from regular school activities as part of what would appear to be a strategy to keep the other parent from seeing or having contact with the child while the child is at school.	1	
33a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> removed pages from the parent's communication journal in what would appear to be an effort to remove undesirable evidence relating to certain pieces of communication between parents.	3	
33b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> removed pages from the parent's communication journal in what would appear to be an effort to remove undesirable evidence relating to certain pieces of communication between parents.	2	
33c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> removed pages from the parent's communication journal in what would appear to be an effort to remove undesirable evidence relating to certain pieces of communication between parents.	1	
34a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , hung up the phone on the other parent before ending the conversation out of what would appear to be anger or frustration.	3	
34b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , hung up the phone on the other parent before ending the conversation out of what would appear to be anger or frustration.	2	
34c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , hung up the phone on the other parent before ending the conversation out of what would appear to be anger or frustration.	1	
35a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , not picked up the phone or returned messages from his/her own child when the child has attempted to call from the other parent's home.	4	
35b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , not picked up the phone or returned messages from his/her own child when the child has attempted to call from the other parent's home.	3	
35c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , not picked up the phone or returned messages from his/her own child when the child has attempted to call from the other parent's home.	1	

36a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , refused to pay for their fair share of extra expenses relating to child without just and reasonable cause.	3	
36b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , refused to pay for their fair share of extra expenses relating to child without just and reasonable cause.	2	
36c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , refused to pay for their fair share of extra expenses relating to child without just and reasonable cause.	1	
37a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , exposed the child to smoking in the home which the child has indicated is causing discomfort to him/her and where the child does not suffer from any known medical condition which is aggravated by smoking.	8	
37b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , exposed the child to smoking in the home which the child has indicated is causing discomfort to him/her and where the child does not suffer from any known medical condition which is aggravated by smoking.	4	
37c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , exposed the child to smoking in the home which the child has indicated is causing discomfort to him/her and where the child does not suffer from any known medical condition which is aggravated by smoking.	1	
38a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> insisted that they should have the right to impose daily telephone contact with the child when the child is at the other parent's home.	4	
38b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> insisted that they should have the right to impose daily telephone contact with the child when the child is at the other parent's home.	2	
38c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> insisted that they should have the right to impose daily telephone contact with the child when the child is at the other parent's home.	1	
39a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> blocked or refused to respond to attempts by another parent to communicate via e mail regarding issues affecting the children or the family.	4	
39b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> blocked or refused to respond to attempts by another parent's to communicate via e mail regarding issues affecting the children or the family.	2	
39c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> blocked or refused to respond to attempts by another parent's to communicate via e mail regarding issues affecting the children or the family.	1	
40a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused the child's request to spend some additional time at the home of another parent's home who at the time of the child's request is parenting the child for less than 50% of the time.	4	
40b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused the child's request to spend some additional time at the home of another parent's home who at the time of the child's request is parenting the child for less than 50% of the time.	2	
40c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused the child's request to spend some additional time at the home of another parent's home who at the time of the child's request is parenting the child for less than 50% of the time.	1	

41a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> purposely disconnected the telephone service to their home without reasonable notice to the other parent and without providing the other parent will an alternative means of communicating with the child, thus interfering with the child's telephone access with the other parent.	4	
41b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> purposely disconnected the telephone service to their home without reasonable notice to the other parent and without providing the other parent will an alternative means of communicating with the child, thus interfering with the child's telephone access with the other parent.	2	
41c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> purposely disconnected the telephone service to their home without reasonable notice to the other parent and without providing the other parent will an alternative means of communicating with the child, thus interfering with the child's telephone access with the other parent.	1	
42a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused to give their permission to allow the other parent to take the child out for lunch at school/daycare or has told the child that they are not allowed to be taken out by the other parent during their school/daycare lunch break.	6	
42b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused to give their permission to allow the other parent to take the child out for lunch at school/daycare or has told the child that they are not allowed to be taken out by the other parent during their school/daycare lunch break.	2	
43c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused to give their permission to allow the other parent to take the child out for lunch at school/daycare or has told the child that they are not allowed to be taken out by the other parent during their school/daycare lunch break.	1	
43a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> transferred money from a child's bank account into another bank account for the child without prior consultation and agreement with the other parent when both parents previously had joint signing authority of the child's account.	4	
43b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> transferred money from a child's bank account into another bank account for the child without prior consultation and agreement with the other parent when both parents previously had joint signing authority of the child's account.	2	
43c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> transferred money from a child's bank account into another bank account for the child without prior consultation and agreement with the other parent when both parents previously had joint signing authority of the child's account.	1	
44a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> withdrawn money from a child's bank account and spent the money on their own personal uses rather than to ensure that the money is kept in trust for the child.	8	
44b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> withdrawn money from a child's bank account and spent the money on their own personal uses rather than to ensure that the money is kept in trust for the child.	4	
44c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> withdrawn money from a child's bank account and spent the money on their own personal uses rather than to ensure that the money is kept in trust for the child.	1	
45a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> interfered with their child's relationship with another child and it would appear that the reason may be because the other child's parents have a friendly relationship with the other parent.	4	

45b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> interfered with their child's relationship with another child and it would appear that the reason may be because the other child's parents have a friendly relationship with the other parent.	2	
45c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> interfered with their child's relationship with another child and it would appear that the reason may be because the other child's parents have a friendly relationship with the other parent.	1	
46a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> told their child in a denigrating or humiliating way that the child's behaviour reminds them of the other parent.	4	
46b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> told their child in a denigrating or humiliating way that the child's behaviour reminds them of the other parent.	2	
46c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> told their child in a denigrating or humiliating way that the child's behaviour reminds them of the other parent.	1	
47a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused or failed to obtain appropriate mental health services for any child when evidence would reasonably suggest that the child is in need of mental health services and that action should take action.	6	
47b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused or failed to obtain appropriate mental health services for any child when evidence would reasonably suggest that the child is in need of mental health services and that action should take action.	3	
47c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused or failed to obtain appropriate mental health services for any child when evidence would reasonably suggest that the child is in need of mental health services and that action should take action.	1	
48a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused or failed to take appropriate steps to deal with a child's chronic minor illness which a parent would be expected to deal with and where this problem has been brought to the attention of the parent by others.	6	
48b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused or failed to take appropriate steps to deal with a child's chronic minor illness which a parent would be expected to deal with and where this problem has been brought to the attention of the parent by others.	3	
48c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused or failed to take appropriate steps to deal with a child's chronic minor illness which a parent would be expected to deal with and where this problem has been brought to the attention of the parent by others.	1	
49a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused or failed to take appropriate steps to deal with a child's learning difficulty at school which a parent would be expected to deal with and where this problem has been brought to the attention of the parent by others.	6	
49b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused or failed to take appropriate steps to deal with a child's learning difficulty at school which a parent would be expected to deal with and where this problem has been brought to the attention of the parent by others.	3	

49c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago refused or failed to take appropriate steps to deal with a child's learning difficulty at school which a parent would be expected to deal with and where this problem has been brought to the attention of the parent by others.	1	
50a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months refused to allow their child to go to the home of the other parent to babysit other younger siblings when the child is old enough to babysit, wishes to go and when this could be reasonably accommodated except for the fact that it is not the child's scheduled time to be with the other parent.	4	
50b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago refused to allow their child to go to the home of the other parent to babysit other younger siblings when the child is old enough to babysit, wishes to go and when this could be reasonably accommodated except for the fact that it is not the child's scheduled time to be with the other parent.	2	
50c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago refused to allow their child to go to the home of the other parent to babysit other younger siblings when the child is old enough to babysit, wishes to go and when this could be reasonably accommodated except for the fact that it is not the child's scheduled time to be with the other parent.	1	
51a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months refused to allow their child to take their pet to the other parent's home when the child wishes to do this and there would appear to be no reasonable reason for refusal of the child's request.	4	
51b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago refused to allow their child to take their pet to the other parent's home when the child wishes to do this and there would appear to be no reasonable reason for refusal of the child's request.	2	
51c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago refused to allow their child to take their pet to the other parent's home when the child wishes to do this and there would appear to be no reasonable reason for refusal of the child's request.	1	
52a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months refused to allow their child to participate in personal development lessons or attend a sports activity and it would appear that this decision is being made because the child will be with the other parent during some of the times that the child will have to attend the activity.	4	
52b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago refused to allow their child to participate in personal development lessons or attend a sports activity and it would appear that this decision is being made because the child will be with the other parent during some of the times that the child will have to attend the activity.	2	
52c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago refused to allow their child to participate in personal development lessons or attend a sports activity and it would appear that this decision is being made because the child will be with the other parent during some of the times that the child will have to attend the activity.	1	
53a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months told their child that the child cannot participate in personal development lessons or attend a sports activity because the child would be normally at the other parent's home.	4	
53b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago told their child that the child cannot participate in personal development lessons or attend a sports activity because the child would be normally at the other parent's home.	2	
53c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago told their child that the child cannot participate in personal development lessons or attend a sports activity because the child would be normally at the other parent's home.	1	

54a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> told the child that the child looks like them and not like the other parent to make the child feel more connected to the HAP parent.	4	
54b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> told the child that the child looks like them and not like the other parent to make the child feel more connected to the HAP parent.	2	
54c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> told the child that the child looks like them and not like the other parent to make the child feel more connected to the HAP parent.	1	
55a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> allowed a girlfriend or boyfriend of a minor child in the household to come and live in the parent's home contrary to the wishes and advice of the other parent.	6	
55b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> allowed a girlfriend or boyfriend of a minor child in the household to come and live in the parent's home contrary to the wishes and advice of the other parent.	3	
55c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> allowed a girlfriend or boyfriend of a minor child in the household to come and live in the parent's home contrary to the wishes and advice of the other parent.	1	
56	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused to allow the other parent to have their name put on the child's passport without reasonable reasons for refusing so.	4	
56b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused to allow the other parent to have their name put on the child's passport without reasonable reasons for refusing so.	2	
56c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused to allow the other parent to have their name put on the child's passport without reasonable reasons for refusing so.	1	
57a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> failed to pass on telephone messages to the child from the other parent in a reasonable and timely manner.	4	
57a	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> failed to pass on telephone messages to the child from the other parent in a reasonable and timely manner.	2	
57a	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> failed to pass on telephone messages to the child from the other parent in a reasonable and timely manner.	1	
58a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> changed the child's family doctor, dentist or other medical professional who has been providing care for the child in the past, without justifiable reason.	4	
58b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> changed the child's family doctor, dentist or other medical professional who has been providing care for the child in the past, without justifiable reason.	2	
58c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> changed the child's family doctor, dentist or other medical professional who has been providing care for the child in the past, without justifiable reason.	1	
Total risk assessment points for "moderate" HAP behaviours			

Part 2

Identifying and evaluating “Severe” HAP behaviours/indicators

The term, “Severe HAP behaviours/indicators” include those behaviours/indicators which can be considered as generally causing more harm to the child than those behaviours which are listed under the “moderate” category.

Instructions

In the boxes on the right side of the sheet, mark down the points assigned to any of the severe HAP behaviours listed below, where information gathered during an investigation into HAP would give reasonable grounds to support the conclusion that the listed behaviour has been noted with the particular parent. If the listed HAP behaviour has not been noted or if the information is unknown during the assessment process then leave the box blank. Note that HAP behaviours are also ranked by date. More recent occurrences are considered as a higher risk factor. If some of the behaviours listed below have been present for more than one time periods indicated, then check all applicable time periods.

Item No.	Severe HAP behaviours/influences	Point Value	Points
1a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> taken <u>ANY</u> child and gone into hiding or has attempted to flee to another country, province, state or jurisdiction which is more than 100 km away from the child’s current place of residence, prior to a court Order authorizing this, which has resulted in a child’s relationship with another parent being interfered with, but the child has since been returned by the parent to his/her original jurisdiction and the child has resumed full contact with the other parent as per the court Order or agreement.	100	
1b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> taken <u>ANY</u> child and gone into hiding or attempted to flee to another country, province, state or jurisdiction which is more than 100 km away from the child’s current place of residence, prior to a court Order authorizing this, which has resulted in a child’s relationship with another parent being interfered with during that time.	50	
1c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> taken <u>ANY</u> child and gone into hiding or attempted to flee to another country, province, state or jurisdiction which is more than 100 km away from the child’s current place of residence, prior to a court Order authorizing this, which has resulted in a child’s relationship with another parent being interfered with during that time.	25	
2a	The subject parent has <u>between 2 months to 24 months ago</u> threatened to kill, to seriously harm, or to use a weapon against any child, or the parent has physically or sexually assaulted <u>ANY</u> child in the household or any child under his/her care, including stepchildren (not to be confused with minor physical discipline necessary to correct a child’s behaviour) and that this incident occurred sometime and there is credible evidence or testimony to support this claim.	100	
2b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> threatened to kill, to seriously harm, or to use a weapon against any child, or the parent has physically or sexually assaulted <u>ANY</u> child in the household or any child under his/her care, including stepchildren (not to be confused with minor physical discipline necessary to correct a child’s behaviour) and that this incident occurred sometime and there is credible evidence or testimony to support this claim.	50	
2c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> threatened to kill, to seriously harm, or to use a weapon against any child, or the parent has physically or sexually assaulted <u>ANY</u> child in the household or any child under his/her care, including stepchildren (not to be confused with minor physical discipline necessary to correct a child’s behaviour) and that this incident occurred sometime and there is credible evidence or testimony to support this claim.	25	

