



TOPICAL BRIEF: SOURCES OF BEST PRACTICES FOR PARENT-CHILD VISITATION

Office of Innovation, Alignment and Accountability



Washington State Department of
CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES

October 2020



CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction	2
Overarching Categories of PCV Best Practices with Examples	3
General Principles.....	3
Organizational Factors	3
Deliverables of PCV Services	3
Supervision of Visits	3
Evaluation	3
Evidence-Based Practice	4
Resources	5
General Compilations of Best Practices for PCV	5
PCV Practice Guides	7
Additional Resources.....	7
Websites.....	8
Conclusions	10
Bibliography (Non-Comprehensive)	11
Endnotes	16

Suggested Citation: Graham, J. Christopher (2020). *OIAA Topical Brief: Sources of Best Practices for Parent-Child Visitation*. Olympia, Washington: Department of Children, Youth, and Families.

Executive Summary

Sources of information on best practices for parent-child visitation (PCV) include the following:

- Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) and its collaborators – both are currently involved in developing improved PCV programs to incorporate best practices.
- General reviews – some of these are specific to subpopulations, including fathers, estranged noncustodial caregivers, and incarcerated parents.
- Practice guidelines – within these, best practices typically are procedurally organized.
- Articles and websites – these include materials oriented to social workers or professionals in the legal profession.ⁱ

While there is no singular definitive set of best practices for PCV, there is a wealth of information available that, taken as a whole, provides a reasonable basis for improving practice. While the research base itself is in its infancy (there are few if any PCV practices that have risen to the standard of evidence-based, and few that would qualify as research based), research does support the belief that PCV in general is extremely important, if not critical, to reunification and to child and family wellbeing. While a comprehensive compilation and review of best practices that have been advocated is beyond the scope of this brief, it provides direction for exploring both the details and the nuances of this body of knowledge.

Perhaps the single best starting reference at this time is the Administration on Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) information memorandum **Family Time and Visitation for Children and Youth in Out-of-Home Care** (ACYF CB-IM-20-02, February 5, 2020).

Hyperlinks within the document are indicated by bold black font.

Introduction

Maintaining and supporting a strong relationship between children and their parents is a core value of DCYF, and it is an essential factor in reunification of children with their families during what usually is a difficult time for everyone involved.ⁱⁱ Parent-child visitation is crucial to strengthening and maintaining family relationships and is linked to positive outcomes, including improved child well-being, less time in out-of-home care, and faster reunification (when it is in the best interest of the child).ⁱⁱⁱ This favorable view of parent-child visitation is shared at the **U.S. federal level**, and the importance of continued contact between parents and their children in care is enshrined in the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child (article nine).^{iv}

Within the context of Substitute Senate Bill 5883, The Washington State Legislature asked DCYF to prepare a report on strategies to expand and increase the capacity, effectiveness, and reliability of contracted visitation services for children. In this context DCYF has committed to work in collaboration with contracted providers to further learning and analyze strategies that support family connection. The question of what are the generally recognized best practices for parent-child visitation (PCV) is central to this effort.

As determined by law, and as implemented by its predecessor agency (DSHS Children’s Administration), DCYF policy does incorporate some best practices,¹ but experts and DCYF staff believe that the current PCV model implemented by DCYF does not sufficiently engage families and that it tends to foster a sterile environment that is not as conducive to family reunification as it could be. Consequently, DCYF is developing a new PCV practice model called Family Time. The goal of this effort is to modernize Washington State’s visitation model using evidence-informed practice to support earlier permanencies by increasing the number of reunifications, and decreasing the amount of time required for a child to safely reunify with their parent(s). The development of Family Time is supported by DCYF’s Performance-Based Contracting (PBC) initiative.

The new PCV model builds on the reforms recently implemented in other states (Texas, Minnesota, Illinois, California, and Utah, all of which recently went through major restructuring of their parent-child visitation models), and is further informed by two recent pilot studies² of the Strive Supervised Visitation Program (**Strive**) model (Orlando, et al., 2019).

According to the Principal Investigator (PI) of these pilot studies,^v the Strive model was developed based on evidence-based and best practice literature, as well as conversations with numerous stakeholders. Strive provides intensive and individualized services to families, and focuses on early parent engagement by providing a welcoming environment, providing in-home parenting education, modeling positive interactions and behaviors, giving helpful feedback to the parent, and observing parent-child interactions for progress.

Regarding the broader research literature on best practices for PCV, there is no generally agreed upon set of best practices, though there are a number of literature reviews.^{vi} However, it is possible to delineate categories of practices associated with parent-child visitation and presumed best practices that have been advocated. Five such categories are listed in the following section, each with some examples.

¹ For example: “The agency shall encourage the maximum parent child and sibling contact possible, when in the best interests of the child.” RCW 13.136), and see Social Worker Practice Guide: Visits Between Parent(s), Child(ren), and Siblings (2008, DSHS Children’s Administration).

² Pilot 1 of Strive was conducted from September 2016 – September 2017, and Pilot 2 of Strive was conducted from November 2017 – December 2019.

