

Custody Assessment Analysis System Workbook

(CAAS)

Companion Workbook for “Evaluating Evaluations”

By

Jeffrey P. Wittmann, Ph.D.
The Center for Forensic Psychology
Albany, New York

**Copyright Matlaw 2013
All Rights Reserved**

ISBN 978-1-939720-04-7

CAAS Analysis Instructions

This workbook is designed as a thought-organizer to make the analysis of a child custody evaluation (CCE) easier for attorneys. It provides a condensed presentation of the full CAAS model and a place to record impressions of a particular assessment. After completion of this workbook the legal team will have an accessible, easy-to-digest summary of any threats to reliability that appear present in a particular CCE.

It is important to remember that proper use of this workbook requires the simultaneous use of the main handbook. This is because the main handbook is the only place where each of the deficit components are defined and where real-life examples are given to help clarify their meaning. The main usefulness of this workbook is its more succinct summary of the CAAS model and as a place to record its application for a particular case.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

CAAS Analysis Process

Step 1: Read CCE Front to Back

After seeing the data gradually laid out by an evaluator over 10, 50 or 100 pages, after being immersed in the unfolding of what the evaluator discovered over time, do the ultimate inferences and conclusions surprise or shock the reader? Do they follow neatly from what has come before, or are many of them simple non sequiturs that should be attacked? Pay attention to your response as a reader to the fruits of the evaluator's data gathering via either the general sense that the conclusions seem, at first blush, to follow from the data or that there seems to be a glaring disconnect.

Step 2: Produce a Process Summary

Generating a process summary involves a brief, overall sketch of what was done when. It provides an easily accessible resource that condenses the evaluation process for analysis, providing a quick glance at how the evaluator chose to conduct his/her assessment.

Background and Process Summary

Identifying Information:

- Case: _____
- Mother: _____ - Age: _____
- Sig. Other: _____ Age: _____
- Father: _____ Age: _____
- Sig. Other: _____ Age: _____
- Child: _____ DOB: _____
- Child: _____ DOB: _____
- Child: _____ DOB: _____
- Child: _____ DOB: _____
- Evaluator: _____
- Date of Report(s): _____

Commencement of Evaluation – Summary of how the evaluation was commenced (e.g., “Court sent the order and psychologist called both parents on the same day to set appointments” or “My adversary sent psychologist 80 pages of material and a biasing case summary and litigant was then called for the first appointment.”):

Basic History – Outline key aspects of marital and family history that give the big picture of events leading up to the decision to separate and milestone events in the negotiation or litigation process:

Step 3: Analyze Professional Relationships Management

It is at this point that the full CAAS model begins to be applied. After reading the components listed under “Management of Professional Relationships” on pages 40- 84 of the main handbook, reread the custody evaluation with this dimension in mind. After this read-through, query yourself about what you have read with respect to the manner in which the evaluator handled his/her relationship with the litigants, attorneys and court. This is accomplished by going through the deficit components for Dimension A, sequentially asking each of the interrogatories about the report. For example, were the limits of confidentiality fully and accurately described for the litigants, either verbally or in the intake materials given to the litigants (“Inadequate Informed Assent”)? Does the report fully disclose all data that was considered or are there indications that certain materials were reviewed that are not clearly identified for the reader (“Inadequate Transparency – Data”)? Record whether or not it appears that each deficit (or each threat to reliability) appears to be present in the assessment you are analyzing, absent, or that it is difficult to tell. Make notes of the basis for concluding that a particular deficit component may be present.