3a	The subject parent has <u>between 30 days and 24 month ago</u> attempted to extort or blackmail another parent into signing court documents relating to any issue and has used denial of access to children as a weapon to extort or blackmail or extort the other parent and the child's access to the other parent was interfered with at the time.	100	
3b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> attempted to blackmail another parent into signing court documents relating to any issue and has used denial of access to children as a weapon to blackmail or extort the other parent and the child's access with the other parent was interfered with at the time.	50	
3c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> attempted to blackmail another parent into signing court documents relating to any issue and has used denial of access to children as a weapon to blackmail or extort the other parent and the child's access with the other parent was interfered with at the time.	25	
4a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 30 days</u> allowed persons to come into contact with a child in the household when there is a consent agreement or court Order in place at the time which specifically prohibits that person from having any contact with that child because of physical or emotional harm caused to the child as a result of that person's previous behaviour and/or actions.	100	
4b	The subject parent has <u>within 30 days to 24 months ago</u> allowed persons to come into contact with a child in the household while there is a consent agreement or court Order in place at the time which specifically prohibits that person from having any contact with the child because of physical or emotional harm caused to the child as a result of that person's previous behaviour and/or actions.	50	
4c	The subject parent has <u>more than 24 months ago</u> allowed persons to come into contact with a child in the household when there is a consent agreement or court Order in place at the time which specifically prohibits that person from having any contact with that child because of physical or emotional harm caused to the child as a result of that person's previous behaviour and/or actions.	25	
5a	The subject parent is <u>currently</u> covertly planning to have the child undergo any sort of unnecessary medical procedure contrary to the wishes of the other parent or the child and there is compelling evidence to support this conclusion.	150	
5b	The subject parent has <u>within the last 24 months</u> had the child undergo any sort of unnecessary medical operation, prior to a court Order authorizing this or contrary to the wishes of the other parent or the child at the time.	75	
5c	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> had the child undergo any sort of unnecessary medical operation, prior to a court Order authorizing this or contrary to the wishes of the other parent or the child at the time.	25	
5d	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> had the child undergo any sort of unnecessary medical operation, prior to a court Order authorizing this or contrary to the wishes of the other parent or the child at the time.	12	
6a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> attempted to change the child's religion or indoctrinate the child into a religious group or cult contrary to the wishes of the other parent or the child.	100	
6b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> attempted to change the child's religion or indoctrinate the child into a religious group or cult contrary to the wishes of the other parent or the child.	25	
6c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> attempted to change the child's religion or indoctrinate the child into a religious group or cult contrary to the wishes of the other parent or the child.	12	

7a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , refused to allow their child to come to their home for an access visit when the child has indicated a desire to do so and there would appear to be no reason to justify the subject parent's refusal to see the child.	6	
7b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , refused to allow their child to come to their home for an access visit when the child has indicated a desire to do so and there would appear to be no reason to justify the subject parent's refusal to see the child.	4	
7c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , refused to allow their child to come to their home for an access visit when the child has indicated a desire to do so and there would appear to be no reason to justify the subject parent's ir refusal to see the child.	2	
8a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> attempted to bribe or blackmail professionals or court officials to support his/her position using money or other favours as enticement.	50	
8b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> attempted to bribe or blackmail professionals or court officials to support the position of the HAP parent using money or other favours as enticement.	25	
8c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> attempted to bribe or blackmail professionals or court officials to support the position of the HAP parent using money or other favours as enticement.	12	
9a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> placed the child into foster care or in a group home facility for what would appear to be frivolous or vexatious reasons or for what would appear to be part of a plan to punish the child or to keep the child from being with the other parent or family member.	100	
9b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> placed the child into foster care or in a group home facility for frivolous or vexatious reasons in what would appear to be part of a plan to punish the child or to keep the child from being with the other parent or family member.	50	
9c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months ago</u> placed the child into foster care or in a group home facility for frivolous or vexatious reasons in what would appear to be part of a plan to punish the child or to keep the child from being with the other parent or family member.	25	
10a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> attempted to mislead, lie or to conceal information considered relative to a custody and access investigation.	8	
10b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> attempted to mislead, lie or to conceal information considered relative to a custody and access investigation.	4	
10	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> attempted to mislead, lie or to conceal information considered relative to a custody and access investigation.	2	
11a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> physically assaulted the other parent and the assault was witnessed by any child who lives within or has visited the household.	50	
11b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> physically assaulted the other parent and the assault was witnessed by any child who lives within or has visited the household.	25	

11c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago physically assaulted the other parent and the assault was witnessed by any child who lives within or has visited the household.	12	
12a	The subject <u>primary care</u> parent is currently in violation of key clauses of a court order or parenting agreement, especially in relation to a child's parenting time, which has resulted in a child's scheduled time with a non primary care parent being interfered with in the absence of compelling evidence to support that this would be in the child's best interest.	50	
12b	The subject <u>primary care</u> parent has within the past 24 months violated key clauses of a court order or agreement in relation to a child's parenting time, which has resulted in any child's scheduled time with a non primary care parent being interfered with but the parent currently is in compliance with.	24	
12c	The subject <u>primary care</u> parent has between 24 and 72 months ago violated key clauses of a court Order or agreement in relation to a child's parenting time, which has resulted in a child's scheduled time with a non primary care parent being interfered with but the parent currently is in compliance with.	12	
12d	The primary parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago violated key clauses of a court Order or agreement in relation to a child's parenting time, which has resulted in a child's scheduled time with a non primary care parent being interfered with but the parent currently is in compliance with.	6	
13a	The subject parent has between 3 months to 24 months ago placed the child into foster care or in a group home facility for children because of significant behaviour problems with the child when there was suitable alternate care available with another parent or other family members at the time.	50	
13b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago placed the child into foster care or in a group home facility for children because of significant behaviour problems with the child when there was suitable alternate care available with another parent or other family members at the time.	25	
13c	The subject parent has more than 72 months ago placed the child into foster care or in a group home facility for children because of significant behaviour problems with the child when there was suitable alternate care available with another parent or other family members at the time.	12	
14a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months forged or attempted to forge, falsify or tamper with court documents or medical reports in his/her family court matter.	24	
14b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago forged or attempted to forge, falsify or tamper with court documents or medical reports in his/her family court matter.	12	
14c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago forged or attempted to forge, falsify or tamper with court documents or medical reports in his/her family court matter.	6	
15a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months submitted a false statement to police or to the court which can be reasonably shown that the parent knew beforehand was false and intended to do harm to the other parent or subvert the administration of Justice.	24	
15b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago submitted a false statement to police or to the court which can be reasonably shown that the parent knew beforehand was false and intended to do harm to the other parent or subvert the administration of Justice.	8	

15c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> submitted a false statement to police or to the court which can be reasonably shown that the parent knew beforehand was false and intended to do harm to the other parent or subvert the administration of Justice.	4	
16a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> appeared to be unable or unwilling to set reasonable and justifiable limits on any child living in their household in relation to sex, drugs, smoking, firearms or other influences generally considered by the community as potentially harmful or having a negative influence on a child.	8	
16b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> appeared to be unable or unwilling to set reasonable and justifiable limits on any child living in their household in relation to sex, drugs, smoking, firearms or other influences generally considered by the community as potentially harmful or having a negative influence on a child.	4	
16c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> appeared to be unable or unwilling to set reasonable and justifiable limits on any child living in their household in relation to sex, drugs, smoking, firearms or other influences generally considered by the community as potentially harmful or having a negative influence on a child.	2	
17a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> appeared to be unable or unwilling to control the use of swearing and other forms of disrespectful language between members of the household.	4	
17b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> appeared to have been unable or unwilling at the time to control the use of swearing and other forms of disrespectful language between members of the household.	2	
17c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> appeared to have been unable or unwilling at the time to control the use of swearing and other forms of disrespectful language between members of the household.	1	
18a	The subject parent has <u>within the last 6 months</u> unilaterally relocated the child's place of residency further away from the other parent, family and friends without consulting the other parent prior to the move which has resulted in a change of schools for the child.	12	
18b	The subject parent has <u>between 6 and 72 months ago</u> unilaterally relocated the child's place of residency further away from the other parent, family and friends without consulting the other parent prior to the move which has resulted in a change of schools for the child.	6	
18c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> unilaterally relocated the child's place of residency further away from the other parent, family and friends without consulting the other parent prior to the move which has resulted in a change of schools for the child.	3	
19a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> threatened the other parent with moving the child to another jurisdiction if the other parent does not do things the way that they want.	6	
19b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> threatened the other parent with moving the child to another jurisdiction if the other parent does not do things the way that they want.	4	
19c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> threatened the other parent with moving the child to another jurisdiction if the other parent does not do things the way that they want.	2	

20a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> displayed anger/verbal abuse against the other parent in front of the child.	12	
20b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> displayed anger/verbal abuse against the other parent in front of the child.	6	
20c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> displayed anger/verbal abuse against the other parent in front of the child.	3	
21a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> displayed anger/verbal abuse against the other parent in front of other third parties other than the child.	6	
21b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> displayed anger/verbal abuse against the other parent in front of other third parties other than the child.	3	
21c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> displayed anger/verbal abuse against the other parent in front of other third parties other than the child.	2	
22a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> encouraged or assisted the child to write or to deliver a mean spirited letter or drawing to the other parent which would appear to be intended to hurt the other parent to extort something from the other parent.	8	
22b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> encouraged or assisted the child to write or to deliver a mean spirited letter or drawing to the other parent which would appear to be intended to hurt the other parent to extort something from the other parent.	4	
22c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> encouraged or assisted the child to write or to deliver a mean spirited letter or drawing to the other parent which would appear to be intended to hurt the other parent to extort something from the other parent.	2	
23a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> encouraged a child to collaborate with him/her in making false allegations against the other parent and evidence to support this exists.	12	
23b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> encouraged a child to collaborate with him/her in making false allegations against the other parent and evidence to support this exists.	6	
23c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> encouraged a child to collaborate with him/her in making false allegations against the other parent and evidence to support this exists.	3	
24a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , coached, threatened, or intimidated a child to remain silent about incidences where the child has been abused or where the child has witnessed abuse, violence or other hostile-aggressive behaviours by the parent.	12	
24b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , coached, threatened, or intimidated the child to remain silent about incidences where the child has been abused or where the child has witnessed abuse, violence or other hostile-aggressive behaviours by the parent.	6	
24c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , coached, threatened, or intimidated the child to remain silent about incidences where the child has been abused or where the child has witnessed abuse, violence or other hostile-aggressive behaviours by the parent.	3	

25a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , applied specific penalties to reprimand or punish a child about saying things to others that were truthful which appears to be intended to make the child remain silent.	12	
25b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , applied specific penalties to reprimand or punish a child about saying things to others that were truthful which appears to be intended to make the child remain silent.	6	
25c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , applied specific penalties to reprimand or punish a child about saying things to others that were truthful which appears to be intended to make the child remain silent.	3	
26a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> made allegations against the other parent involving sexual or physical abuse of the child with no evidence to support their claims.	8	
26b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> made allegations against the other parent involving sexual or physical abuse of the child with no evidence to support their claims.	4	
26c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> made allegations against the other parent involving sexual or physical abuse of the child with no evidence to support their claims.	2	
27a	The subject parent has, <u>within the past 24 months</u> , assaulted or attempted to physically harm the other parent.	8	
27b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , assaulted or attempted to physically harm the other parent.	4	
27c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , assaulted or attempted to physically harm the other parent.	2	
28	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , committed acts of vandalism in the home against any property belonging to <u>any</u> child living in the parent's home.	8	
28	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , committed acts of vandalism in the home against any property belonging to <u>any</u> child living in the parent's home.	4	
28c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , committed acts of vandalism in the home against any property belonging to <u>any</u> child living in the parent's home.	2	
29a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , forced the child to see the other parent under supervised (court ordered or otherwise) access when there would appear to be highly questionable need for supervision or contrary to the child's age appropriate wishes and preferences.	8	
29b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , forced the child to see the other parent under supervised access (court ordered or otherwise) when there would appear to be highly questionable need for supervision or contrary to the child's age appropriate wishes and preferences.	4	
29c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , forced the child to see the other parent under supervised access (court ordered or otherwise) when there would appear to be highly questionable need for supervision or contrary to the child's age appropriate wishes and preferences.	2	
30a	The subject <u>custodial</u> parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> or has attempted to have, members of his/her own family appointed as supervisors for access to the child by the other parent contrary to the wishes of the other parent or the child.	4	

<p>30b</p> <p>The subject <u>custodial</u> parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u>, or has attempted to have, members of his/her own family appointed as supervisors for access to the child by the other parent contrary to the wishes of the other parent or the child.</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p>30c</p> <p>The subject <u>custodial</u> parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u>, or has attempted to have, members of his/her own family appointed as supervisors for access to the child by the other parent contrary to the wishes of the other parent or the child.</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>31a</p> <p>This subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u>, failed to deliver the child to a supervised access centre without valid reason to allow the child to see the other parent when this is part of a court order or agreement.</p>	<p>12</p>	
<p>31b</p> <p>This subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u>, failed to deliver the child to a supervised access centre without valid reason to allow the child to see the other parent when this is part of a court order or agreement.</p>	<p>6</p>	
<p>31c</p> <p>This subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u>, failed to deliver the child to a supervised access centre without valid to allow the child to see the other parent when this is part of a court order or agreement.</p>	<p>3</p>	
<p>32a</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> legally renamed a child, or attempted to rename a child more than 12 months after the birth of the child, contrary to the general prevailing customs of the country or contrary to the wishes of the other biological or established parent. (Generally applicable to mothers only in North America)</p>	<p>6</p>	
<p>32b</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> legally renamed a child, or attempted to rename a child more than 12 months after the birth of the child, contrary to the general prevailing customs of the country or contrary to the wishes of the other biological or established parent. (Generally applicable to mothers only in North America)</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p>32c</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> legally renamed a child, or attempted to rename a child more than 12 months after the birth of the child, contrary to the general prevailing customs of the country or contrary to the wishes of the other biological or established parent. (Generally applicable to mothers only in North America)</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>33a</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> rejected regular or registered mail from the other parent or has refused to accept mail from the other parent's solicitor.</p>	<p>6</p>	
<p>33b</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> rejected regular or registered mail from the other parent or has refused to accept mail from the other parent's solicitor.</p>	<p>3</p>	
<p>33c</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> rejected regular or registered mail from the other parent or has refused to accept mail from the other parent's solicitor.</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>34a</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused to allow paternity (DNA) testing to be done on any child or upon themselves in order to confirm the identity of the biological father when there may allegations raised in a family court matter as to the identity of the father of a child.</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p>34b</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused to allow paternity (DNA) testing to be done on any child or upon themselves in order to confirm the identity of the biological father when there may allegations raised in a family court matter as to the identity of the father of a child.</p>	<p>2</p>	