Overarching Categories of PCV Best Practices with Examples

General Principles

- Visitation is a right of children and parents.
- Parents deserve support to have a meaningful experience with their children.
- Frequent and consistent visiting in the most natural setting helps mitigate the trauma of removal and sense of loss experienced by parents and children while separated.
- Visitation is a key factor for timely reunification and other forms of permanency.
- Beyond contact and relationship maintenance, one goal of visitation should be to keep parents in a parenting role.
- The maximum parent, child and sibling contact possible should be encouraged when it is in the best interests of the child.
- Visitation should never be used as a reward or punishment for parental compliance with the treatment plan or the child's behavior.
- When it serves the child's best interest, an absent parent should not be excluded from the possibility of ongoing contact with their child(ren), even if only virtual.^{vii}

Organizational Factors

- Consistent availability of local PCV contracted services.
- Providing experienced staff.
- Providers and staff are trained in trauma-based practice.
- Ensuring stability of visitation providers.

Deliverables of PCV Services

- Preparation for visits takes place, including the option to make an activity plan for visits.
- Starting PCV quickly (The definition of "quickly" ranges widely: from within 48 hours of the initial removal, to three days [e.g. Texas], to within 60 days).
- Determining the optimal frequency of visits for each family.
- Including siblings when possible.
- Developing a visit schedule that is responsive to parent and child needs and the referral specifics.
- Providing visit coaching to encourage positive interactions between parents and children.
- Allowing for the provider to be supportive and engaged in positive interactions with the family.
- Providing a supportive post-visit debrief with parent(s).

Supervision of Visits

- Ascertaining the appropriate level of supervision.
- Allowing for a range of appropriate activities and locations.
- Decreasing the use of supervised visitation when appropriate and in the best interest of the child.

Evaluation

- Including the parents' voices in documentation.
- Providing families with copies of their visit reports.

- Capturing PCV information in the administrative electronic data.^{viii}
- Considering child reactions and outcomes.

Evidence-Based Practice

As has been recognized for many years, empirical research scientifically demonstrating the value of best practices for PCV is limited.^{ix} In 2015, a review of the literature^x concluded, “Within the child protection literature there is little discussion or evidence about the impact of supervision of contact visits, nor of the extent to which this occurs amongst families with children in care.” Even very recently, a former CA administrator and author remarked that, “There has been quite a bit of scholarship on visitation, and lots of unsupported claims regarding what this research has found.”^{xi} Consistent with this view, in a systematic review of 12 interventions that were meant to improve supervised contact visits between children in out-of-home care and their parents, Bullen et al. (2016) concluded that “Because of the variations in and limited evaluative methodology, the small scale of the studies, the short follow-up periods used and a lack of outcome data, conclusions about their efficacy and effectiveness are limited.”^{xii} In the context of Washington State, there are no PCV programs that are included in the **Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP)** inventory of evidence-based, research-based, and promising practices.^{xiii}

However, there is research supporting the conclusion that PCV, in general, is beneficial for children. A thorough review is available in the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare’s **Visitation: Promoting Positive Visitation Practices for Children and Their Families Through Leadership, Teamwork, and Collaboration** report. Some research is mentioned also in the 2014 Partners for Our Children (P4C) summary brief **Family Time Visitation in the Child Welfare System**.

Furthermore, there is some research-based evidence regarding particular practices and programs.^{xiv} For example:^{xv}

- When child welfare workers did not encourage parents to visit or use visit locations other than the agency office or engage in problem-solving with parents, children tended to remain in foster care 20 months or more.
- Parents who are given regularly scheduled visits have a better attendance rate than parents who are told to request visits and thereby visits are not regular.

Practice guides sometimes include extremely specific guidelines that are research-based. For example,^{xvi} “According to a few best practice guides that are based on research there are different frequency and duration goals [of visitation] for different age groups:

- Birth to five years old, at least one hour a day, five days a week (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2012).
- School-aged, at least one hour a day, two to three days a week (Visitation/Access Guide, 2005).
- Teenage, 30 minutes to one hour a day, weekly (Visitation/Access Guide, 2005).”

Regarding Strive, the pilot studies’ PI reports that “We are working on developing the evidence base for Strive and have preliminary promising evidence that it does improve parent attendance, engagement in visits, and the quality of parent-child visits.”^{xvii} And as of June 2020 WISSP has given Strive the “promising” practice classification. How DCYF proceeds with Strive and whether it will go statewide, will depend upon the results of the evaluation study (i.e., the expanded pilot in Region 1),^{xviii} indicating the importance that is placed on DCYF programs being evidence-based, and funding available.

Resources

General Compilations of Best Practices for PCV

There have been some helpful efforts to generally summarize best practices for PCVs and, though the research base often is unspecified, many of these are excellent. Those that have come to DCYF's attention are briefly described in this section.

A. Tip Sheets from Washington State.

Successful Parent Child Visits

These DSHS-created guides cover roles, responsibilities, suggestions and best practice recommendations.

- **Parent Tip Sheet**
- **Caregiver Tip Sheet**

Family Time In-Person Visitation Protocol During COVID-19

These DCYF-created guides detail procedures for in-person visits under COVID-19 pandemic conditions.

