WASPLC SPC: STATEHOOD

By Tanya Goodman
Date: April 25, 2026

Type: Policy

Washington State Family Court Child Harm Acknowledgment & Recovery Act

Executive Summary

Washington State created its modern family court structure through legislative delegation, judicial rulemaking, and administrative expansion over several decades. Although commonly referred to as “family court,” Washington does not maintain a constitutionally separate family court system. Rather, family law matters operate as a specialized subset of the Superior Court system through statutory authority, local court organization, judicial assignment, administrative policy, and delegated professional networks.

Family court exists as a legislatively authorized and administratively structured “special set” system within Superior Courts, the Legislature retains authority to evaluate whether the system is functioning in accordance with constitutional principles, public policy objectives, and child safety obligations.

Washington has created statutory remedies and compensation pathways for harms occurring in other state-managed child systems, including dependency, foster care, juvenile detention, public education, and institutional abuse settings. Yet no meaningful pathway exists for children harmed within the family court system itself, despite family courts exercising extraordinary state power over a child’s residence, education, medical care, psychological treatment, parent-child relationships, and long-term developmental trajectory.

This paper proposes that Washington establish a narrowly tailored statutory acknowledgment and recovery framework for children harmed by systemic failures within family court proceedings. The proposal does not seek to eliminate judicial immunity or relitigate custody disputes. Rather, it recognizes a simpler principle.

Introduction

“When a state-created system causes foreseeable and documented harm to a child, the state may acknowledge that harm and provide restorative remedies without dismantling judicial independence.”

Family court decisions influence where children live, who they can safely trust, access to medical care, educational stability, exposure to violence, and the preservation or disruption of critical parent-child relationships. When these systems function well, children benefit. When they fail, the resulting harms often extend far beyond the courtroom and may persist for decades.

Accordingly, the question before policymakers is not simply whether family courts are operating fairly, but whether Washington has an obligation to acknowledge and address documented child harm arising from a state-created system whose decisions shape a child’s long-term health, safety, and development. For decades, domestic violence and child abuse were treated primarily as private family matters rather than public health crises. That changed after accumulating medical, psychological, and epidemiological research demonstrated the long-term societal costs associated with Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs), trauma exposure, chronic stress, and family violence. [1] [2]

Researchers, physicians, and public health experts increasingly recognize that childhood exposure to violence and coercive family dynamics contributes to increased suicide risk, addiction, chronic illness, educational failure, incarceration, homelessness, disability, intergenerational violence, and reduced lifetime productivity. [1] Adults with ACEs incur significantly higher healthcare expenditures, with the national economic burden of ACE-related adult health conditions estimated at $14.1 trillion annually. [3]

Barry Goldstein, Mo Therese Hannah, and Veronica York argued in *Preventing Domestic Violence and Child Abuse*, meaningful societal change occurred only after cigarette smoking was reframed from an individual behavior issue into a coordinated public health crisis requiring legal, medical, educational, media, and institutional intervention.

Family court systems now occupy a similarly underexamined position. Although family courts are tasked with protecting the “best interests of the child,” these systems frequently operate without trauma-informed safeguards consistent with modern ACEs science, domestic violence research, disability science, or child developmental psychology.

When family courts minimize abuse, misclassify coercive control, separate protective parents from children, ignore disability-related needs, force unsafe reunification, or frame trauma responses as parental pathology, the resulting harm transfers outward to schools, healthcare systems, law enforcement, mental health services, and future generations. [4]

Washington already recognizes state responsibility for child harm in dependency and foster care systems. Yet children harmed through family court processes remain largely invisible within public policy discussions despite the long-term societal consequences. [5]

I. Historical Background: Washington's Family Court Structure

A. Family Court as a "Special Set" Court

Washington's Superior Courts are constitutional courts established under Article IV of the Washington Constitution. Family court itself is not separately created by the Constitution. Instead, family law developed as a specialized docket administered through Superior Courts under legislative authority[1] under RCW Chapter 26.12, which assigns family-law jurisdiction to the Superior Courts and designates those proceedings as the family court.

Over time, Washington expanded judicial authority in family law matters through Title 26 RCW (Domestic Relations), Parenting Act reforms, Guardian ad Litem statutes, court commissioner systems, parenting evaluator frameworks, local family court rules, mandatory mediation and arbitration systems, and court-appointed professional networks.

This created a quasi-specialized adjudicative ecosystem operating with broad discretion and limited external oversight.

Unlike criminal courts, family courts frequently operate with relaxed evidentiary standards, rely heavily on court-appointed third parties, make predictive rather than adjudicative findings, utilize discretionary "best interest" frameworks, and issue life-altering decisions absent many traditional procedural safeguards.

The system evolved incrementally through legislative delegation and judicial rulemaking rather than direct constitutional design.

B. Expansion of Delegated Authority

Washington family courts increasingly rely on delegated actors (Guardians ad Litem, parenting evaluators, parenting coordinators, reunification therapists, etc.) who operate with broad discretion, quasi-judicial immunity, and limited public oversight. [6] Many of these actors are quasi-judicial, operate under immunity protections, lack independent constitutional accountability, and function within closed referral ecosystems.

The result is a diffuse accountability structure where decisions affecting children are often shaped by actors insulated from meaningful public oversight.

---

[1] Washington State created family courts in 1949 through Chapter 50, Laws of 1949, now codified in Chapter 26.12 RCW.