34c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) refused to allow paternity (DNA) testing to be done on any child or upon themselves in order to confirm the identity of the biological father when there may allegations raised in a family court matter as to the identity of the father of a child.	1	
35a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months has arranged to have anti-depressants prescribed by a doctor to their child without the consent or approval of the other parent or without giving the other parent the opportunity to discuss the child's medical matter with the doctor first.	6	
35b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago has arranged to have anti-depressants prescribed by a doctor to their child without the consent or approval of the other parent or without giving the other parent the opportunity to discuss the child's medical matter with the doctor first.	3	
35c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) has arranged to have anti-depressants prescribed by a doctor to their child without the consent or approval of the other parent or without giving the other parent the opportunity to discuss the child's medical matter with the doctor first.	2	
36a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months committed acts of minor vandalism in the home or against the personal property of the other parent.	4	
36b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago committed acts of minor vandalism in the home or against the personal property of the other parent.	2	
36c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) committed acts of minor vandalism in the home or against the personal property of the other parent.	1	
37a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months disclosed to the child, information from court documents that are not appropriate for the child's level of maturity and understanding.	6	
37b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago disclosed to the child, information from court documents that are not appropriate for the child's level of maturity and understanding.	3	
37c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) disclosed to the child, information from court documents that are not appropriate for the child's level of maturity and understanding.	1	
38a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months secretly tape recorded the children's telephone conversations with the other parent or other family members without the children's knowledge or permission and without reasonable cause.	4	
38b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago secretly tape recorded the children's telephone conversations with the other parent or other family members without the children's knowledge or permission and without reasonable cause.	2	
38c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) secretly tape recorded the children's telephone conversations with the other parent or other family members without the children's knowledge or permission and without reasonable cause.	1	
39a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months , intercepted and read private E mail communication intended for the child or has erased E mail messages intended for the child from the other parent or other family members before the child has read the message.	6	
39b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago , intercepted and read private E mail communication intended for the child or has erased E mail messages intended for the child from the other parent or other family members before the child has read the message.	4	

39c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> , intercepted and read private E mail communication intended for the child or has erased E mail messages intended for the child from the other parent or other family members before the child has read the message.	2	
40a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , intercepted private regular mail intended for the child from the other parent or other family members before the child has read the mail.	4	
40b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , intercepted private regular mail intended for the child from the other parent or other family members before the child has read the mail.	2	
40c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> , intercepted private regular mail intended for the child from the other parent or other family members before the child has read the mail.	1	
41a	This subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> taken the personal property (eg computers, personal records, financial records, etc.) of the other parent without the other parent's consent.	10	
41b	This subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> taken the personal property (eg computers, personal records, financial records, etc.) of the other parent without the other parent's consent.	5	
41c	This subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> taken the personal property (eg computers, personal records, financial records, etc.) of the other parent without the other parent's consent.	2	
42a	This subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> abandoned the shared or matrimonial home without notice to the other parent and removed mutually shared belongings prior to the consent or knowledge of the other parent. (eg furniture, appliances, pictures, etc.)	12	
42b	This subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> abandoned the shared or matrimonial home without notice to the other parent and removed mutually shared belongings prior to the consent or knowledge of the other parent. (eg furniture, appliances, pictures, etc.)	6	
42c	This subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> abandoned the shared or matrimonial home without notice to the other parent and removed mutually shared belongings prior to the consent or knowledge of the other parent. (eg furniture, appliances, pictures, etc.)	2	
43a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> intercepted (or arranged), private and confidential e mail communication between the other parent and other third parties and/or has attempted to use this intercepted communications in court proceedings or has disclosed these private messages to the children, family members or friends for purposes other than to protect the children.	10	
43b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> intercepted (or arranged), private and confidential e mail communication between the other parent and other third parties and/or has attempted to use this intercepted communications in court proceedings or has disclosed these private messages to the children, family members or friends for purposes other than to protect the children.	5	

43c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) intercepted (or arranged), private and confidential e mail communication between the other parent and other third parties and/or has attempted to use this intercepted communications in court proceedings or has disclosed these private messages to the children, family members or friends for purposes other than to protect the children.	2	
44a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months acted in a manner that has made the child feel unwanted or rejected in the subject parent's home such as giving the child's possessions away to other siblings, taking away the child's room, or packing up the child's possessions as if the child was not welcome.	12	
44b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago acted in a manner that has made the child feel unwanted or rejected in the subject parent's home such as giving the child's possessions away to other siblings, taking away the child's room, or packing up the child's possessions as if the child was not welcome.	6	
44c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) acted in a manner that has made the child feel unwanted or rejected in the subject parent's home such as giving the child's possessions away to other siblings, taking away the child's room, or packing up the child's possessions as if the child was not welcome.	2	
45a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months attempted to promote dissention and disharmony between siblings in an effort to alienate those siblings who do not support the HAP parent.	12	
45b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago attempted to promote dissention and disharmony between siblings in an effort to alienate those siblings who do not support the HAP parent.	6	
45c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) attempted to promote dissention and disharmony between siblings in an effort to alienate those siblings who do not support the HAP parent.	2	
46a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months attempted to have other persons make false allegations against the other parent which appear intended to infringe upon the rights and freedoms of the child and/or the other parent in any way.	12	
46b	This subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago attempted to have other persons make false allegations against the other parent which appear intended to infringe upon the rights and freedoms of the child and/or the other parent in any way.	6	
46c	This subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) attempted to have other persons make false allegations against the other parent which appear intended to infringe upon the rights and freedoms of the child and/or the other parent in any way.		
47a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months during a disagreement with a child, <u>threatened</u> a child with eviction from the home or has told the child to go and live with the other parent or threatened foster care because they don't want them in their house.	12	
47b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago during a disagreement with a child, <u>threatened</u> a child with eviction from the home or has told the child to go and live with the other parent or threatened foster care because they don't want them in their house.	6	

47c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) during a disagreement with a child, <u>threatened</u> a child with eviction from the home or has told the child to go and live with the other parent or threatened foster care because they don't want them in their house.	2	
48a	The subject custodial parent has within the past 24 months told the other parent that they cannot have access to the child because they are behind in child support payments.	12	
48b	The subject custodial parent has between 24 and 72 months ago told the other parent that they cannot have access to the child because they are behind in child support payments.	6	
48c	The subject custodial parent has more than 72 months (6 years) told the other parent that they cannot have access to the child because they are behind in child support payments.	2	
49a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months refused to attend an anger management or parenting course when reasonable evidence would exist to suggest that the subject parent suffers from anger related problems.	6	
49b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago refused to attend an anger management or parenting course when reasonable evidence would exist to suggest that the subject parent suffers from anger related problems.	3	
49c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) refused to attend an anger management or parenting course when reasonable evidence would exist to suggest that the subject parent suffers from anger related problems.	2	
50a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months made a complaint about the other parent leaving the children in the care of other family member during the child's scheduled time with another parent who was receiving less than 50% of the child's parenting time at the time of the complaint.	4	
50b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago made a complaint about the other parent leaving the children in the care of other family member during the child's scheduled time with another parent who was receiving less than 50% of the child's parenting time at the time of the complaint.	3	
50c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) made a complaint about the other parent leaving the children in the care of other family member during the child's scheduled time with another parent who was receiving less than 50% of the child's parenting time at the time of the complaint.	2	
51a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months made allegations in court documents to cast the other parent in an unfavourable light to the court by bringing to the attention of the court, any lawful activities which the other parent may be involved in which may involve the other parent's protest of the court system.	4	
51b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago made allegations in court documents to cast the other parent in an unfavourable light to the court by bringing to the attention of the court, any lawful activities which the other parent may be involved in which may involve the other parent's protest of the court system.	3	
51c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) made allegations in court documents to cast the other parent in an unfavourable light to the court by bringing to the attention of the court, any lawful activities which the other parent may be involved in which may involve the other parent's protest of the court system.	1	

52a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> attempted or supported efforts to have the other parent incarcerated for child support arrears when the other parent does not have the reasonable means of paying the child support payments or when the other parent is depended upon by another spouse or by other children.	8	
52b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> attempted or supported efforts to have the other parent incarcerated for child support arrears when the other parent does not have the reasonable means of paying the child support payments or when the other parent is depended upon by another spouse or by other children.	4	
52c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> attempted or supported efforts to have the other parent incarcerated for child support arrears when the other parent does not have the reasonable means of paying the child support payments or when the other parent is depended upon by another spouse or by other children.	2	
53a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> tried to have the other parent pay retroactively for previous additional expenses relating to the child which the parent did not previously bring to the attention of the other parent at the time when the additional expenses were being considered or incurred.	8	
53b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> tried to have the other parent pay retroactively for previous additional expenses relating to the child which the parent did not previously bring to the attention of the other parent at the time when the additional expenses were being considered or incurred.	4	
53c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> tried to have the other parent pay retroactively for previous additional expenses relating to the child which the parent did not previously bring to the attention of the other parent at the time when the additional expenses were being considered or incurred.	2	
54a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> made, or attempted to make false claims for additional expenses for the child such day care, clothing, medical expenses etc., when no such expenses existed.	8	
54b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> made, or attempted to make false claims for additional expenses for the child such day care, clothing, medical expenses etc., when no such expenses existed.	4	
54c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> made, or attempted to make false claims for additional expenses for the child such day care, clothing, medical expenses etc., when no such expenses existed.	2	
55a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused to reimburse or to cooperate to have any government subsidy or tax credit properly designated to the other parent when the other parent is legally entitled to the government subsidy or tax credit. (most applicable when a child may change primary residence)	8	
55b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused to reimburse or to cooperate to have any government subsidy or tax credit properly designated to the other parent when the other parent is legally entitled to the government subsidy or tax credit. (most applicable when a child may change primary residence)	4	
55c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> refused to reimburse or to cooperate to have any government subsidy or tax credit properly designated to the other parent when the other parent is legally entitled to the government subsidy or tax credit. (most applicable when a child may change primary residence)	2	
56a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> been found to be intoxicated while caring for any child or has been reported by another third party as being	8	

	intoxicated while in charge of any child or when attempting to take charge of a child.		
56b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> been found to be intoxicated while caring for any child or has been reported by another third party as being intoxicated while in charge of any child or when attempting to take charge of a child.	4	
56c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> been found to be intoxicated while caring for any child or has been reported by another third party as being intoxicated while in charge of any child or when attempting to take charge of a child.	2	
57a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> made harassing phone calls to the other parent (late night, multiple hang-ups, swearing, etc.)	6	
57b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> made harassing phone calls to the other parent (late night, multiple hang-ups, swearing, etc.)	3	
57c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> made harassing phone calls to the other parent (late night, multiple hang-ups, swearing, etc.)	2	
58a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> threatened to remove or has attempted to remove the child from the public education system and to home school the child without the prior consultation or consent of the other parent.	6	
58b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> threatened to remove or has attempted to remove the child from the public education system and to home school the child without the prior consultation or consent of the other parent.	3	
58c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> threatened to remove or has attempted to remove the child from the public education system and to home school the child without the prior consultation or consent of the other parent.		
59a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> exposed the child to ongoing smoking in the home contrary to the advice of a physician or when the child is known to have a medical condition which is aggravated by the smoking.	8	
59b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> exposed the child to ongoing smoking in the home contrary to the advice of a physician or when the child is known to have a medical condition which is aggravated by the smoking.	4	
59c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> exposed the child to ongoing smoking in the home contrary to the advice of a physician or when the child is known to have a medical condition which is aggravated by the smoking.	2	
60a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> failed to follow-up with appropriate professional help for a child under his/her care and control who has exhibited signs of depression, anxiety or who exhibits an unhealthy attraction or obsession to socially undesirable behaviours and influences such as guns, fires, knives, drugs, drinking, the occult, violent crimes, rapes, torture, killing, etc. that were apparent at that time.	8	
60b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> failed to follow-up with appropriate professional help for a child under his/her care and control who has exhibited signs of depression, anxiety or who exhibits an unhealthy attraction or obsession to socially undesirable behaviours and influences such as guns, fires, knives, drugs, drinking, the occult, violent crimes, rapes, torture, killing, etc. that were apparent at that time.	4	