- **Parent Information**
- **Foster Parents and Caregiver Information**
- **Provider Information**
- **DCYF Staff Information**

B. Family Time: Supportive Virtual Family Time Program and Training (eLearning). This is an online learning course offered by the Alliance for Child Welfare Excellence to help family time/visitation providers or child welfare agency staff setting up and facilitating virtual family time to develop the skills necessary to support it. Much of the class could be helpful when visits are no longer virtual.

C. Family Visitation in Child Welfare: Helping Children Cope with Separation while in Foster Care (P4C). "This brief was written for Children's Administration and Washington State courts to provide a framework for best practice and opportunities to support and improve practice around visitation." The categories of best practices included in this document are: Timely First Visits, Visitation Plans, Levels of Supervision, Progressive Family Visitation, Stages of Family Visitation (including preparation and planning, the visit, and after the visit), Visitation Oversight, Factors that Support Visitation, How Social Workers Can Address Challenges to Parents' Participation in Visits, and How the Courts Can Support Parents' Participation in Visits.

D. Children's Services Practice Notes for North Carolina's Child Welfare Workers: Parent-Child Visits. (October 2000). Jordan Institute for Families. This is a very helpful article oriented toward "making the most of visitation" and includes sections on conditions that optimize visiting, suggestions for visitation, a checklist for facilitating visits, visitation and concurrent planning, and involving foster parents and supporting them around visitation.

E. Child and Family Visitation Best Practice Guide. Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (2015). This very thorough practice guide outlines the primary purpose of visitation in maintaining parent-child attachment. This resource provides information about timeframes, policy, monitoring, and locations for each successive parent-child visit. This has been a primary resource used in the development of the Family Time practice model in Washington.

F. Toolbox #1: Using Visitation to Support Permanency (2000). “This publication by Lois Wright presents the best professional child welfare practice in planning and implementing visitation between children in out-of-home care and their parents, within the context of current federal legislation emphasizing permanency planning. This toolbox contains helpful aids and tools that practitioners can use quickly and easily to guide their thinking and the information necessary to use the tools fully and meaningfully.”

G. Child Protection Best Practices Bulletin: Parent-Child Visitation. New Mexico Courts. The categories of PCV best practices included are timely first visits (within 48 hours of the initial removal), visit coaching, creative approaches to ensuring safe visits, and trial home visits. Also the various roles of involved professionals are described and visitation planning suggestions are made.

H. Child Protection Best Practices Bulletin: Connecting Children with Incarcerated Parents. New Mexico Courts. “When a parent goes to jail or prison, their children are punished as well. Parental separation due to incarceration has profound impacts on children’s psychological, developmental, and financial well-being. Children have varying reactions to the trauma of separation from a parent due to incarceration. Often times children experience shame and isolation, and they are stigmatized by the larger society. They feel guilty and are unsure if they are to blame for their parent’s incarceration. This resource includes information on parent-child visiting between a child and an incarcerated parent.”

I. Best Practice for Father-Child Visits in the Child Welfare System. National Family Preservation Network (2012). Outlines guidelines for caseworkers partnering with fathers with children involved in the child welfare system in order to make visitation meaningful and productive.

J. The Supervised Visitation Checklist: Validation with Lawyers, Mental Health Professionals, and Judges. Saini, Michael, & Birnbaum, Rachel (2015). *Family Law Quarterly*, 49(3): 449-476. According to the authors, “The Supervised Visitation Checklist was developed to: (1) provide a reliable and valid screening checklist to assist lawyers and mental health professionals in making parenting recommendations for supervised visitation; and (2) to aid judges in their decision-making about supervised parent-child contact that addresses the safety concerns for children and families while facilitating maximum and ongoing contact between children and both parents.” (p. 455). The article includes the checklist as Appendix A.

K. Enhancing Visitation for Children and Families. Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts, Office of Children and Families in the Courts (2009). Provides information approved by the Pennsylvania State Roundtable that has assisted Pennsylvania counties in evaluating guidelines for visitation. The site also includes:

- **Pennsylvania’s 10 key components for enhancing visitation:**
 - These components serve as a guiding checklist for counties assessing their current visitation practices and determining where to begin their enhancement efforts.
- **Oversight matrix and six operating principles:**
 - While each situation must be carefully assessed, the workgroup created an oversight matrix, along with six operating principles to help guide professionals to the most natural and least restrictive oversight.
- Visitation tools specifically designed for **parents, resource parents, teens, and young children.** Each handbook is specifically developed according to the age of the child and to the needs of those being impacted.

L. Visitation: Promoting Positive Visitation Practices for Children and Their Families Through Leadership, Teamwork, and Collaboration. The Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare. This outstanding handbook includes recommended visiting practice standards, which are presented under the following topics in chapter two:

- Developing Written Visiting Plans
- Building the Family’s Service Team
- Developing Visiting Plans That Are Safe, Creative and Effective
- The Management of Reactions to Visiting
- The Recruitment and Retention of Foster Parents Who Will Be Involved in Visiting Services to Children’s Families

PCV Practice Guides

Child and Family Visitation Best Practice Guide. Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (2015). This practice guide is featured in the preceding section of this brief.