Dimension A: Management of Professional Relationships

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
1. Competence Does the evaluator have the necessary education and training to prepare him/her for the complexity and breadth of issues relevant for custody assessments?				
Insufficient General Psychological Training Are there indications that the evaluator has not studied or been trained in the broad range of psychological concepts and domains that are foundational to custody assessment?				
Insufficient Forensic Technique Training Are there indications that the evaluator has not completed sufficient training about the basic principles of gathering data and forming psychological opinions for court matters?				
Insufficient Custody Issues Training Are there indications that the evaluator has not completed sufficient training in the specialized areas of psychological knowledge relevant to custody/access assessment?				
Insufficient Legal Understanding Are there indications the evaluator is inadequately educated about the legal milieu in which s/he is practicing?				
Misrepresentation of Training/Credentials Are there indications that the evaluator has either inaccurately described or exaggerated his/her credentials and/or training?				
2. Interaction With Participants/Attorneys/Court/Collaterals Has the evaluator managed any interactions with those individuals involved in the case in a manner characterized by clear communication about roles, fidelity to agreements and orders, and cautious management of professional boundaries?				
Insufficient Informed Assent Are there indications the litigants, children or the collaterals were given insufficient information before the commencement of the assessment about what to expect in the evaluation process and about its parameters?				
Violation of Contract Did the evaluator make or imply certain promises to the parties that s/he ultimately violated?				
Unclear Scope Is there evidence that the evaluator was given little or no clarity about what questions were to be addressed in the assessment and did not work diligently to gain additional information about the scope of his/her inadequately defined engagement?				
Inappropriate Psycho-Legal Question Are there indications that the MHP has agreed in advance to try to answer a question for which his/her discipline has inadequate specialized knowledge?				

Dimension A: Management of Professional Relationships

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
<p>Multiple Relationships Are there indications that the MHP, while engaged in a forensic/evaluative role with the litigant(s), was also involved in or planned to be involved in other relationships with the litigant(s), their child or with persons close to or professionally working with the litigant(s)?</p>				
<p>Assumption of Therapeutic Posture Are there indications that the MHP gravitated into a helping posture with the litigants and/or child rather than maintaining an evaluative stance?</p>				
<p>Questionable Communications with Litigants/Child Are there indications that the evaluator spoke or otherwise communicated with the subjects of the assessment in ways that were less than appropriate for a forensic professional?</p>				
<p>Questionable Communications with Attorneys/Court Are there indications that the evaluator spoke or otherwise communicated with the legal professionals involved in a case in ways that were inappropriate for a forensic professional?</p>				
<p>Violation of Scope Are there indications that the evaluator failed to address requests in the court order or offered information or conclusions about psychological matters about which the court did not seek an opinion?</p>				
<p>Other Non-Conformance to Court Order Are there indications that the evaluator ignored or failed to attend to specific proscriptions or prohibitions, unrelated to assessment scope, contained in the appointment order?</p>				
<p>3. Attitude Did the evaluator convey an attitude during the assessment process marked by sufficient neutrality, respect for litigants and children, diligence and humility?</p>				
<p>Intense Affiliation Are there indications that the MHP had a strikingly positive emotional response to one of the litigants that may have interfered with objectivity?</p>				
<p>Intense Disaffiliation Are there indications that the MHP had a strikingly negative emotional response to one of the litigants that may have interfered with objectivity?</p>				
<p>Insufficient Cultural/Group Sensitivity Are there indications that the evaluator was inattentive to or insensitive about empirically established ways in which variables related to sub-group membership (cultural, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, race, age, disability, language, etc.) should be factored into the gathering of or reasoning about CCE data?</p>				
<p>Insufficient Respect for Dignity/Rights Did the evaluator interact with the parties or child in a manner that was disrespectful or socially insensitive, or that conveyed a lack of appreciation for basic human rights?</p>				