60c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) failed to follow-up with appropriate professional help for a child under his/her care and control who has exhibited signs of depression, anxiety or who exhibits an unhealthy attraction or obsession to socially undesirable behaviours and influences such as guns, fires, knives, drugs, drinking, the occult, violent crimes, rapes, torture, killing, etc. that were apparent at that time.	2	
61a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months over-reacted to situations by calling for intervention by police to deal with minor incidents or misunderstandings involving family members or the children	8	
61b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago over-reacted to situations by calling for intervention by police to deal with minor incidents or misunderstandings involving family members or the children	4	
61c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) over-reacted to situations by calling for intervention by police to deal with minor incidents or misunderstandings involving family members or the children	2	
62a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months attempted to intimidate or humiliate the other parent or family member with the inappropriate and obtrusive use of a video or still camera without cause for such action. (as opposed to the unobtrusive use of such equipment for purposes of collection of evidence or for self protection against false allegations)	8	
62b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago attempted to intimidate or humiliate the other parent or family member with the inappropriate and obtrusive use of a video or still camera without cause for such action. (as opposed to the unobtrusive use of such equipment for purposes of collection of evidence or for self protection against false allegations)	4	
62c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) attempted to intimidate or humiliate the other parent or family member with the inappropriate and obtrusive use of a video or still camera without cause for such action. (as opposed to the unobtrusive use of such equipment for purposes of collection of evidence or for self protection against false allegations)	2	
63a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months impeded the registration or admittance of a child into a school after the child who is above the age of 10 years of age has run away from the parent's home to live with the other parent and wishes to live with the other parent.	8	
63b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago impeded the registration or admittance of a child into a school after the child who is above the age of 10 years of age has run away from the parent's home to live with the other parent and wishes to live with the other parent.	4	
63c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) impeded the registration or admittance of a child into a school after the child who is above the age of 10 years of age has run away from the parent's home to live with the other parent and wishes to live with the other parent.	2	
64a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months instructed other children in the household to interfere or prevent another child in the home from exercising his/her wishes to phone or to spent time with another parent when there is no reasonable reason to confine the child or to restrict the child rights and wishes in this manner. (Sibling Alienation)	8	

<p>64b</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> instructed other children in the household to interfere or prevent another child in the home from exercising his/her wishes to phone or to spend time with another parent when there is no reasonable reason to confine the child or to restrict the child's rights and wishes in this manner. (Sibling Alienation)</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p>64</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> instructed other children in the household to interfere or prevent another child in the home from exercising his/her wishes to phone or to spend time with another parent when there is no reasonable reason to confine the child or to restrict the child's rights and wishes in this manner. (Sibling Alienation)</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>65a</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>within the past 61 days to 24 months</u> physically locked a child in a room using a mechanical device or object with the intent to keep the child from contacting the other parent by phone or from escaping the home to be with the other parent.</p>	<p>24</p>	
<p>65b</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> physically locked a child in a room using a mechanical device or object with the intent to keep the child from contacting the other parent by phone or from escaping the home to be with the other parent.</p>	<p>8</p>	
<p>65c</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> physically locked a child in a room using a mechanical device or object with the intent to keep the child from contacting the other parent by phone or from escaping the home to be with the other parent.</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>66a</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> threatened to call the police and to have the other parent charged with harassment for attempting to call a child in the household even when the child has indicated that he/she wishes to communicate with the other parent or there is no apparent threat to the child.</p>	<p>8</p>	
<p>66b</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> threatened to call the police and to have the other parent charged with harassment for attempting to call a child in the household even when the child has indicated that he/she wishes to communicate with the other parent or there is no apparent threat to the child.</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p>66c</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> threatened to call the police and to have the other parent charged with harassment for attempting to call a child in the household even when the child has indicated that he/she wishes to communicate with the other parent or there is no apparent threat to the child.</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>67a</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> told the child that the other parent does not love or did not want him/her at birth.</p>	<p>8</p>	
<p>67b</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> told the child that the other parent does not love or did not want him/her at birth.</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p>67c</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> told the child that the other parent does not love or did not want him/her at birth.</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>68a</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused the other parent's request to modify, update or to change a court order or parenting agreement that was put in place more than 36 months ago, in order to make the agreement more appropriate for the child's current developmental needs.</p>	<p>8</p>	
<p>68b</p> <p>The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused the other parent's request to modify, update or to change a court order or parenting agreement that was put in place more than 36 months ago, in order to make the agreement more appropriate for the child's current developmental needs.</p>	<p>4</p>	

68c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) refused the other parent's request to modify, update or to change a court order or parenting agreement that was put in place more than 36 months ago, in order to make the agreement more appropriate for the child's current developmental needs.	2	
69a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months personally interrogated the child and put the child in a situation where the child has been made to feel uncomfortable with the subject parent's line of questioning.	8	
69b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago personally interrogated the child and put the child in a situation where the child has been made to feel uncomfortable with the subject parent's line of questioning.	4	
69c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) personally interrogated the child and put the child in a situation where the child has been made to feel uncomfortable with the subject parent's line of questioning.	2	
70a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months either threatened, humiliated, criticized, lashed, out or denigrated the child for spending additional time with the other parent or for the child indicating a preference to spend time or to live with the other parent.	8	
70b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago either threatened, humiliated, criticized, lashed, out or denigrated the child for spending additional time with the other parent or for the child indicating a preference to spend time or to live with the other parent.	4	
70c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) either threatened, humiliated, criticized, lashed, out or denigrated the child for spending additional time with the other parent or for the child indicating a preference to spend time or to live with the other parent.	2	
71a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months attempted to have the other parent excluded from participating in the child's extra-curricular activities such as volunteering as a driver, sports coach or any activity where the parent may be taking on a voluntary role with the organization.	8	
71b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago attempted to have the other parent excluded from participating in the child's extra-curricular activities such as volunteering as a driver, sports coach or any activity where the parent may be taking on a voluntary role with the organization.	4	
71c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) attempted to have the other parent excluded from participating in the child's extra-curricular activities such as volunteering as a driver, sports coach or any activity where the parent may be taking on a voluntary role with the organization.	2	
72a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months prevented or interfered with the other parent's attempts to obtain medical, dental or school information about the child from other agencies or professionals.	6	
72b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago prevented or interfered with the other parent's attempts to obtain medical, dental or school information about the child from other agencies or professionals.	3	
72c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) prevented or interfered with the other parent's attempts to obtain medical, dental or school information about the child from other agencies or professionals.	1	
73a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months encouraged or put pressure on their child take on the last name of their current spouse without legally changing the	4	

	name when the child is mature enough to know his/her other parent and birth name.		
73b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> encouraged or put pressure on their child take on the last name of their current spouse without legally changing the name when the child is mature enough to know his/her other parent and birth name.	2	
73c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> encouraged or put pressure on their child take on the last name of their current spouse without legally changing the name when the child is mature enough to know his/her other parent and birth name.	1	
74a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> fostered or contributed to an environment which could be seen as condoning, encouraging or providing the opportunity for a minor child to engage in premature sexual activities which could put their child at risk of becoming pregnant or the child impregnating another person. (Permissive Parenting)	20	
74b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> fostered or contributed to an environment which could be seen as condoning, encouraging or providing the opportunity for a minor child to engage in premature sexual activities which could put their child at risk of becoming pregnant or the child impregnating another person. (Permissive Parenting)	10	
74c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> fostered or contributed to an environment which could be seen as condoning, encouraging or providing the opportunity for a minor child to engage in premature sexual activities which could put their child at risk of becoming pregnant or the child impregnating another person. (Permissive Parenting)	5	
75a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> while the parties were still cohabitating at the time, taken the child away for at least one overnight without advising the other parent where the subject parent and the child have gone in what would appear an attempt to cause worry or to deprive the other parent of knowing the whereabouts of the child.	6	
75b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> while the parties were still cohabitating at the time, taken the child away for at least one overnight without advising the other parent where the subject parent and the child have gone in what would appear an attempt to cause worry or to deprive the other parent of knowing the whereabouts of the child.	3	
75c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> while the parties were still cohabitating at the time, taken the child away for at least one overnight without advising the other parent where the subject parent and the child have gone in what would appear an attempt to cause worry or to deprive the other parent of knowing the whereabouts of the child.	2	
76a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused to share prescription medication intended for the child and has sent the child to the other parent's home without permitting the prescribed medication to travel with the child.	8	
76b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused to share prescription medication intended for the child and has sent the child to the other parent's home without permitting the prescribed medication to travel with the child.	4	
76c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> refused to share prescription medication intended for the child and has sent the child to the other	2	

	parent's home without permitting the prescribed medication to travel with the child.		
77a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused to allow his/her drug/dental benefit plan to be used to purchase medication for the child when the child is at the other parent's home thus forcing the other parent to purchase medication which would otherwise be covered by the parent's benefit's plan.	8	
77b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused to allow his/her drug/dental benefit plan to be used to purchase medication for the child when the child is at the other parent's home thus forcing the other parent to purchase medication which would otherwise be covered by the parent's benefit's plan.	4	
77c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> refused to allow his/her drug/dental benefit plan to be used to purchase medication for the child when the child is at the other parent's home thus forcing the other parent to purchase medication which would otherwise be covered by the parent's benefit's plan.	2	
78a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused to allow the child to take passes or coupons (season ski passes or amusement park passes, etc.) to the other parent's home which the child could benefit from the use of while at the other parent's home.	6	
78b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused to allow the child to take passes or coupons (season ski passes or amusement park passes, etc.) to the other parent's home which the child could benefit from the use of while at the other parent's home.	3	
78c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused to allow the child to take passes or coupons to the other parent's home which the child could benefit from the use of while at the other parent's home.	2	
79a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused to cooperate to vary a previous court order after the child has started working or has moved to live with the other parent or for any other reason is no longer applicable for child support.	4	
79b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused to cooperate to vary a previous court order after the child has started working or has moved to live with the other parent or for any other reason is no longer applicable for child support.	3	
79c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused to cooperate to vary a previous court order after the child has started working or has moved to live with the other parent or for any other reason is no longer applicable for child support.	1	
80a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused to take the necessary steps to advise a child support collection agency from withdrawing money from another parent for child support or daycare expenses when the child is no longer living with the subject parent or daycare expenses are no longer applicable or has refused to refund the other parent for child support or daycare expenses that were not rightfully owed to the parent for a specific time period.	6	
80b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused to take the necessary steps to advise a child support collection agency from withdrawing money from another parent for child support or daycare expenses when the child is no longer living with the subject parent or daycare expenses are no longer applicable or has refused to refund the other parent for child support or daycare expenses that were not rightfully owed to the parent for a specific time period.	3	
80c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused to take the	1	

	necessary steps to advise a child support collection agency from withdrawing money from another parent for child support or daycare expenses when the child is no longer living with the subject parent or daycare expenses are no longer applicable or has refused to refund the other parent for child support or daycare expenses that were not rightfully owed to the parent for a specific time period.		
81a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> permitted a minor child in the household to allow a boyfriend or girlfriend of the minor to live in the household contrary to the wishes of the other parent.	6	
81b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> permitted a minor child in the household to allow a boyfriend or girlfriend of the minor to live in the household contrary to the wishes of the other parent.	3	
81c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> permitted a minor child in the household to allow a boyfriend or girlfriend of the minor to live in the household contrary to the wishes of the other parent.	1	
82a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> offered the child money or other financial incentives conditional upon the child living with the parent.	8	
82b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> offered the child money or other financial incentives conditional upon the child living with the parent.	4	
82b	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> offered the child money or other financial incentives conditional upon the child living with the parent.	2	
83a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused to allow the other parent to purchase his/her portion of the matrimonial home which has been the home for one or more of the couple's children and has insisted that the home be put up for sale on the open marketplace.	8	
83b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused to allow the other parent to purchase his/her portion of the matrimonial home which has been the home for one or more of the couple's children and has insisted that the home be put up for sale on the open marketplace.	4	
83c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused to allow the other parent to purchase his/her portion of the matrimonial home which has been the home for one or more of the couple's children and has insisted that the home be put up for sale on the open marketplace.	2	
84a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> refused to obtain professional help or to participate in any program intended to help any child who would appear to be suffering from the effects of Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS).	50	
84b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> refused to obtain professional help or to participate in any program intended to help any child who would appear to be suffering from the effects of Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS).	25	
84c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> refused to obtain professional help or to participate in any program intended to help any child who would appear to be suffering from the effects of Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS).	12	
Total risk assessment points for "severe" HAP behaviours			

Part 3

Identifying and evaluating “Critical” Risk Behaviours/Indicators

The term “Critical Risk Behaviour/Indicators” refers to any behaviour/action of a parent or guardian which would be considered as so potentially damaging, neglectful or potentially life-threatening to a child’s physical or emotional well-being as to warrant immediate intervention and temporary removal of the child from the care and control of the HAP parent. Under many child welfare protection laws, most of the behaviours/influences listed in the “critical” category would be considered illegal or as meeting the threshold for child abuse, neglect or maltreatment.

The presence of any Critical Risk Indicators listed below will warrant immediate intervention and temporary removal of the parent’s custody rights and a comprehensive review of the child’s time with the HAP parent and a possible temporary termination of a parent’s access to a child is the risk of harm is considered serious enough to warrant this level of intervention. Parents who expose their child to such high levels of risk must be dealt some consequences for their actions to encourage them to be better parents.

Instructions

In the boxes on the right side of the sheet, mark down the points assigned to any of the “Critical” Risk Factors listed below, where information gathered during an investigation into HAP would give reasonable grounds to support the conclusion that the listed item below has been noted with the particular parent. If the listed critical risk behaviour/indicator has not been noted or if the information is unknown during the assessment process then leave the box blank.