Family Time Practice Guide: A Guide to Providing Appropriate Family Time for Children in Foster Care (May 2019). This impressive practice guide, a project of the Georgia Supreme Court Committee on Justice for Children and the J4C Court Improvement Initiative, is a comprehensive production. It is “the result of 15+ years of collaborative efforts by over 100 people who care deeply about families affected by trauma and who have dedicated their careers to improving the lives of victims of child maltreatment,” and is characterized in the foreword as “a remarkable document, unique in the United States and destined to be the starting point for other jurisdictions to modify their policies regarding contact between children removed by the state from parental care and their parents.”

Visitation/Family Access Guidelines: A Practice Model For Social Workers. Olmsted County Child and Family Services Division, Rochester Minnesota (2005). This is a relatively comprehensive practice model that includes a helpful set of references. The authors include the disclaimer that “The following guidelines are not intended to serve as a rigid blueprint for practice nor are they intended to establish a legal standard to which professionals must adhere, unless the action described is required by State or Federal statute or rule. Rather, the guidelines provide a model of desirable professional practice” (p. 3). That said, the guide is nicely done and generally is broadly applicable.

Additional Resources

4254. Parent, Child, Sibling, and Relative Visits. Relevant practices and procedures (Washington State DCYF). Also includes links to the relevant RCWs.

Information packet parent-child visiting (April, 2008). National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning. Hunter College School of Social Work, NY. A relatively brief but helpful overview written by Amber Weintraub.

Do place-based programs, such as Family Resource Centers, reduce risk of child maltreatment and entry into foster care? Prepared for Oklahoma (updated June, 2019). This review was requested to address the following:

- Roles and responsibilities for the planning and supervision of visits, specifically regarding the involvement of the family caseworker versus specialized center personnel.
- Functions performed by centers (i.e., supervision only, planning, debriefing/teaching, etc.).

- Coordination between the assigned caseworker and center personnel.
- Input from families regarding their experiences in using visitation centers (i.e., what worked well and what didn't from the family perspective).
- Outcomes related to length of stay and attainment of permanency, particularly when compared to children/families served by the same agency, but not using such centers.
- Characteristics of families most benefiting from center-based visits.

Websites

Clearinghouse on Supervised Visitation. The University of Florida's Institute for Family Violence Studies. The clearinghouse "was created to provide statewide technical assistance on issues related to the delivery of supervised visitation services to providers, the judiciary, and Florida's Department of Children and Families." It includes sections on **Training Manuals & Materials** and **Standards & Best Practices**, among others.

Supervised Visitation Network. This website is for a membership organization for professionals providing visitation services to families.

Marty Beyer. This website provides information on visit coaching.

National Resource Center for Permanency and Family Connections (NRC-PFC) website on family/child visiting. This website has good information on PCV, including:

- **Resources**
- **Resources from the states**
- **Research**
- **Curricula**
- **Webcasts and videos**
- **Information Packets**
- **PowerPoint presentations**
- **Websites**

Rose Wentz's training site. This extensive site includes a video of Rose presenting on the laws, research, and best practice of parent-child visits.

Child Welfare Information Gateway:

- **Parent-Child Visits**
 - This resource provides information about timeframes, policy, monitoring, etc.
- **Assessing Child Visitation**
 - This site includes resources on using visits to assess the quality of the parent-child relationship and the family's progress.

Center for Child Welfare at University of Southern Florida:

- **Supporting Meaningful Family Engagement (Part 1).**
The first Sue Badeau video recorded at the 11th Annual Families First Inservice Training Conference.
- **"Seven Ceas" of Engagement (Part 2).**
The second Sue Badeau video recorded at the 11th Annual Families First Inservice Training Conference.

What are the benefits of family visitation for crossover youth? Casey Family Programs (2018).

“An effective model of practice for crossover youth — youth who sit at the intersection of the child welfare and juvenile justice systems — has at its core increased family engagement and family voice in decision-making. One way to strengthen family engagement involves frequent, consistent, and meaningful visits with family. This resource list provides the highlights from recent research articles and reports relevant to increasing family engagement through visitation, as well as jurisdictional examples of guidance and other materials intended to encourage effective family visitation for crossover youth.” Selected resources include:

- **Honorable Jolene Grubb Kopriva, Report to the Pennsylvania State Roundtable: “Visitation is a right, not a privilege” (2013).**
Key themes: Visitation highly correlates to reunification and is a right, not a privilege, for children and youth in foster care.
- **Juvenile Justice Information Exchange, Juvenile Facilities Strive to Foster ‘Family Engagement’ (2014).**
Key themes: Fostering family engagement improves incarcerated youths’ behavior, helps families feel more connected, reduces disciplinary incidents, and boosts the staff morale. Strengthening these connections better prepares youth for a return to the community upon release and reduces repeat offenses.
- **Massachusetts Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, Family Engagement in Juvenile Justice (2014).**
Key themes: Genuine family involvement and engagement is vital to achieving positive long-term outcomes for the vulnerable youth in the justice system.
- **Minnesota Department of Human Services, Child and Family Visitation: A Practice Guide to Support Lasting Reunification and Preserving Family Connections for Children in Foster Care (2009).**
Key themes: Visitation is essential for a child’s well-being, fundamental to permanency, and vital to a child maintaining family relationships and cultural connections.
- **New Mexico Children’s Court Improvement Commission, Child Protection Best Practices Bulletin: Parent-Child Visitation (2011).**
Key themes: Quality parent-child visitation in the context of a reunification plan results in shorter foster care placement.
- **Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers, Family Involvement in Pennsylvania’s Juvenile Justice System (2009).**
Key themes: Family visitation should not be used as reward or punishment, but should instead be regarded as an essential and necessary tool for effective intervention and treatment.
- **Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, Child and Family Visitation Best Practice Guide (2015).**
Key themes: Visitation and family contact should never be used as a reward or punishment, but should always be considered a right of families and children.
- **Vera Institute of Justice, Families as Partners: Supporting Incarcerated Youth in Ohio (2012).**
Key themes: Incarcerated youth who received more visits reported feeling happier with their relationships and more connected and committed to family members. As a result of the project, facilities changed their policies to make it easier for young people to maintain important family relationships.

Conclusions

Numerous excellent compilations of best practices for PCV exist, and these provide a reasonably strong basis for development of new practice models, but empirical research into specific best practices of parent-child visitation remains in its infancy, and the number of “best” practices that at this time rise to the formal level of evidence-based practice, or even research-based practice, is limited. That acknowledged, the collective wisdom that has formulated the present body of knowledge about best practices for PCV should be honored and applied as best as possible rather than discounted. Current efforts in Washington State (Supported Visits, Family Time) should be commended, but the improvement of PCV in light of an evolving evidence base should be seen as an ongoing effort, and moreover this continual improvement should be appreciated as being critical to the success and ultimate wellbeing of children, youth, and families engaged in the challenging but potentially rewarding process of family reunification.

Bibliography (Non-Comprehensive)

- Administration on Children, Youth and Families (February 5, 2020). *Family Time and visitation for children and youth in out-of-home care* (ACYF-CB-IM-20-02). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. <https://familyfirstact.org/sites/default/files/ACYF-CB-IM-20-02.pdf>.
- Albers, and Christine Bitoni (1996). Factors in Length of Foster Care: Worker Activities and Parent-Child Visitation. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 23(2): 75-84.
- Beyer, M. (1999). *Parent-child visits as an opportunity for change*. National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice. Prevention Practice, #1.
- Beyer, M. (2004). *Visit Coaching: Building on Family Strengths to Meet Children's Needs*. NYC Administration for Children's Services.
- Beyer, M. (2008). Visit Coaching: Building on Family Strengths to Meet Children's Needs. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 59(1): 47-60.
- Blecher-Prigat, Avelet (2009). Rethinking Visitation: From a Parental to a Relational Right, 16 *DUKE J. GENDER L. & POL'Y* 1. The article describes difficulties faced by third parties who seek visitation with children. The author challenges traditional understandings of the "parental right" of visitation and proposes a new approach based on relational interests.
- Bullen, Tracey, Taplin, Stephanie, Kertesz, Margaret, Humphreys, Cathy, and McArthur, Morag (Feb. 2015). *Literature review on supervised contact between children in out-of-home care and their parents*. Institute of Child Protection Studies, Australian Catholic University, and University of Melbourne.
- Bullen, Tracey, Taplin, Stephanie, McArthur, Morag, and Humphreys, Cathy (2016). Interventions to improve supervised contact visits between children in out of home care and their parents: A systematic review. *Child & Family Social Work*, 22(2).
- Cantos, A. L. & Gries, L. T. (1997). Behavioral correlates of parental visiting during family foster care. *Child Welfare*, 76(2): 309-330.
- Cardell, Amanda (2019). Therapeutic Supervised Visitation (TSV): When Supervised Visitation is Not Enough for High-Conflict Families. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. 13808541.
- Clare, B. (2012). *Best Practice in Delivering Family Contact for Children in Care in Western Australia: A Preliminary Study of Issues and Themes*. Perth, WA: Children, Youth and Families Agencies Association
- Crook, W. P; & Oehme, K. (2007). Characteristics of Supervised Visitation Programs Serving Child Maltreatment and Other Cases. *Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention*, 7(4): 291-304.
- Davis, I., Landsverk, J., Newton, R., & Ganger, W. (1996). Parental visiting and foster care reunification. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 18: 363-382.
- Alexandra Deprez, Jaqueline Wendland, Line Brotnow, Arno C. Gutleb, Servane Contal, Antoine GueÂdeney (2018) - Protecting the child while preserving the relationship: **Using baby's relational withdrawal to gauge the effect of parental visitation**, *PLoS one*.