Dimension A: Management of Professional Relationships

Notes

Dimension A: Management of Professional Relationships

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
<p>Unnecessarily Stressful Interaction Did the evaluator appear to interact with the parties or child in a manner or create an assessment environment that induced unnecessary distress?</p>				
<p>Inattention to Safety Issues Did the evaluator manage the logistics and planning of the assessment in a manner insufficiently attentive to safety concerns relevant to the parents or child?</p>				
<p>Insufficient Diligence/Promptness Are there indications that the evaluator failed to take the importance of timely, efficiently completed and promptly delivered services seriously?</p>				
<p>Insufficient Forensic Humility Does the evaluator manifest an attitude suggesting excessive conviction that s/he knows the ultimate answers to complex questions or operates with an unreasonable degree of professional certainty?</p>				
<p>4. Case Management Did the evaluator exhibit caution and attention to detail in the creation and maintenance of the records and releases?</p>				
<p>Poor Fee Management Are there indications that the evaluator's clarity about, and management of, issues related to payment for services have been less than fair and/or professional?</p>				
<p>Poor Records Management Are there indications the evaluator has failed to create and maintain records of services that are sufficiently readable, complete, accurate and orderly to be usable in a court setting?</p>				
<p>Inadequate Release Authorizations Are there indications that the parties have not explicitly given authorization for the evaluator to contact collaterals or ask for professional records?</p>				
<p>5. Written Work Product Is the final work product delivered by the evaluator characterized by sufficient transparency, clarity, detachment and completeness?</p>				
<p>Inadequate Transparency - Data Are there indications that important data which formed a basis for the inferences in a report, that might be seen as arguing against those inferences or that otherwise might be viewed as relevant by the court to its best interests decision were not reported in the final work product?</p>				
<p>Inadequate Transparency – Technique Is it difficult upon reading a forensic custody report to determine what the evaluator did with a particular family and when it was done?</p>				
<p>Inadequate Transparency – Reasoning Is the logical connection between the data gathered and the conclusions reached left unstated?</p>				

Dimension A: Management of Professional Relationships

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
<p>Observations/Inferences Merged Has the evaluator failed to clearly distinguish between the data gathered and inferences and conclusions purported to flow from that data?</p>				
<p>No Limitations Warning Has the evaluator failed to summarize relevant limitations in the data set or methodology?</p>				
<p>Written Errors Does the report contain typographical or other written errors?</p>				
<p>Judicial Posture/Tone Are there indications that the evaluator's behavior during the assessment or tone in the crafting of the report involves inappropriate authoritativeness regarding the issues at hand?</p>				
<p>Insufficient Detachment/Neutrality Are there indications that the evaluator became emotionally invested in the opinion proffered?</p>				
<p>Premature Data Refutation Are there written indications that the evaluator expends notable effort to argue against a litigant's assertions in a manner suggestive of premature dismissal?</p>				
<p>Inclusion of Irrelevant Information Has the evaluator included data in the written report that was irrelevant to the psycho-legal question at hand and potentially damaging to the party in question?</p>				
<p>Misleading Data-Reporting Are there indications that an evaluator failed to report available data that was potentially relevant to the matter before the court or that contradicted key inferences draw by that evaluator?</p>				
<p>No Research References Has the evaluator failed to annotate the report with references to peer-reviewed literature that provides a foundation for the inferences drawn?</p>				

Page intentionally left blank

Step 4: Analyze Data Adequacy

After assessing the report regarding the basic ways the evaluator handled his/her professional relationships, read through the assessment again focusing on Dimension B (Data Adequacy): On the breadth, adequacy and balance of the data set that was used to offer conclusions about the family. The components related to this step are defined on pages 85-106 in the main handbook. For example, did the process focus on traditional mental status assessment (e.g., no signs of disordered thought, level mood, average intelligence, etc.) in a case without mental health allegations, while neglecting to gather adequate data about the more relevant issue of parenting capacity and style (“Insufficient Exploration of Parenting Skills/Attitudes”)? Did the evaluator review a ream of material offered by the mother in a case in support of her position, while reviewing almost nothing from the father (“Records Volume Imbalance”)? Again, make notes about the basis for concluding that a particular deficit component may be present.