Item No.	Critical Risk Behaviours/Indicators	Point Value	Points
1	There is compelling evidence to suggest that the subject parent is currently covertly planning to take a child into hiding or is attempting to flee to another country, province, state or jurisdiction without ample notice to the other parent and prior to seeking the court’s permission to do this, which will if implemented likely result in a child’s relationship with another parent or other family members being adversely affected.	500	
2	The subject parent has coached, attempted to coach or has used threats, intimidation or terror to make the child to provide false or misleading information to authorities and there is compelling evidence to show this.	500	
3	The subject parent has abducted a child and is currently in hiding with the whereabouts of the custodial parent and the child is being kept secret from the other parent and extended family members without reasonable explanation. This has resulted in a child’s relationship with another parent and other family friends being interfered with.	500	
4	The subject parent has currently moved away from their current place of residence and has taken the child with them and has located the child more in another country, province, state or jurisdiction more than 50 km away without a court Order authorizing this and without the prior knowledge or consent of the other parent which has resulted in a child’s relationship with another parent, family and friends being currently interfered with.	500	

5	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> exhibited a gross unwillingness or inability to reduce the child's exposure to HAP influences by failing to follow recommendations intended to reduce HAP influences after being formally cautioned about the harm that these behaviours could cause the child.	500	
6	The subject parent has <u>within the past 2 months</u> threatened to kill, to seriously harm, or to use a weapon or firearm against any child, or the subject parent has physically or sexually assaulted <u>ANY</u> child in the household or any child under his/her care, including stepchildren (not to be confused with minor physical discipline necessary to correct a child's behaviour) and there is credible evidence or testimony to support this claim.	500	
7	The parent has <u>within the past 3 months</u> placed the child into foster care or in a group home facility for children because of behaviour problems when there was suitable alternate care available with another parent or other family members at the time.	500	
8	The subject parent has attempted suicide, threatened suicide or has overdosed on drugs as part of a suicide attempt while acting in capacity as parent to any child <u>and is currently in a hospital or under a doctor's care outside of a hospital setting as a result of this recent attempted suicide.</u>	500	
9	Any child in the subject parent's household has attempted suicide, threatened suicide or has overdosed on drugs as part of a suicide attempt while under the care and control of the subject parent <u>within the past 3 months</u> and evidence would seem to support that HAP related influences may have been a factor leading up to the child's actions.	500	
10	The subject parent is <u>currently or within the past 30 days</u> attempted to extort or to blackmail another parent into signing court documents relating to any issue and has used denial of access to children as a weapon to extort or blackmail the other parent <u>and</u> the other parent's access with the child has been interfered with.	500	
11	There is compelling evidence to suggest that the subject parent may be currently planning to murder or physically injure the other parent.	500	
12	Any child in the subject parent's household has reported being physically or sexually assaulted <u>within the past 24 months</u> by the subject parent's current boyfriend, girlfriend or spouse and collateral information would support this as being a reasonable possibility and either a) the subject parent continues in a relationship with that person or b) the subject parent has failed address the legal or emotion issues of the assault to the expectations of the child's family and community.	500	
13	A child of the subject parent has indicated being physically or sexually assaulted by a step sibling or one of the children of the parent's current boyfriend, girlfriend or spouse <u>within the past 24 months</u> and either a) the subject parent continues in a relationship with that person or b) the issue of the assault remains unaddressed legally or emotionally to the expectations of the child's family and community.	500	
14	The subject parent has engaged in incest or been involved with intimate or sexual activities with any child within the household <u>within the past 24 months</u> and the issue remains unaddressed legally or emotionally to the expectations of the child's family and community.	500	

15	The subject parent has <u>within the past 2 months</u> exposed the child to situations involving excessive consumption of alcohol or use of drugs by anyone in the home to the point of intoxication or rowdiness or where any child has been made to feel uncomfortable or afraid in that situation.	500	
16	The subject parent has <u>within the past 3 months</u> refused to promptly submit to a drug test when it has been found that any child of the parent under the age of 16 years of age has been taking illegal drugs and it is alleged that the subject parent has been influencing or encouraging his/her child to take the drugs.	500	
17	The subject parent has <u>within the past 6 months</u> allowed the child to be exposed to smoke in the home which has been identified as being a possible or likely contributor to respiratory related problems that the child has been diagnosed as having (eg asthma) when the parent should have known that the exposure of the child to the smoke could cause further health related problems for the child.	500	
18	The subject parent <u>currently or has within the past 3 months</u> failed to obtain appropriate medical attention for a child who is in need of medical attention.	500	
19	The subject parent has <u>within the past 3 months</u> been evaluated using this risk assessment protocol as being a high risk of harm to the child and has also been recently diagnosed as suffering from some form of long term mental illness which can be directly linked to the subject parent's HAP behaviour, which in the written opinion a qualified health care professional, the prognosis is not good for the parent being able to return to a normal state of mental health and stability within the next 24 months from the date of this risk assessment evaluation.	500	
20	The subject parent has <u>within the past 3 months</u> encouraged his/her child to engage in the purchase or sale of illegal drugs, alcohol or other banned substances.	500	
21	The parent has <u>within the past 3 months</u> encouraged his/her child to engage in criminal activities such as shoplifting, theft or fraud or has condoned such criminal activities.	500	
22	The subject parent is currently or has <u>within the past 3 months</u> physically locked a child in a room using a lock or other mechanical device, contrary to the wishes of the child with the intent of punishing the child or to keep the child from contacting the other parent by phone or to keep the child from escaping in order to be with the other parent.	500	
23	The subject parent has <u>within the past 3 months</u> left a child who is 12 years of age or younger alone in the home without anyone in the home to supervise and prior to leaving the home the subject parent deliberately locked up the phones in the home with the purpose of preventing the children from communicating with anyone by telephone in the event of an emergency.	500	
24	The subject parent has <u>within the past 3 months</u> left any young child in the household unattended while the subject parent has gone out without ensuring that the child is in the care of an appropriate child care provider.	500	
25	The subject parent has <u>within the past 6 months</u> been found in the illegal possession of a gun, explosive or other restricted weapon and it would appear that the subject parent was intentionally trying to conceal these restricted items from being discovered by authorities.	500	

26	The subject parent has <u>within the past 6 months</u> been involved in an automobile accident when the child was present in the vehicle and the consumption of alcohol by the subject parent appears to have been a factor in the accident.	500	
27	The subject parent has <u>within the past 12 months</u> helped to foster alienation between a child and another parent by allowing a child to cut off reasonable communication between themselves and another parent because of <u>minor</u> issues or disagreements with the other parent, rather than encouraging the child to deal with the issues between himself/herself and the other parent. The subject parent has, in effect, allowed a child to punish the other parent over what would considered as unreasonable reasons.	500	
28	Any child of the subject parent is currently not involved in a meaningful relationship with his/her other parent or is currently refusing to spend a reasonable amount of time with the other parent without and it would appear that the child may exhibiting the early signs of Parental Alienation (PAS) induced by the subject parent's behaviour.	500	
29	The subject parent has <u>within the past 2 months</u> has made allegations of assault or abuse against his/her own child or has attempted to have police or child welfare protection agencies take action against the child and the parent has not tried to deal with this problem with the other parent before contacting outside agencies.	500	
29	The subject parent has <u>within the past 3 months</u> administered psychiatric prescription drugs to a child without a doctor's prescription.	500	
Total risk assessment points for "Critical" Risk behaviours			

Part 4

Identifying and evaluating high risk indicators of harm to a child due to Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP)

High Risk indicators of harm to a child due to Hostile Aggressive Parenting (HAP) generally includes the following:

- 1) The actions/behaviours of a parent which do not impact directly on the other parent or the child.
- 2) The actions or behaviours of other persons which may be linked to the subject parent.
- 3) Various other influences and/or conditions which would be considered as being outside the direct and observable actions or behaviours of the subject parent, but, which can be reasonably argued as being significantly linked to, or a result of, the behaviour, actions, influence or decision-making of the subject parent.

Instructions

In the boxes to the right of the form, check off any of the high risk indicators listed below where information gathered during an investigation into HAP would give reasonable grounds to support the conclusion that the listed high risk indicators are applicable with this particular parent. If the particular risk indicator has not been noted or if the information is unknown then leave the box blank. Separate sheets should be used for each parent.

Item No.	High Risk indicators of HAP	Point Value	Assigned Points
1a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 5 years</u> been diagnosed by a qualified health care professional as having Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD) .	12	
1b	The subject parent has <u>more than 5 years ago</u> been diagnosed by a qualified health care professional as having Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD) but has not shown symptoms or been under treatment for such condition in the past 5 years.	4	
2a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 5 years</u> been diagnosed by a qualified health care professional as having Munchausen Syndrome by Proxy (MSBP) .	12	
2b	The subject parent has <u>more than 5 years ago</u> been diagnosed by a qualified health care professional as having Munchausen Syndrome by Proxy (MSBP) but has not shown symptoms or been under treatment for such condition in the past 5 years.	4	
3a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> been under medication and is being administered prescription drugs for depression and/or stress related mental illnesses.	6	
3b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> been under medication and was being administered prescription drugs for depression and/or stress related mental illnesses at that time.	3	
3c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> been under medication and was being administered prescription drugs for depression and/or stress related mental illnesses at that time.	1	
4a	The subject parent has <u>between 2 months to 24 months ago</u> attempted suicide, threatened suicide or has overdosed on drugs as part of a suicide attempt while acting in capacity as parent or caregiver to any child.	100	

4b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> attempted suicide, threatened suicide or has overdosed on drugs as part of a suicide attempt while acting in capacity as parent or caregiver to any child.	50	
4c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> attempted suicide, threatened suicide or has overdosed on drugs as part of a suicide attempt while acting in capacity as parent or caregiver to any child.	10	
5a	Any child in the subject parent's household has <u>within the past 24 months</u> reported being physically or sexually assaulted by the parent's boyfriend, girlfriend or spouse at the time and information gathered would support this as being a reasonable possibility and that the parent <u>has taken</u> appropriate steps to address the legal or emotion issues of the assault to the expectations of the child's family and community.	12	
5b	Any child in the subject parent's household has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> reported being physically or sexually assaulted by the parent's boyfriend, girlfriend or spouse at the time and information gathered would support this as being a reasonable possibility.	6	
5c	Any child in the subject parent's household has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> reported being physically or sexually assaulted by the parent's boyfriend, girlfriend or spouse at the time and information gathered would support this as being a reasonable possibility.	3	
6a	Any child in the subject parent's household has reported being physically or sexually assaulted <u>within the past 24 months</u> by a step sibling or another child who is related to the parent's boyfriend, girlfriend or spouse at the time and information gathered would support this as being a reasonable possibility and that the parent <u>has taken</u> appropriate steps to address the legal or emotion issues of the assault to the expectations of the child's family and community.	12	
6b	Any child in the subject parent's household has reported being physically or sexually assaulted <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> by a step sibling or another child who is related to the parent's boyfriend, girlfriend or spouse at the time and information gathered would support this as being a reasonable.	6	
6c	Any child in the subject parent's household has reported being physically or sexually assaulted <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> by a step sibling or another child who is related to the parent's boyfriend, girlfriend or spouse at the time and information gathered would support this as being a reasonable.	3	
7a	Any child of the subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> self inflicted injuries or mutilation or has attempted suicide while under the care and control of this parent and the child's actions could be seen as being linked to the subject parent's maltreatment of the child or HAP behaviours.	75	
7b	Any child of the subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> self inflicted injuries or mutilation or has attempted suicide while under the care and control of this parent and the child's actions could be seen as being linked to the subject parent's maltreatment of the child or HAP behaviours.	25	
7c	Any child of the subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years)</u> self inflicted injuries or mutilation or has attempted suicide while under the care and control of this parent and the child's actions could be seen as being linked to the subject parent's maltreatment of the child or HAP behaviours.	6	
8a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> submitted a false statement to police or to the court which can be reasonably shown that the subject parent knew beforehand was false and intended to do harm to the other parent or subvert the administration of justice.	8	

8b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> submitted a false statement to police or to the court which can be reasonably shown that the subject parent knew beforehand was false and intended to do harm to the other parent or subvert the administration of justice.	4	
8c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> submitted a false statement to police or to the court which can be reasonably shown that the subject parent knew beforehand was false and intended to do harm to the other parent or subvert the administration of justice.	2	
9a	Any child of the subject parent has made handwritten notes or drawings <u>within the past 24 months</u> , indicating that they do not like or are fearful of the subject parent and can provide some reasons to support why he/she made the notes or drawings.	8	
9b	Any child of the subject parent has made handwritten notes or drawings <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , indicating that they do not like or are fearful of the subject parent and can provide some reasons to support why he/she made the notes or drawings.	4	
9c	Any child of the subject parent has made handwritten notes or drawings <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , indicating that they do not like or are fearful of the subject parent and can provide some reasons to support why he/she made the notes or drawings.	2	
10a	Any child of the subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> , expressed a desire not to live with the subject parent or has expressed a desire to spend less time with the subject parent and can provide reasons to support their wishes.	8	
10b	Any child of the subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> , expressed a desire not to live with the subject parent or has expressed a desire to spend less time with the subject parent and can provide reasons to support their wishes.	4	
10c	Any child of the subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> , expressed a desire not to live with the subject parent or has expressed a desire to spend less time with the subject parent and can provide reasons to support their wishes.	2	
11a	The child of the subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> disclosed through third parties, a fear of reprisal (eg loss of privileges or physical punishment) from the parent or members of that parent's extended family for disclosure of truthful information.	4	
11b	The child of the subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> disclosed through third parties, a fear of reprisal (eg loss of privileges or physical punishment) from the parent or members of that parent's extended family for disclosure of truthful information.	2	
11c	The child of the subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> disclosed through third parties, a fear of reprisal (eg loss of privileges or physical punishment) from the parent or members of that parent's extended family for disclosure of truthful information.	1	
12a	The child has <u>within the past 24 months</u> indicated to third parties, a strong distrust and/or dislike of the subject parent's extended family members (eg. Grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc.) to third parties.	4	