- Dozier, M., Lindhiem, O., Lewis, E., Bick, J., Bernard, K., & Peloso, E. (2009). Effects of a foster parent training program on young children's attachment behaviors: Preliminary evidence from a randomized clinical trial. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 26(4): 321-332.
- Edwards, Cicely M. (2015). A Family Visitation Program for Families Involved in the Child Welfare System: A Grant Proposal (Master's Thesis).
<https://search.proquest.com/openview/019692961974ac7629ab5d56f05aa5a5/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Edwards, L.P. (2003). **Judicial oversight of parental visitation in family reunification cases.** *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 54(3): 1-62.
- Fanshel, D., & Shinn, E. (1978). *Children in foster care: a longitudinal investigation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Farley, Amanda J., Dennis Feaster, Tara J. Schapmire, Joseph G. D'Ambrosio, LeAnn E. Bruce, C. Shawn Oak and Bibhuti K. Sar (2009). **The Challenges of Implementing Evidence Based Practice: Ethical Considerations in Practice, Education, Policy, and Research**, *Social Work and Society International Online Journal*, 7(2).
- Gerring, C. E., Kemp, S. P., & Marcenko, M. O. (2008). The connections project: A relational approach to engaging birth parents in visitation. *Child Welfare*, 87(6): 5-30.
- Goldsmith, D. F., Oppenheim, D., & Wanlass, J. (2004). Separation and reunification: Using attachment theory and research to inform decisions affecting the placements of children in foster care. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 55 (2): 1-14.
- Gottfried, Sarah. (2002). Virtual Visitation: The Wave of the Future in Communication Between Children and Non-Custodial Parents in Relocation Cases. *Family Law Quarterly*, 36(3): 475-485.
- Great Britain Department of Health (1991). *Patterns & outcomes in child placement: messages from current research and their implications*.
- Haight, W. L., Black, J. E., Mangelsdorf, S. C., Giorgio, G., Tata, L., Schoppe, S. J., et al. (2002). Making visits better: The perspectives of parents, foster parents, and child welfare workers. *Child Welfare*, 81, 173-202.
- Haight, W. L., Kagle, J. D., & Black, J. E. (2003). Understanding and Supporting Parent-Child Relationships during Foster Care Visits: Attachment Theory and Research. *Social Work*, 48(2): 195-207.
- Haight, W.L., Mangelsdorf, S., Black, J., Szewczyk, M., Schoppe, S., Giorgio, G., Madrigal, K., Tata, L. (2005). Enhancing Parent-Child Interaction during Foster Care Visits: Experimental Assessment of an Intervention. *Child Welfare*, 84(4): 459.
- Hess, P. (2003). **Visiting between children in care and their families: A look at current policy**. New York: The National Resource Center for Foster Care & Permanency Planning, Hunter College School of Social Work, City University of New York.
- Hess, Peg McCartt & Proch, Kathleen Ohman (1988). *Family Visiting in Out of Home Care: A Guide to Practice*. Child Welfare League of America.

- Hess, P., & Proch, K. (1993). Visiting: The heart of reunification. In B. Pine, R. Warsh & A. Maluccio (Eds.), *Together again: Family reunification in foster care*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.
- Hill, Sheri & Solchany, Joanne. (2005). "Mental Health Assessments for Infants and Toddlers," *American Bar Association Child Law Practice*, 24(9): 139.
- Holcomb, R. (2004). *Innovative practice in foster child visitation: A review of the literature for family alternatives, Inc.* Minneapolis, MN.
- Institute for Family Violence Studies, Florida State University. (Undated).
Annotated Bibliography on Supervised Visitation.
- Johnston, Janet R. Children of Divorce Who Reject a Parent and Refuse Visitation: Recent Research and Social Policy Implications for the Alienated Child. *Family Law Quarterly*, 38, 757-775.
- Jones Harden, Brenda. Infants in the Child Welfare: A Developmental Framework for Policy and Practice, *Zero To Three*, 2007, p. 252.
- Jordan Institute for Families (2000). **Children's Services Practice Notes** (for North Carolina's Child Welfare Workers): Parent-Child Visits. Volume 5 (4).
- Kufeldt, K. & Armstrong, J. (1995). How Children in Care View Their Own and Their Foster Families: A Research Study. *Child Welfare*, 74(3): 695-716.
- Leathers, S. J. (2002). Parental visiting and family reunification: Could inclusive practice make a difference? *Child Welfare: Journal of Policy, Practice, and Program*, 81(4): 595-616.
- Lewis, J. Dean (2006). **An Overview of Foster Care Family Visitation Issues**. *The Judges' Page Newsletter*.
 casaforchildren.org.
- Lewis, M. (2013). *A study of parents and supervised visitation in a child welfare setting*. Arcate California: Humboldt State University.
- Loar, L. (1998). Making Visits Work. *Child Welfare*, 77(1): 41-58.
- Mallon, G. P. & Hess, P. (2005). Visits: Critical to the wellbeing and permanency of children and youth in care. In Hess, P. and Mallon, G. (Eds.), *Child welfare for the twenty-first century: A handbook of practices, policies and programs*, pp. 548-557. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mapp, S. C. (2002). A framework for family visiting for children in long-term foster care. *Families in Society*, 83, 175-182. doi:10.1606/1044-3894.35.
- McWey, L. M., & Mullis, A. K. (2004). Improving the Lives of Children in Foster Care: The Impact of Supervised Visitation. *Family Relations*, 53(3): 293-300.
- McWey, Lenore M., Acock, Alan, and Porter, Breanne (2010). The Impact of Continued Contact with Biological Parents upon the Mental Health of Children in Foster Care *Child Youth Serv Rev.*, 32(10): 1338-1345. doi:10.1016/j.chilyouth.2010.05.003.
- Mourikis, M. (2002). *Information Packet: Family & Child Visiting*. New York: The National Resource Center for Foster Care & Permanency Planning, Hunter College School of Social Work, City University of New York.