Dimension B: Data Adequacy

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
1. Interview Data-Set				
Was the data gathered via the interviews sufficiently broad, relevant, and balanced?				
Insufficient Exploration of Parenting Skills/Attitudes Are there indications that the evaluator failed to adequately explore history, skills and attitudes relevant to parenting assessment?				
Insufficient Exploration of Parent-Child Relationship Are there indications that the evaluator failed to adequately explore the nature and quality of the parent-child relationship?				
Insufficient Exploration of Personal History Are there indications that the evaluator failed to adequately explore aspects of the parents' personal history relevant to a parenting assessment?				
Insufficient Exploration of Child Issues Are there indications that the evaluator failed to adequately explore aspects of child development and emotional functioning relevant to a custody assessment?				
Insufficient Exploration of Co-Parenting/Hostility Issues Are there indications that the evaluator failed to adequately explore aspects of the parenting-relationship between the litigants that are relevant to a custody assessment?				
Insufficient Exploration of Extended Family/Partner Issues Are there indications that the evaluator failed to adequately explore contributions of extended family members and/or new partners to psychological dimensions of the family that are relevant to custody issues?				
Insufficient Exploration of Access-Plan Issues Are there indications the evaluator gave insufficient attention during parent and child interviews to important issues that could argue for or against certain custodial schedules?				
Insufficient Exploration of Intervention Issues Are there indications the evaluator gave insufficient attention during parent and child interviews to issues relevant to treatment needs?				
2. Testing Data-Set				
Is the data that was gathered via testing complete, appropriate and relevant?				
Relevant Testing Omitted Are there psychological variables relevant to the custody issues at hand for which there are valid and reliable tests and for which no tests were administered?				
Failure to Equate Testing Has the evaluator equated the tests chosen for administration to the parents when there is no rationale to do otherwise?				
Poor Test Choice Are there indications the evaluator chose instruments that were insufficiently relevant or reliable for measuring the trait, skill or syndrome in question?				

Dimension B: Data Adequacy

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
Population Mismatch Did the evaluator choose to administer a test that generates scores based on a standardization sample that did not include people from the litigant's sub-group in the general population?				
Outdated Tests Did the evaluator administer a version of a test other than the most updated version available?				
3. Collaterals Data-Set Was the data set that was gathered via collateral contacts complete and balanced?				
Collateral Omissions Has the evaluator made choices regarding collateral contacts that unnecessarily omit access to important information?				
Collateral Content Imbalance Did the evaluator explore certain issues with collateral sources about one parent without balancing the process with exploration about the same issues regarding the other parent?				
Collateral Volume Imbalance Has the evaluator gathered substantially more collateral information from sources offered by one litigant than the other?				
4. Records Data-Set Was the data set gathered via written materials complete and balanced?				
Records Omissions Has the evaluator made choices regarding the review of records that unnecessarily omit access to important information?				
Records Content Imbalance Did the evaluator review records related to issues about one parent without balancing the process with exploration of records about the same issues regarding the other parent?				
Records Volume Imbalance Has the evaluator accepted or requested substantially more documentary information from one litigant than the other?				

Page intentionally left blank

Step 5: Analyze Technique Adequacy

This next read-through involves a more technical look at the specifics of how the evaluator completed the nuts and bolts of the process and involves the CAAS dimension where access to the underlying notes, test protocols, etc. are helpful and, in some cases, essential. The components related to this step are defined on pages 110-127 in the main handbook. For example, did the evaluator administer a Rorschach inkblot test, draw negative inferences about one parent, yet violate some of the basic administration standards for this instrument (“Administration Standards Violated”)? Did the evaluator, while interviewing a five-year-old about alleged abuse, use repeated leading questions known to contaminate historical recall in children (“Violation of Child Interview Principles”)? More than any of the other dimensions in the CAAS, assessment of an evaluation through the lens of this dimension may benefit from the assistance of a forensic consultant who has both training in clinical and forensic technique and easy access to test manuals, scoring protocols, etc. Again, make notes of the basis for concluding that a particular deficit component may be present.