12b	The child has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> indicated to third parties, a strong distrust and/or dislike of the subject parent's extended family members (eg. Grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc.) to third parties.	2	
12c	The child has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> indicated to third parties, a strong distrust and/or dislike of the subject parent's extended family members (eg. Grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc.) to third parties.	1	
13a	Other members of the subject parent's family (such as grandparents, aunts or uncles to the child) have <u>within the past 24 months</u> also engaged in Hostile-Aggressive Parenting practices as well.	4	
13b	Other members of the subject parent's family (such as grandparents, aunts or uncles to the child) have <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> also engaged in Hostile-Aggressive Parenting practices as well.	2	
13c	Other members of the subject parent's family (such as grandparents, aunts or uncles to the child) have <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> also engaged in Hostile-Aggressive Parenting practices as well.	1	
14a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> had other members of their own family (such as grandparents, aunts or uncles to the child), physically assaulted or verbally threaten the other parent.	4	
14b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> had other members of their own family (such as grandparents, aunts or uncles to the child), physically assaulted or verbally threaten the other parent.	2	
14c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> had other members of their own family (such as grandparents, aunts or uncles to the child), physically assaulted or verbally threaten the other parent.	1	
15a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> been involved in family violence involving a boyfriend or girlfriend.	6	
15b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> been involved in family violence involving a boyfriend or girlfriend.	4	
15c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> been involved in family violence involving a boyfriend or girlfriend.	2	
16a	Any child of the subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> reported to teachers at school or other independent third parties about abuse, neglect or HAP behaviours of the subject parent.	6	
16b	Any child of the subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> reported to teachers at school or other independent third parties about abuse, neglect or HAP behaviours of the subject parent.	3	
16c	Any child of the subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> reported to teachers at school or other independent third parties about abuse, neglect or HAP behaviours of the subject parent.	2	
17a	The subject parent has <u>within the last 24 months</u> refused without a good reason, to submit for drug testing when it has been alleged by another credible party that the parent has been taking illegal drugs which may affect the ability of the subject parent to care for any child in his/her care	6	
17b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months</u> refused, without a good reason, to submit for drug testing when it has been alleged by another credible party that the parent has been taking illegal drugs which may affect the ability of the subject parent to care for any child in his/her care	3	

17c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) refused, without a good reason, to submit for drug testing when it has been alleged by another credible party that the parent has been taking illegal drugs which may affect the ability of the subject parent to care for any child in his/her care	1	
18a	There has been animosity between siblings in the family within the past 6 months and at least one of the siblings has indicated that the animosity between the siblings is caused by the actions or behaviour of this parent and there is information which would support the reasons given by the child.	8	
18b	There has been animosity within siblings within the family between 6 and 24 months ago and at least one of the siblings has indicated that the animosity between the siblings is caused by the actions or behaviour of this parent and there is information which would support the reasons given by the child.	4	
18c	There has been animosity within siblings within the family more than 24 months ago and at least one of the siblings has indicated that the animosity between the siblings is caused by the actions or behaviour of this parent and there is information which would support the reasons given by the child.	1	
19a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months refused to discuss or to grant permission to obtain an updated copy of all police occurrence reports to their home in order to help disprove allegations of violence or criminal activity in their home.	6	
19b	The subject parent has between 6 and 24 months ago refused to discuss or to grant permission to obtain an updated copy of all police occurrence reports to their home in order to help disprove allegations of violence or criminal activity in their home.	3	
19c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago refused to discuss or to grant permission to obtain an updated copy of all police occurrence reports to their home in order to help disprove allegations of violence or criminal activity in their home.	2	
20a	The subject parent's child has within the past 24 months has indicated a fear or strong dislike of the subject parent's boyfriend or girlfriend at the time and can provide reasons which reasonably support their feelings towards the person who their parent is having a relationship with.	8	
20b	The subject parent's child has between 6 and 24 months ago has indicated a fear or strong dislike of the subject parent's boyfriend or girlfriend at the time and can provide reasons which reasonably support their feelings towards the person who their parent is having a relationship with.	4	
20c	The subject parent's child has more than 72 months (6 years) ago has indicated a fear or strong dislike of the subject parent's boyfriend or girlfriend at the time and can provide reasons which reasonably support their feelings towards the person who their parent is having a relationship with.	2	
21	The subject parent has a past history of being raised as a child in a home where Hostile-Aggressive Parenting was practiced by the parents in that home.	4	
22	The subject parent has a past history of being raised in a home where he/she was sexually/physically or emotionally abused as a child.	4	
23	The subject parent has a documented past history as a perpetrator of physical or emotional child abuse or neglect which has required intervention of a child welfare protection agency.	8	

24	The subject parent has a past history of perpetrating or participating in paternity fraud where another person was wrongly identified as being the father to a child.	4	
25a	There are one or more police occurrence reports which show police have attended the home of the subject parent to deal with issues of family conflict or violence in the subject parent's home <u>within the past 24 months.</u>	4	
25b	There are one or more police occurrence reports which show police have attended the home of the subject parent to deal with issues of family conflict or violence in the subject parent's home <u>between 24 and 72 months ago.</u>	2	
25c	There are one or more police occurrence reports which show police have attended the home of the subject parent to deal with issues of family conflict or violence in the subject parent's home <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago.</u>	1	
26a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> taken out a life insurance policy on the other parent without the knowledge or consent of the other parent.	2	
26b	The subject parent has <u>more than 24 months ago</u> taken out a life insurance policy on the other parent without the knowledge or consent of the other parent.	1	
27	The subject parent has a child from a previous relationship who has no contact with the other biological or step parent. (This factor is not applicable where death of the other parent is the cause of no contact)	4	
28a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> encouraged the other parent to participate in the use of illegal drugs.	4	
28b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> encouraged the other parent to participate in the use of illegal drugs.	2	
28c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> encouraged the other parent to participate in the use of illegal drugs.	1	
29a	Any child of the subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> displayed hostility, aggression or dislike towards his/her other parent (includes refusal to visit or to attend an access center) and would appear unable to give consistent and reasonable reasons for their dislike of the other parent.	8	
29b	Any child of the subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> displayed hostility, aggression or dislike towards his/her other parent (includes refusal to visit or to attend an access center) and would appear unable to give consistent and reasonable reasons for their dislike of the other parent.	4	
29c	Any child of the subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> displayed hostility, aggression or dislike towards his/her other parent (includes refusal to visit or to attend an access center) and would appear unable to give consistent and reasonable reasons for their dislike of the other parent.	2	
30a	The parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> has been involved in an intimate or live-in relationship with his/her solicitor while family court matters were before the court.	4	
30b	The parent was <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> involved in an intimate or live-in relationship with his/her solicitor while matters involving the other parent were before the court at that time.	2	
30c	The parent was <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> involved in an intimate or live-in relationship with his/her solicitor while matters involving the other parent were before the court at that time.	1	

31a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> been actively earning income from offering sexual related services in the sex trade industry.	4	
31b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> been actively earning income from offering sexual related services in the sex trade industry.	2	
31c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> been actively earning income from offering sexual related services in the sex trade industry.	1	
32a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> exhibited jealous rages and made unfounded accusations against the other parent of being unfaithful while they were still in a relationship together.	6	
32b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> exhibited jealous rages and made unfounded accusations against the other parent of being unfaithful while they were still in a relationship together.	4	
32c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> exhibited jealous rages and made unfounded accusations against the other parent of being unfaithful while they were still in a relationship together.	1	
33a	A previous spouse of the subject parent has <u>within the past 72 months</u> committed suicide during or after divorce proceedings and reasonable information available would indicate that Hostile-Aggressive Parenting by the parent was present during the dissolution of that relationship.	10	
33b	A previous spouse of the subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> committed suicide during or after divorce proceedings and reasonable information available would indicate that Hostile-Aggressive Parenting by the parent was present during the dissolution of that relationship.	5	
34a	Any child has <u>within the past 24 months</u> run away from the subject parent or defied the existing parenting arrangements in order to spend time with another parent or family member.	8	
34b	The child has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> run away from the subject parent or defied the existing parenting arrangements in order to spend time with another parent or family member.	4	
34c	The child has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> run away from the subject parent or defied the existing parenting arrangements in order to spend time with another parent or family member.	2	
35a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> been unfaithful to his/her partner and has been involved in a secret affair while being married or in a common-law relationship during the time that he/she was living with their partner.	8	
35b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> been unfaithful to his/her partner and has been involved in a secret affair while being married or in a common-law relationship during the time that he/she was living with their partner.	4	
35c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> been unfaithful to his/her partner and has been involved in a secret affair while being married or in a common-law relationship during the time that he/she was living with their partner.	1	
36a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> created a disturbance in the courtroom during court proceedings or has had to be cautioned by the judge for his/her conduct while in the court.	6	
36b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> created a disturbance in the courtroom during court proceedings or has had to be cautioned by the judge for his/her conduct while in the court.	3	

36c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago created a disturbance in the courtroom during court proceedings or has had to be cautioned by the judge for his/her conduct while in the court.	2	
37a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months interfered with the administration of justice by intentionally avoiding the service of court documents.	4	
37b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago interfered with the administration of justice by rejecting or avoiding the service of court documents.	2	
37c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago interfered with the administration of justice by rejecting or avoiding the service of court documents.	1	
38a	The subject parent (mother only) has within the past 24 months impregnated herself using artificial insemination through a qualified medical clinic without the consent of her cohabitating partner at the time.	8	
38b	The subject parent (mother only) has between 24 and 72 months ago impregnated herself using artificial insemination through a qualified medical clinic without the consent of her cohabitating partner at the time.	4	
38c	The subject parent (mother only) has more than 72 months (6 years) ago impregnated herself using artificial insemination through a qualified medical clinic without the consent of her cohabitating partner at the time.	2	
39a	The subject parent has within the past 24 months become pregnant by someone outside of the current relationship or has impregnated another person outside the relationship while still in a relationship with a current partner.	10	
39b	The subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago become pregnant by someone outside of the current relationship or has impregnated another person outside the relationship while still in a relationship with a current partner.	5	
39c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago become pregnant by someone outside of the current relationship or has impregnated another person outside the relationship while still in a relationship with a current partner.	2	
40a	Any child of the subject parent has within the past 24 months exhibited serious behavioural problems or anti-social behaviours, is defiant of any form of authority or has exhibited violence or aggression against others at school or with others in the community.	6	
40b	Any child of the subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago exhibited serious behavioural problems or anti-social behaviours, is defiant of any form of authority or has exhibited violence or aggression against others at school or with others in the community.	3	
40c	Any child of the subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) ago exhibited serious behavioural problems or anti-social behaviours, is defiant of any form of authority or has exhibited violence or aggression against others at school or with others in the community.	1	
41a	Any child of the subject parent has within the past 24 months failed to acknowledge another parent's birthday either in person, by phone or by birthday card or note.	3	
41b	Any child of the subject parent has between 24 and 72 months ago failed to acknowledge another parent's birthday either in person, by phone or by birthday card or note.	2	

41c	Any child of the subject parent has <u>more than 72 months ago</u> failed to acknowledge another parent's birthday either in person, by phone or by birthday card or note.	1	
42a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> violated key clauses contained in a peace bond or bail document by contacting another parent, family member or any other person in regards to issues which are not related directly to any child.	6	
42b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> violated key clauses contained in a peace bond or bail document by contacting another parent, family member or any other person in regards to issues which are not related directly to any child.	3	
42c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> violated key clauses contained in a peace bond or bail document by contacting another parent, family member or any other person in regards to issues which are not related directly to any child.	1	
43a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> exhibited unusual, obsessive or compulsive behaviour in regards to tending to the children's needs (such as making the child wear old or second hand clothes when the parent has the money for new, having family members share bath water and other excessive restriction to the child's use of water, hydro or toiletries in the home).	3	
43b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> exhibited unusual, obsessive or compulsive behaviour in regards to tending to the children's needs (such as making the child wear old or second hand clothes when the parent has the money for new, having family members share bath water and other excessive restriction to the child's use of water, hydro or toiletries in the home).	2	
43c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> exhibited unusual, obsessive or compulsive behaviour in regards to tending to the children's needs (such as making the child wear old or second hand clothes when the parent has the money for new, having family members share bath water and other excessive restriction to the child's use of water, hydro or toiletries in the home).	1	
44a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> been arrested or charged by police for driving while under the influence of drugs or alcohol.	3	
44b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> been arrested or charged by police for driving while under the influence of drugs or alcohol.	2	
44c	The subject parent has <u>more than 72 months (6 years) ago</u> been arrested or charged by police for driving while under the influence of drugs or alcohol.	1	
45a	The subject parent has <u>within the past 24 months</u> been the subject of a family court report which was prepared by an assessor or social worker and the report would provide information which indicates that the subject parent has acted in a hostile or aggressive manner towards any other parent or child.	6	
45b	The subject parent has <u>between 24 and 72 months ago</u> been the subject of a family court report which was prepared by an assessor or social worker and the report would provide information which indicates that the subject parent has acted in a hostile or aggressive manner towards any other parent or child.	3	

45c	The subject parent has more than 72 months (6 years) been the subject of a family court report which was prepared by an assessor or social worker and the report would provide information which indicates that the subject parent has acted in a hostile or aggressive manner towards any other parent or child.	1	
46a	A child of the subject parent within the past 24 months exhibited a noticeable difference in behaviour and/or mood in the presence of the subject parent child as compared to when the subject parent is not present and this has been observed by persons other than the parents.	3	
46b	A child of the subject parent between 24 and 72 months ago exhibited a noticeable difference in behaviour and/or mood in the presence of the subject parent child as compared to when the subject parent is not present and this has been observed by persons other than the parents.	2	
46c	A child of the subject parent more than 72 months (6 years) ago exhibited a noticeable difference in behaviour and/or mood in the presence of the subject parent child as compared to when the subject parent is not present.	1	
Total assessment points for high risk indicators			

Part 5

Identifying familial risk indicators associated with Hostile-Aggressive Parenting

Familial risk indicators associated with Hostile-Aggressive Parenting generally include those conditions/factors which have been known to be associated with, but cannot be ascertained, to be significantly or directly linked to the behaviour, actions or decision-making of an HAP parent. Some specific actions/behaviours of other persons could be considered as risk indicators as well. For instance, poverty has been widely associated with children's behavioural problems, yet some children living in poverty develop into normal successful adults. Poverty is only an influence which may fuel the formation of many other conditions and influences which when combined together create the behavioural problems. It can be argued that poverty contributes to HAP but conversely it could be argued that HAP behaviour and dysfunctional relationships as a result of HAP may contribute to poverty. For the reason that some influences cannot be reasonably demonstrated to be directly linked to HAP, these risk factor influences have not been included as part of the point system used to determine risk to a child. These factors are only used to add weight to any previous analysis of HAP and its level of harm to the child.