- National Scientific Council on the Developing Child (2012). The science of neglect: The persistent absence of responsive care disrupts the developing brain. Working Paper No. 12. Retrieved from <http://www.developingchild.harvard.edu> .
- Nesmith, A. (2013). Parent–Child Visits in Foster Care: Reaching Shared Goals and Expectations to Better Prepare Children and Parents for Visits. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 30, 237-255.
- Ohio Caseload Analysis Initiative in partnership with ProtectOhio Initiative. (2005). Visitation/ Family Access Guide: A best practice model for social workers and agencies.
- Orlando, L, Barkan, S. Brennan, K. (2019). Designing an Evidence-Based Intervention for Parents Involved with Child Welfare. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 105, 104429.
- Partners for Our Children (2014). **Family Time Visitation in the Child Welfare System.**
- Pavao, J., St. John, M., Cannole, R., Fischer, T., Maluccio, A., & Peining, S. (2007). Sibling kinnections: A clinical visitation program. *Child Welfare*, 86(2): 13-30.
- Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families (1999). **Visitation: Promoting Positive Visitation Practices for Children and Their Families Through Leadership, Teamwork, and Collaboration.**
- Perkins, D.F & Ansay, S.J. (1998). The Effectiveness of a Visitation Program in Fostering Visits with Noncustodial Parents. *Family Relations*, 47, 253-259.
- Poulin, J. E. (1992). Kin visiting and the biological attachment of long-term foster children. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 15(3/4): 65-79.
- Prasad, N. (2011). *Decision making principles around contact visits: A literature review.* New South Wales.
- Pulido, M. L., Forrester, S. P., & Lacina, J. M. (2011). Raising the bar: Why supervised visitation providers should be required to meet standards for service provision. *Family Court Review*, 49(2): 379-387. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-1617.2011.01378.x
- Quinton, D., Rushton, A., Dance, C. & Mayes, D. (1997). Contact between Children Placed away from Home and their Birth Parents: Research Issues and Evidence. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 2(3): 393-413.
- Saini, M., van Wert, M., & Gofman, J. (2012). Parent-child supervised visitation within child welfare and custody dispute contexts: An exploratory comparison of two distinct models of practice. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34(1): 163-168.
- Saini, Michael, & Birnbaum, Rachel (2015). The Supervised Visitation Checklist: Validation with Lawyers, Mental Health Professionals, and Judges. *Family Law Quarterly*, 49(3): 449–476.
- Shefts, Kimberly R. (2002). Virtual Visitation: The Next Generation of Options for Parent-Child Communication, *Family Law Quarterly*, 36(2): 303-327.
- Smariga, M. (2007). **Visitation with infants and toddlers in foster care: What judges and attorneys need to know.** American Bar Association Center on Children and the Law.

- Smith, G. T., Shapiro, V. B., Sperry, R. W., & LeBuffe, P. A. (2014). A Strengths-based Approach to Supervised Visitation in Child Welfare. *Child Care in Practice, 20*(1): 98-119. doi: 10.1080/13575279.2013.847056
- Stoner, Susan (2018). **Evidence-based Practices in Washington State**. UW Alcohol & Drug Abuse Institute.
- Taplin, S., & Mattick, R.P. (2014). Supervised contact visits: results from a study of women in drug treatment with children in care. *Children and Youth Services Review, 39*, 65-72.
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2014.01.023>
- Thoburn, J. (2004). Post-placement contact between birth parents and older children: The evidence from a longitudinal study of minority ethnic children. *Contact in Adoption and Permanent Foster Care: Research, Theory and Practice*. London: British Association for Adoption and Fostering.
- Triseliotis, J. (2010). Contact between looked after children and their parents: A level playing field? *Adoption & Fostering, 34*(3): 59-66.
- Weintraub, A. (2008). **Information packet parent-child visiting**. National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning. Hunter College School of Social Work, NY.
- Welsh, D. (2008). Virtual parents: How virtual visitation legislation is shaping the future of custody law. *Journal of Law and Family Studies, 11*, 215-225.
- White, Mary E., Eric Albers, and Christine Bitoni (1996). "Factors in Length of Foster Care: Worker Activities and Parent-Child Visitation." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 23*(2): 75-84.
- Wright, L.E. (2001). Toolbox No. 1: Using Visitation to Support Permanency. Toolboxes for Permanency. CWLA Press, Washington, DC.
- Washington State Institute for Public Policy (December, 2018). Updated Inventory of Evidence-Based, Research-Based, and Promising Practices: For Prevention and Intervention Services for Children and Juveniles in the Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice, and Mental Health Systems. University of Washington.