Dimension C: Technique Adequacy

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
1. Interview Technique Were the interviews conducted in a manner consistent with the principles of valid and reliable assessment?				
Insufficient Interview Structure Did the evaluator seek significantly different interview material from one litigant compared to the other or from one child compared to another?				
Failure to Counterbalance Has the evaluator failed to stagger the order of sessions to minimize the potential effects of sequence on how data is interpreted and weighted?				
Failure to Equate Context Did the evaluator fail to make sure that a child was brought to the office for assessment under generally equivalent conditions with respect to pre-interview time and time at the interview site with each parent? For parents, were the interview and observation contexts sufficiently similar between the parties?				
Violation of Child-Interview Principles Did the evaluator fail to adhere to interview principles established as important for the assessment of children?				
No Cross Checking Did the evaluator fail to give each litigant-parent an opportunity to respond to or give his/her version of each major allegation leveled by the other parent?				
Imbalance in Interview Time Did the evaluator fail to roughly equate the amount of time spent with each of the parents?				
Flawed Family-Observation Method Did the evaluator use a method of observing children with their parents that is incongruent with commonly suggested principles for family observation?				
2. Testing Technique Were the tests administered and scored consistent with published assessment instructions and standards?				
Administration Standards Violated Did the evaluator fail to abide by the guidelines for standardized administration associated with the instruments used with parents or children?				
Flawed Scoring Did the evaluator score a test in a manner or with a system that increases the risk of inaccurate or misleading results?				
Litigant Norms Ignored Has the evaluator failed to compare the test takers' scores to those that tend to be obtained by custody litigants?				
No Testing Feedback/Clarification Did the evaluator fail to offer the test takers (usually the parents) an opportunity to learn about and respond to their test results?				

Dimension C: Technique Adequacy

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
3. Collateral/Records Technique Was the information gathered via collateral contacts and written materials collected in a manner that facilitates balance and completeness?				
Selective Collateral/Record Review Has the evaluator failed to review potentially relevant written material that was made available by the parties, attorneys or court?				
Sequence Imbalance Has the evaluator chosen to review records and other collateral information in a sequence that increases the risk for judgment distortions?				
4. Other Technique Problems Was the general method for gathering the assessment data characterized by a cautious hypotheses-testing approach				
Confirmatory Process Did the evaluator gather and analyze the available data with an emphasis on confirming hypotheses rather than trying to both confirm and disconfirm them?				
Premature Conclusions Are there indications that the evaluator drew important conclusions early in the data gathering sequence before all relevant data had been acquired?				

Step 6: Extract and Summarize Main Inferences and Conclusions

This step involves a clerical task of highlighting any phrases or sentences in the report that represent inferences drawn by the evaluator. Look for any text that appears to represent a conclusion, rather than a simple observation, about the parents, child, family functioning or other important issues. Record the conclusion on the “inference” lines below, leaving the “Notes” section blank – You will fill in the notes section at steps 7 and 8.

Take each sentence highlighted and place it in one of the following categories listed under Dimension D:

Parent Inferences (For example, “The mother in this matter appears deficient in her capacity to anticipate situations that may be physically risky for her children, setting the stage for the regular bumps and bruises social services has discovered.”)

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Parent – Child Relationship Inferences (For example, “There is a pattern in which this teen has learned to provoke his mother with barbed comments, provocation that yields defensive and excessively harsh responses in return.”)

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Child Inferences (For example, “Jason needs nightly assistance with his homework given his documented learning disability.”)

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Co-Parenting Inferences (For example, “This is a high-conflict couple entirely unable to communicate in a respectful manner about their children.”)

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Extended Sibling/Family/Friends Inferences (For example, “The maternal grandmother appears to be a divisive figure, unable to shield the children from her distain for their dad.”)

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Access Plan-Inferences (For example, “The children should be primarily placed with their father with two half-day visits with their mother weekly.”)

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Decision-Making Inferences (For example, “This couple can make a reasonable percentage of their parenting decisions amicably, so it appears joint-legal custody makes sense.”)

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Intervention-Inferences (For example, “This father should participate in individual psychotherapy to increase his insight into the effect of his attitudes on his children.”)

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Inference: _____

Notes: _____

Step 7: Analyze Global Reasoning Adequacy

On this read-through focus on the quality of the logic and the nexus or lack thereof between the data that was gathered and the evaluator's ultimate conclusions. The components related to this step are defined on pages 131-137 in the main handbook but the interrogatories connected with each of these components are listed below for convenience. For each conclusion or inference recorded in the prior section (Step 6) ask each of the interrogatories presented below, regardless of the content category the inference has been placed under. Record any deficits that appear present for an inference in the "Notes" sections above.