Instructions

In the boxes to the right of the form, check off any of the familial risk indicators listed below where information gathered during an investigation into HAP would give reasonable grounds to support the conclusion that the listed risk indicators are applicable to this particular parent. If the particular familial risk indicator has not been noted then leave the box blank.

	Familial risk indicators associated with HAP	Check if applicable
1	The subject parent has siblings in his/her own family who have also been alienated from a parent or other family members due to family conflict in the past resulting from separation of the parents.	
2	The subject parent has a past history of being a victim of sexual, physical abuse or neglect as a child or young adult.	
3	The subject parent is currently abusing drugs or alcohol or has a past history of drug or alcohol abuse.	
4	The subject parent has a general history of conflict with third parties such as neighbours, landlords, babysitters, in-laws or past friends.	
5	The subject parent has a past history of being a "bully" in school when he/she was a child.	
6	The subject parent has a past history as a foster child or child receiving temporary care or assistance of local child welfare protection agencies.	
7	The subject parent has a past history of neglect of children such as leaving children alone in the home when the children were too young to be left alone.	
8	The subject parent has a history as a victim of physical or emotional abused by their partner during cohabitation.	
9	The subject parent has few or no long term friendships.	

10	The subject parent has a past history of protracted litigation with one or more previous partners.	
11	The subject parent has a history of poor relationships with his/her own parents or other members of his/her immediate family.	
12	The subject parent has a past history of conflict or poor relations with in-laws and former in-laws from previous relationships.	
13	The subject parent has been previously involved in a relationship where the former partner was charged criminally for sexual or physical abusing the subject parent.	
14	Some neighbours and friends of the family while they were together also express concern about hostile behaviours and motivations of the subject parent.	
15	The subject parent has a history of anger management problems such as history of yelling at children, spouse and others.	
16	The subject parent has a pattern of multiple, short term intimate relationships or exhibits promiscuous behaviours.	
17	The subject parent has a past history of deceptive and illegal practices such as shoplifting, fraud, use of false or misleading information relating to abuse of welfare or immigration laws.	
18	The subject parent is currently involved in an intimate or live-in relationship with a new partner.	
19	The subject parent is currently involved in an intimate or live-in relationship with a new partner where the new partner has a history of being a perpetrator of family violence in previous relationships or where the person has been known to be violent and aggressive.	
20	The subject parent currently resides, or was raised as a child, in what would be considered as an economically depressed or high crime neighbourhood."	
21	The subject parent is collecting child support from more than one other parent for the same child in a practice referred to as "double-dipping."	
22	The subject parent is currently collecting welfare or social assistance or has a history of collecting welfare or social assistance at various times over a number of years.	
23	The subject parent is currently living in a women's shelter or has lived in a women's shelter within the past 24 months. (There are no known shelters for men and children)	
24	Any child of the subject parent is exhibiting a number of behavioural problems while under the care and control of the subject parent.	
25	Any child of the subject parent has shown aggression, uncooperativeness and/or unwillingness to return to the home of this parent upon returning from the home of another parent of family member.	
26	Any child of the subject parent has experienced a noticeable drop in school performance or attendance since residing in the sole or primary care of with this parent.	
27	Any child of the subject parent has been engaged in vandalism or acts of racism in the community while under the care and control of this parent.	

28	Any child of the subject parent is smoking tobacco against the law while under the care and control of this parent.	
29	Any child of the subject parent is or has been involved with the use of illicit drugs while under the care and control of the parent.	
30	Children living with the subject parent are overly aggressive (physically, emotionally), competitive and abusive with each other.	
31	Any child of the subject parent has self inflicted injuries or mutilation or has attempted suicide while under the care and control of this parent and the cause of the child's actions cannot be ascertained.	
32	Any child of the subject parent suffers from chronic absenteeism or late attendance at school without reasonable cause while under the care and control of this parent.	
33	Any child of the subject parent is a member of a youth gang or has been a member of a youth gang within the past 24 months.	
34	Any child of the subject parent appears to have an unhealthy attraction to socially undesirable influences such as guns, fires, knives, drugs, drinking, rapes, torture, killing, etc.	
35	Any child of the subject parent is on mood altering drugs such as Ritalin or anti-depressants with the knowledge and consent of both parents.	
36	Any child of the subject parent is not performing well in school or has dropped out of school without completing high school.	
37	Any child of the subject parent has poor social skills and has difficulty getting along with his/her peers.	
38	The subject parent had his/her relationship with his/her own parent ended with another parent during childhood and the cause of this appears to be divorce or separation of the parents.	
Total familial risk indicators identified		

Part Six

Analysis of risk of harm to child

Using the form below transfer the point totals from the “moderate” HAP sheet (Part 1) and the “severe” HAP sheet (Part 2) and using the scale below the chart to determine the risk to the child. Note that the “additional risk indicators” are not used in the evaluation formula to determine risk to the child but are only used as an additional factor when comparing the additional risk factors between parents.

Line		Points
A	Total number of points allotted for “moderate” Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP) behaviours noted with subject parent. (Checklist 1)	
B	Total number of points allotted for “severe” Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP) behaviours noted with subject parent. (Checklist 2)	
C	Total number of points allotted for “Critical” Risk Behaviours (Checklist 3)	
D	Total number of points allotted for “high risk indicators” associated with the subject parent. (Checklist 4)	
E	Total combined point value of HAP behaviours and high risk indicators noted attributed to the parent. (Total of lines A to D)	
F	Total number of familial risk indicators associated with Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP). (Checklist 5)	

Assessing the level of risk of harm to the child

Using the point system outlined in this document and the total found on **LINE E**, above, the following categories are to be used when determining the level of risk of harm to the child. Line F is not used in the calculation process itself but is used to provide additional support.

0 to 49 points	Low risk of harm to child
50 to 249 points	Moderate risk of harm to child
250 to 499 points	High risk of harm to child
500 or more points	Extreme risk of harm to child

How to Determine the presence of Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS)

Parental alienation syndrome (PAS) is an abnormal psychological condition most often observed in children affected by high conflict divorce and/or separation. Is one of the most damaging outcomes affecting children as a result of exposure to Hostile-Aggressive Parenting. The most common symptom of children affected by PAS is their severe opposition to contact with one parent and/or overt hatred toward such parent when there is little and often, no logical reason to explain the child's behaviour. The effects of PAS can last well into adulthood and may last for a lifetime with tragic consequences.

Parental Alienation can be defined as follows:

Parental Alienation Syndrome is an abnormal psychological condition in a child which adversely impacts the child's relationship with a (target) parent in a number of clearly identifiable and dysfunctional ways and the causes of the disorder can be reasonably traced back to the actions, behaviours and decision-making of a person or persons who are interfering with the child's relationship with the (target) parent.

Although in the vast majority of cases, it is one of a child's parents who is the victim of the child's PAS, other persons such as siblings, step parents grandparents and friends of the child may also be adversely victimized in a similar manner. For the purposes of determining the presence of PAS, the word "parent" may also be used to refer to any other person whose relationship with the child may be adversely affected in a similar manner as described for a parent.

Those who conduct assessments into Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP) must understand PAS and know how to identify its presence as some information being gathered for an evaluation of HAP could be tainted due to a child being affected by PAS providing untruthful information.

Up until the development of the "***Risk assessment protocol to evaluate the risk of harm to children caused by Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP)***", identifying the presence of Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS) was usually shrouded in clinical terms that were vague and open to interpretation and, therefore, susceptible to endless argument by opposing lawyers and their experts within the adversarial court system. Often the term PAS was grouped together to include the negative behaviour of one or both of the parents, rather than being identified as a mental health condition of the child. PAS clearly refers to a mental health condition of the child. PAS clearly is a disorder in a child which can be easily identified by referencing a simple list of identifying criteria and qualifiers. The actions, behaviours and decision-making of persons (usually called HAP parents) influencing the child are the causes of PAS and should not be confused with the condition of PAS.

To determine if PAS has developed in a child, two simple criteria need to be satisfied. The first criteria to be satisfied is the observance of one or more symptoms of a child's abnormal psychological condition and the second criteria being the condition that the child's mental disorder

has been largely caused by the Hostile-Aggressive influences other than those created by the target (or alienated) parent which in turn are supported by a number of qualifiers.

The phenomenon of one parent alienating a child from another once loving parent is not a complicated concept to understand for professionals or for laypersons nor is it complicated to identify. Just as HAP can be readily identified by just simple observation, PAS does not require extensive medical or psychological tests by a mental health professional to identify. In previous years PAS has been difficult to clearly identify as there has been no clearly written criteria for its determination. As a result, cases involving PAS have been heavily litigated, with accusations and counter accusations, which have left most courts more confused than ever with much of the testimony being eventually discounted as hearsay.

Presenting a case of PAS to the courts

The manner of presenting a case to support parental alienation syndrome is crucial. It can take a terribly long time to get to a trial and a lot of damage can be done to a child before a trial ever occurs. An effective case built on as much written evidence is crucial to a success in motions court. Parental Alienation Syndrome does not just happen on its own. It is caused by the actions of an HAP parent.

In Ontario, Justice Nancy Mossip ordered an immediate change of interim custody where the father had engaged in a very obvious campaign designed to alienate the children from their mother. *Reeves v. Reeves*, [2001] O.J. No. 308 (Ont. S.C.J.) What appeared to be convincing here was that there was a great deal of outside third party evidence of HAP which reasonably supported the presence of parental alienation.

In her decision, Ontario Justice Mossip wrote the following:

26 There are two choices for the Court in the matter before me:

- (1) Leave the children where they are or
- (2) Move the children to live with their mother

Both choices are fraught with difficulties, however, only the second option I find, offers any hope that Brandon and Nicholas might grow into healthy adults. I am choosing the option that will no doubt cause the most immediate pain, for what I perceive to be the long term best interests of the children. **I find this is a clear case of parental alienation by the father which has resulted in obvious harm to the Reeves children. Sometimes it takes years for the harm resulting from children being denied their right to have a relationship with both parents to surface. In the case before me, there is already evidence of deep and ongoing harm as a result of parental alienation.**

¶27 The results of parental alienation by the father against their mother on these children are observable now, and according to the Children's Lawyer social worker, the children are being adversely affected at a rapid and increasing rate.

¶28 Rarely does a Court have such unequivocal evidence as to the adverse effects on the children to remain with one parent as is set out in the two affidavits of the Children's Lawyer social worker. **It would, in my view, be a grave disservice to the Reeves**

children not to act promptly and effectively on her advice and recommendations in this case.

Using the procedures outlined in this risk assessment protocol for HAP, coupled with the simple key identifying criteria of PAS, the presence of PAS can be consistently and effectively identified. Because PAS is induced in a child as a result of the behaviours, actions or decision-making of a parent or guardian, the use of the risk assessment Protocol for HAP can serve as the foundation in the identification of PAS in a particular case and can provide that critical body of written evidence to build a case to convince a court that it must deal with the issue of PAS

PAS can be reasonably concluded to exist when the two criteria outlined below have been satisfied. The first criteria that must be satisfied relates to the child's mental disorder. Some sort of mental disorder relating the child's relationship with another parent must be observed. The second criteria that must be satisfied is the list of qualifiers to the mental disorders listed under criteria 1. Qualifiers are required because in some cases there may be a legitimate and compelling reason why a child may exhibit one of the disorders listed under Criteria 1. For example, a child may not want to have a normal relationship with one parent because he/she was physically or emotionally abused by the target parent and reasonable and compelling evidence exists which would support this as being factual. In such a case, the refusal of the child to have a normal relationship with a parent would not be considered PAS as the child has legitimate reasons for his/her feelings towards the parent who has physically or emotionally abused him. However, even in cases where the child's feelings may have a legitimate cause, counselling should be explored to see if the prior damage between the child and the parent can be repaired and some form of normal relationship restored.