The law provides that each Washington superior court, when exercising jurisdiction over covered family matters, is known as the "family court." In other words, Washington did not create a wholly separate court system; it assigned family-court jurisdiction to the existing superior courts.

1949: Washington created the family court framework within superior courts.
1983: The legislature broadened family court from a marriage-reconciliation model into a more general family-law forum involving custody, visitation, support, property, contempt, and child-abuse reporting.

1991: The legislature substantially restructured the system around parenting plans, child support, mediation, investigations, treatment referrals, guardians ad litem, commissioner review, county services, and priority for cases involving children. It also repealed much of the original conciliation-petition structure.

C. The Accountability Gap

Washington provides accountability pathways in dependency/foster care, DCYF, public schools, and institutional settings, but family court children fall into a unique legal void. Judicial immunity, narrow appellate review, litigation privilege, and practical barriers leave many children with no acknowledgment or restorative support. Washington courts rarely discipline Guardians ad Litem (GALs) even when complaints allege bias or misconduct [6] [7].

II. Policy Problem

A. Children Bear the Long-Term Costs

Family court errors can permanently alter attachment development, educational trajectory, mental health, physical safety, and parent-child relationships during critical developmental windows.

Supporting Evidence:

- Multiple studies document that protective parents (often mothers alleging abuse) frequently lose custody or decision making rights when in retaliation for raising abuse dynamics, alienation claims are raised against them, while courts credit abuse allegations at lower rates than expected. [4]
- Washington dependency system data shows persistent challenges with placement stability and timely permanency, patterns that mirror risks in high-conflict family court cases. [5] [8]
- In 2025, Washington's child welfare system recorded a record high of 57 children who died or nearly died, highlighting broader systemic strains on child safety in the courts. [9]

Unlike ordinary civil disputes, family court decisions occur during developmental windows where harm may become irreversible before meaningful review occurs, if at all. Children do not choose the litigation. They do not control the professionals. They do not select the court. Yet they bear the consequences for their entire lifetime.

B. Existing Remedies Are Structurally Inaccessible

Current mechanisms fail children because judicial immunity bars direct accountability, quasi-judicial immunity expands the shield, appeals are not practical remedies for children, federal review is extremely limited, and the child lacks independent standing in practice.

III. Proposed Legislative Framework

The Family Court Child Harm Acknowledgment & Recovery Act

A. Purpose

To establish a limited statutory mechanism for acknowledging documented harm to children arising from family court system failures, providing restorative support, collecting statewide data, and improving institutional accountability, without impairing judicial independence.

B. Independent Family Court Child Review Commission
An independent body (outside the AOC, Lawyer associations, AFCC, and county Superior Courts) with expertise in child psychology, domestic violence, disability rights, trauma, and constitutional law.

C. Eligibility Criteria
Documented harm involving ignored abuse evidence, educational deprivation, disability failures, medical neglect, coercive reunification, retaliatory litigation, unsafe placements, or systemic procedural failures. The claim does **not** require overturning the underlying custody order.

D. Compensation Structure

- Tier I Harm: up to $50,000
- Tier II Harm: up to $250,000
- Severe/Long-Term Harm: up to $500,000

Funds support therapy, educational remediation, medical care, housing stabilization, and trauma recovery.

E. Funding Sources
Family court filing surcharges, GAL/evaluator fees, legislative appropriations, sanctions, and professional dues.

F. Data Transparency
Annual public reports mirroring existing dependency dashboards: claims by county, professional categories implicated, disability/DV patterns, medical/educational harm patterns, compensation totals, and systemic recommendations. [8]

IV. Constitutional and Governance Considerations

This proposal preserves judicial immunity. It creates a restorative mechanism for systemic harm, consistent with how Washington already compensates children harmed in other state-created systems. The Legislature created the family court framework; it can also create remedies when that framework foreseeably harms children.

V. Conclusion

For much of the twentieth century, society minimized the harms of cigarette smoking despite mounting evidence of long-term injury. Meaningful reform only occurred once the issue was reframed as a public health crisis requiring coordinated institutional accountability.

Family court-related child harm may represent a similar inflection point. The documentary record, developmental science, ACE research, and lived outcomes increasingly establish that harm occurs. Children harmed in dependency, education, and institutional settings have remedies. Children harmed in family court should not disappear into procedural silence. Washington can — and should — acknowledge these harms without dismantling judicial independence..

References

[1] CDC. Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) – Vital Signs and Prevention Resources.

[2] Swedo EA, et al. Youth Risk Behavior Survey, United States, 2023. MMWR.

[3] Peterson C, et al. (2023). Economic Burden of Health Conditions Associated with Adverse Childhood Experiences Among US Adults. *JAMA Network Open*. ($14.1 trillion annual national burden).

[4] Meier JS. (2019). U.S. Child Custody Outcomes in Cases Involving Parental Alienation and Abuse Allegations. George Washington University Law School.

[5] Washington State Center for Court Research. Dependency Timeliness Dashboard and Annual Reports.

[6] Washington State Standard / InvestigateWest. (March 25, 2026). “Washington courts rarely discipline guardians ad litem accused of misconduct in custody cases.”

[7] Washington Courts. Guardian ad Litem Grievance Procedures.

[8] Washington State Courts. Dependency Case Timeliness Reports.

[9] Washington State Standard. (February 2026). “Record deaths in WA child welfare system have Legislature’s attention.” (57 children died or nearly died in 2025).