Endnotes

ⁱ The Supervised Visitation Checklist, Saini & Birnbaum, 2015, is notable, and see the excellent Visitation with infants and toddlers in foster care: What judges and attorneys need to know (Smariga, 2007). Also there is Edwards, L.P. (2003), Judicial oversight of parental visitation in family reunification cases. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 54(3) 1-62, and Lewis, J. Dean (2006). An Overview of Foster Care Family Visitation Issues. *The Judges' Page Newsletter*. casaforchildren.org.

ⁱⁱ Haight, et al. (2002). Making visits better: The perspectives of parents, foster parents, and child welfare workers. *Child Welfare*, 81, 173-202.

ⁱⁱⁱ And see Weintraub (2008). *Information packet parent-child visiting*. National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning. Hunter College School of Social Work, NY.

^{iv} UN General Assembly (1989), as noted in Bullen, et al. (2016), p. 1.

^v Dr. Susan Barkan, University of Washington School of Social Work, Partners for Our Children (P4C).

^{vi} See Holcomb, R. (2004), Prasad (2011), Bullen, et al. (2015), and Annotated Bibliography on Supervised Visitation.

^{vii} See Shefts, Kimberly R. (2002). Virtual Visitation: The Next Generation of Options for Parent-Child Communication, *Family Law Quarterly*, 36(2): 303-327; Gottfried, Sarah. (2002). Virtual Visitation: The Wave of the Future in Communication Between Children and Non-Custodial Parents in Relocation Cases. *Family Law Quarterly*, 36(3): 475-485; Welsh, D. (2008). Virtual parents: How virtual visitation legislation is shaping the future of custody law. *Journal of Law and Family Studies*, 11, 215-225.

^{viii} PCV plans are referred to in FamLink as "Visit Plans." These data include the essential information about the visitation plan (such as level of supervision, frequency and duration of visits), but other information is not captured (such as how long it takes for the contracted provider to start providing the visits, how many or how often visits are missed and details about transportation-only cases). Furthermore, the FamLink data source does not capture the visits completed by relatives (where there is no contract provider included in the visit). These relative visits do not consistently get entered into the FamLink visit plans, because the referral is not required for the visit to take place. In addition, DCYF has purchased the electronic database system (Oliver) from Partners for Our Children (now referred to as Sprout), which captures and analyzes PCV data more efficiently than has been possible with FamLink.

^{ix} Triseliotis, J. (2010). Contact between looked after children and their parents: A level playing field? *Adoption & Fostering*, 34(3) 59-66. And note Mapp, S. C. (2002). A framework for family visiting for children in long-term foster care. *Families in Society*, 83, 175-182.

doi:10.1606/1044-3894.35, who earlier noted the "demonstrated gap between research and practice."

^x Bullen, et al. (2015). *Literature review on supervised contact between children in out-of-home care and their parents*. Institute of Child Protection Studies, Australian Catholic University, and University of Melbourne. In support of the point the authors cite Taplin & Mattick (2014). Supervised contact visits: results from a study of women in drug treatment with children in care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 39, 65-72.

^{xi} Dee Wilson (January 14, 2019). Personal communication. Dee is a former CA administrator and training director, and the author of *The Sounding Board*.

^{xii} Even so, the authors concluded that "... the findings from this systematic review show that the majority of these interventions show promise." However, this optimistic view was offered with some reservations: "The group programmes tended to focus on parents who were less likely to be reunified with their children. These studies offer stronger evidence that these types of programmes might be effective in improving parenting knowledge and behaviours. However, the lack of comparison groups and explicit assessment of the impact of the intervention on the quality of visits across studies needs to be addressed in future research..."

^{xiii} The most closely related is Attachment and Biobehavioral Catch-Up, which is categorized by WSIPP as *research-based practice*, but this is a *home* visitation program.

^{xiv} One example is Haight, et al. (2005). Enhancing Parent-Child Interaction during Foster Care Visits: Experimental Assessment of an Intervention. *Child Welfare*, 84(4), 459. Also noteworthy are Dozier, et al. (2009). Effects of a foster parent training program on young children's attachment behaviors: Preliminary

evidence from a randomized clinical trial. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 26(4), 321-332, Thoburn (2004). Post-placement contact between birth parents and older children: The evidence from a longitudinal study of minority ethnic children. *Contact in Adoption and Permanent Foster Care: Research, Theory and Practice*, and Davis, Landsverk, Newton, & Ganger, W. (1996). Parental visiting and foster care reunification. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 18, 363-382.

^{xv} Beyer, M. (1999). *Parent-child visits as an opportunity for change*. National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice. Prevention Practice, #1. Original source of research: White, Mary E., Eric Albers, and Christine Bitoni (1996). "Factors in Length of Foster Care: Worker Activities and Parent-Child Visitation." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 23(2): 75-84.

^{xvi} This example is excerpted from the 2014 P4C summary brief Family Time Visitation in the Child Welfare System.

^{xvii} Susan Barkan (January 15, 2019). Personal communication. Susan, Director of Research for *Partners for our Children*, is the PI on the *Strive Supervised Visitation Program*.

^{xviii} Liza Sterbick (January 14, 2019). Personal communication. Liza was DCYF Permanency Planning Program Manager at the time.