PAS can be concluded to exist in a person when **both** of the following two criteria categories have been investigated and the requirements of each category validated for any particular family situation:

Criteria 1 (Indicators of a mental disorder relating to a child's parental relationship)

In order to validate the requirement of "Criteria 1", at least **one** of the following indicators of a mental disorder or abnormality relating to the child's relationship with another parent must be present (usually the parent but can also apply to siblings and other family members):

- 1) The child is indicating a fear or hatred of the targeted parent or is claiming to be harassed by attempts by the targeted parent to make contact with him or her.
- 2) The child has denigrated or slandered the targeted parent privately to other friends, family or publicly
- 3) The child has used borrowed scenarios or accusations advanced by one of the parents in Family Court proceedings.
- 4) The child has created a scene in public which has embarrassed, humiliated or denigrated the targeted parent with the child using untoward language or violence
- 5) The child has made false allegations against the targeted parent or has attempted to have the targeted parent charged criminally by police or has supported such a complaint advanced by the other parent.

- 6) The child is displaying a severe opposition to contact with a parent or insisting on spending less time or is resisting reasonable attempts to engage in meaningful contact with the targeted parent.
- 7) The child expresses guiltless disregard for the feelings of the targeted parent.
- 8) The child has attempted suicide or has self mutilated themselves and has indicated that it was because of the targeted parent.
- 9) The child has written a letter or note to the targeted parent telling the target parent that he/she does not want to see the parent or to have any further contact with the parent.
- 10) The child has assaulted the target parent, or spits, bites, swears or has displayed other violent opposition to contact with a parent.

Criteria 2 (Qualifying conditions applicable to the indicators listed under criteria 1)

In order to validate the requirement of “**Criteria 2, all** of the following must be present:

- 1) There must be at least one person having influence over a child who is engaging in Hostile-aggressive parenting directed against the targeted parent where the risk to the child because of HAP has been evaluated using the risk assessment protocol for HAP as being in the moderate or higher category (50 points or above).
- 2) The targeted parent has suffered the loss of parenting time with the child due to the interference with access to the child by another parent or family member or due to the refusal of the child to spend scheduled time with the targeted parent.
- 3) There would appear to be no compelling and credible evidence to support the reasons given by the child or the HAP parent to explain why the child is exhibiting one or more of the disorders listed under criteria 1. Some of the reasons given may appear to be weak, frivolous, contradictory, exaggerated or in some cases totally fabricated or an extension of another person’s thoughts or feelings.
- 4) There would appear to be no compelling and credible information which would indicate that the child’s relationship with the targeted parent was not considered healthy and normal up until the time that either the parents were separated or until such time as conflict between parents involving the child became an issue.

Although PAS is identified by reviewing the child's behaviours, it is extremely important to not discount the complex interrelationships between parents, children and siblings in understanding PAS cases. PAS is induced by a parent through Hostile-Aggressive Parenting and the ability of a parent to successfully induce PAS in a child depends to some extent on the child's emotional bonding with the target parent. If a child has a strong bond with a target parent, it is much more difficult, but still not impossible, for an HAP parent to successfully induce PAS into a child.

In family situations where one child may have a stronger bond with one parent and another child a stronger bond to another parent, it is not uncommon for one of the children to suffer from PAS and not the other. This phenomena is directly related to the psychological relationship which each parent enjoys with the children. In a blended home environment, where there may be more than two biological parents involved, it is not uncommon to see PAS arise in the child who is the biological child of one parent, but not the biological child of both current parents.

In a family situation where one child suffers PAS and another does not, the family dysfunction often grows more severe because sibling rivalry often develops in respect of the various parenting relationships. The PAS child may attack the non PAS child with accusation, blame and scorn for the non PAS child's continuing relationship with the target parent. This places the non PAS child in a conflict, not only with the HAP parent, but also his or her sibling, which results in long term damage to the sibling relationship as well.

Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS) Evaluation Form

This form has been developed to provide a simple and reliable means in which to reasonably determine the existence of Parental Alienation Syndrome or PAS as it is more commonly referred to. This form is intended to be used in conjunction with the “**Risk assessment protocol to evaluate the risk of harm to children caused by Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP)**”

Step 1

Review the items listed under Criteria 1 and check off the applicable symptoms. At least one of the symptoms under Criteria 1 must be identified as being present in the child.

Step 2

Review the items listed under Criteria 2. All of the items must be identified as being present.

Criteria 1 (Indicators of a mental disorder/disturbance relating to a child’s relationship with a parent/guardian)		
To meet the conditions of Criteria 1, at least one (1) of the following need to be present		
1	The child is indicating a fear or hatred of the targeted parent or is claiming to be harassed by attempts by the targeted parent to make contact with him or her.	
2	The child has denigrated the targeted parent privately to other friends, family or in public.	
3	The child appears to be mimicking scenarios or accusations advanced by one of the parents in family court proceedings.	
4	The child has created a scene in public which has embarrassed, humiliated or denigrated the targeted parent with the child using untoward language or violence	
5	The child has made false allegations against the targeted parent or has attempted to have the targeted parent charged criminally by police or has supported such a complaint advanced by the other parent.	
6	The child is displaying a severe opposition to contact with a parent or insisting on spending less time or is resisting reasonable attempts to engage in meaningful contact with the targeted parent.	
7	The child expresses guiltless disregard for the feelings of the targeted parent or other family members who may support the targeted parent.	
8	The child has attempted suicide or has self mutilated themselves and has indicated that it was because of the targeted parent.	
9	The child has written a letter or note to the targeted parent telling the target parent that he/she does not want to see the parent or to have any further contact with the parent.	
10	The child spits, bites, swears or has displayed other violent opposition to contact with a parent.	
11	The child has assaulted, attempted to harm, harmed or has murdered the target parent.	

Criteria 2 (Conditions to qualify the indicators listed under criteria 1) To meet the conditions of Criteria 2, all of the below need to be present		
1	There must be at least one person having influence over a child who is engaging in Hostile-aggressive parenting (HAP) directed against the targeted parent where the risk to the child because of HAP has been evaluated using the protocol for HAP as being in the moderate or higher category (above 50 points).	
2	The targeted parent has suffered the loss of parenting time with the child due to the interference with access to the child by another parent or family member or due to the refusal of the child to spend scheduled time with the targeted parent or the target parent has care and control of the child for 40% of the time or less.	
3	There would appear to be no compelling and credible evidence to support the reasons given by the child or the HAP parent to explain why the child is exhibiting one or more of the disorders listed under criteria 1. Some of the reasons given may appear to be weak, frivolous, contradictory from evidence given by others, exaggerated or in some cases totally fabricated or an extension of another person's thoughts or feelings.	
4	There would appear to be no compelling evidence or other compelling information which would indicate that the child's relationship with the targeted parent was not considered within the limits of a reasonably healthy and normal relationship (for example, no violence or abuse against the child) under the circumstances up until the time that either the parents were separated or until such time as conflict between parents involving the child's issues became an problem.	

Section 5

Recommended intervention strategies

General Recommendations

Below are the general recommended intervention strategies to be used with this protocol depending on the evaluated level of risk to the child. Readers should also review the more detailed intervention strategies with specific examples which are outlined in the next section of this document to know how to best apply the protocol to any particular situation.

Low risk of harm to child (0 to 49 points)

For low risk situations, the family should be encouraged to deal with the issues using their own resources. Generally, it should not be necessary to employ most of the strategies that are necessary when the child is at moderate or high risk of harm. The involvement of a trained family coordinator or a family support group can be most helpful to parents who are in the “low risk of harm” category.

Moderate risk of harm to child (50 to 249 points)

For moderate risk situations, a full review of the parenting arrangements for the child must be undertaken and an effective and prompt intervention strategy put in place to stop the HAP behaviours from causing any further harm. When matters are before the court, it is important that the court take immediate and effective action. Further delays in implementing effecting strategies to minimize any further HAP will likely only make matters worse for the child and may result in the risk to the child being elevated to the high or extreme category. Generally, parents whose HAP behaviours and decisions have placed their child in a moderate risk of harm category, can, with appropriate intervention, be guided back on to a more appropriate course of parenting. Where a child is determined to be at a moderate risk of harm because of a HAP parent, it is recommended that:

- The HAP parent should not be permitted to have sole custody of the child. Ideally, a second parent or guardian must also be allowed to share custodial authority in the form of joint custody over the child in order to balance the power of the HAP parent and to provide a legal protection for the child in the event that the child is further abused by an HAP parent. In most cases, custody should be shared with the other parent but where both parents would be considered as exposing the child to risk of harm, then another third party should be given custody of the child on a temporary basis.
- A family coordinator, parent referee or other trained person(s) should be assigned to monitor the family given the specific task of monitoring the parents’ compliance to any court Order or agreement and parenting plan.
- A comprehensive parenting plan should be in place which will clearly deal with the issues of HAP and establish parenting times that the child will be with each parent and clearly lay out parental responsibilities and duties of each parent.
- A monitoring period of at least one year should be put in place until it can be clearly seen that the situation has improved to a point where a child would be in low risk category.
- Specific penalties should be in place as part of any court Order or agreement to deal with any violations of the Order or agreement by any of the parents or their family members. Penalties should include removal of all custody rights and provide clear guidelines as to when this

penalty will be applied. The person(s) monitoring the agreement should be given the authority to oversee imposition of penalties without the parents having to go back to court to have the penalties imposed.

- The current parenting time arrangements of the child be reviewed and the parenting times modified so that the child will spend less time with the HAP parent on a temporary basis should the required criteria for altering the residency of the child be met.

High risk of harm to child (250 to 499 points)

For high risk of harm situations, a full review of the current parenting arrangements for the child must be made and effective and prompt intervention strategies put in place to prevent more serious harm and potentially long term psychological damage being done to the child. A parent whose actions have caused their child to be put at high risk of harm is more likely going to be difficult to deal with and will likely respond only to effective intervention of the court coupled with monitoring of the situation by third parties. Under such conditions the following intervention is recommended:

- That if the high risk parent has sole custody of the child, then the sole custody status of the parent should be removed from the high risk HAP parent and the child be placed in the temporary primary care of the other parent or another family member who would not be evaluated as placing the child at high risk of harm.
- That an adjustment to the child's time should be made so that the child spends less time in the care of the high risk parent. If the high risk parent currently has more than 50% of the parenting time with the child then the parenting time will be balanced with each parent getting approximately 50% of the time with the child if this can be reasonably accommodated. If the high risk parent already has only 50% of the time with the child, then the child's time with the high risk parent will be reduced further to less than 50% with the other parent becoming the legal primary care giver to the child.
- That a trained family support person (family coordinator, parent referee or other trained person) should be assigned to assist the family and given the specific task of monitoring the parents' compliance to any court Order or agreement. The information gathered by the family support person(s) should be shared with any other professional working with the family.
- That a comprehensive parenting plan should be in place either by consent or by court Order which will clearly establish parenting times that the child will be with each parent and well as clearly lay out the responsibilities and duties of each parent.
- That specific penalties should be in place to deal with any violations of the parenting agreement by any of the parents or their family members, including removal or reversal of custody. The person(s) monitoring the agreement should be given the authority to oversee imposition of penalties without the parents having to go back to court.
- That a monitoring period of at least one year should be imposed until it can be clearly seen that the situation has improved to a point where a child would be in low risk category.
- That joint custodial authority be returned to the HAP parent once he/she has been able to demonstrate with reasonable consistency the ability to comply with the court Order and to provide an environment for the child that would be free of HAP behaviours.

Extreme risk of harm to child (500 or more points)

For extreme risk of harm situations, effective intervention strategies should be employed as quickly as possible to stop the influences of the HAP parent from causing any further harm to the child and hopefully to begin the process of reversing any potential psychological damage already done to the child. Where it has been determined that a child is in the extreme risk of harm category and there is at least one critical risk factor present, removal of custodial and/or access rights to the child must usually be taken away from the HAP parent as quickly as possible in order to bring relief to the situation and to ensure that the child's exposure to HAP influences is significantly and immediately reduced. The complete removal of the HAP parent's custody rights on a temporary basis sends in this situation a strong message that the actions of the HAP will not be tolerated by society. Under conditions of extreme risk of harm to the child, and where one critical risk indicator is present, the following intervention is recommended:

- That the HAP parent's current custody status (sole or joint) be temporarily suspended until such time as it can be determined using the "risk assessment protocol" that the parent no longer poses an extreme risk of harm to the child stemming from HAP and its associated risk factors.
- That the HAP parent's access rights with the child be reviewed and access suspended temporarily should the required criteria for suspending access to the child be met. Supervised access should be considered for parents who are considered as posing an extreme risk of harm to their child.
- That the currently residency arrangements of the child be reviewed and the primary residence of the child be changed on a temporary basis should the required criteria for altering the residency of the child be met.
- That, as the first option, the child should be placed under the care and control of the other parent or another family member where an assessment has determined the child not to be at extreme risk of harm caused by an HAP party.
- That a psychological assessment or parenting assessment or evaluation on the HAP parent should be conducted by a competent professional in an attempt to find the root causes of the HAP behaviours.
- That a plan of care for the child be developed that can reasonably show how the risk of harm from HAP will be reduced prior to any consideration is made to re-establish any parenting or custodial rights.

In most cases involving children at high risk, intervention will not be pleasant to implement and in many cases, may meet severe opposition from the child, especially when it comes to curtailing the child's time with the HAP parent. Although there may be what can be referred to as "short term pain" in reversing the damage done to a child because of HAP, inevitably, the child will benefit from the "long term gain" of appropriate intervention. There are a number of cases on record where children who have been kidnapped from another parent for sometime long periods of time have been successfully re-integrated back with a parent they have not seen for a long period of time. In these cases the courts ordered the kidnapping parents to be jailed and the children physically placed with the parent who the child had not seen for a long period of time, sometimes years. The damage to children caused by HAP or PAS can be reversed if strong measures are taken.