Dimension D: Reasoning Adequacy (Apply to inferences listed in Step 6 above)

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
1. Global Reasoning Components Is the inference characterized by a sufficient empirical basis, a logically and technically correct nexus with the data and appropriate conclusory restraint?				
Single Source Does the inference have only a single source for its foundation (no additional convergent data)?				
Inadequate Rationale Is the inference offered with no stated rationale?				
Insufficient Basis Does the inference appear to have a weak or thin foundation in the data?				
Inattention to Rival Hypotheses Are there contradictory data or rival hypotheses related to this inference that are not mentioned nor explained away in the report?				
Contrary to Research Is there replicated empirical research arguing against the inference?				
Speculative Reasoning Does the inference appear to be based in speculative reasoning rather than data-based reasoning?				
Illogical Reasoning Does the inference violate the basic tenets of logic?				
Non-Psychological Inference Does the inference involve a conclusion that falls outside of the evaluator's professional discipline?				
Inference About Absent Person Does the inference involve conclusions about a person who was never directly evaluated?				
Conceptual Bias Is the inference based on a known and questionable theoretical bias on the part of the evaluator?				
Credibility Judgment Is the inference based on assumptions about reporter credibility or document accuracy that are unwarranted?				
Inaccurate Test Interpretation Is the inference based in psychological test findings that were interpreted inaccurately?				
Subjective Test Interpretation Is the inference based on subjective forms of test interpretation known to be less than reliable/valid?				

Step 8: Analyze Categorical Reasoning Adequacy

For the separate *groups of inferences* falling into categories a-h above (Step 6), ask the Categorical Reasoning questions associated with the particular domain (e.g., parent, child, co-parenting, etc.). Again, the components related to this step are defined on pages 138-149 in the main handbook but the interrogatories connected with each of these components are listed below for convenience. Record any deficits that appear present for an inference in the “Notes” sections above.

Dimension D: Reasoning Adequacy (Apply to inferences listed in Step 6 above)

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
2. Categorical Reasoning Components Have the specific content areas most relevant to custody assessment received sufficiently objective, thorough, and empirically sound attention in the conclusions?				
Parent Inferences				
<u>Subjective Parenting Judgment</u> Do these inferences appear based in subjective parenting values held by the evaluator rather than on empirically established information?				
<u>Pathology Overemphasized</u> Do these inferences place excessive weight on mildly dysfunctional or distasteful traits or on low-level psychopathology?				
<u>Pathology Missed/Underweighted</u> Do these inferences place insufficient weight on dysfunctional traits or psychopathology?				
<u>Flawed Parent-Rejection Analysis</u> Are these inferences based on a flawed parent-rejection analysis (alienation issues)?				
<u>Deficit-Permanence Assumptions</u> Do these inferences imply permanence of parental deficits without attention to interventions that might ameliorate the problem?				
<u>Parental Deficit Missed</u> Do these inferences fail to attend to an important parental deficit/risk?				
<u>Parental Strength Missed</u> Do these inferences fail to attend to an important parental asset/strength?				
<u>Excessive Reliance on CGTI</u> Are these inferences grounded on a computer-generated test interpretation system in a manner or to a degree that raises questions about their validity/reliability?				
<u>Parent-Situational Factors Missed/Inflated</u> Do these inferences suggest that situational factors that might explain certain examples of negative parent behavior (litigation, divorce stress) were not considered, were underweighted, or were overweighted?				
Child Inferences				
<u>Situational/Social Influence Factors Missed</u> Are there situational and/or social influence factors that offer alternative explanations for a child's behavior than those suggested by these inferences?				

Dimension D: Reasoning Adequacy (Apply to inferences listed in Step 6 above)

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
<p><u>Flawed Child-Needs Analysis</u> Do the inferences suggest certain important child needs or traits were not addressed, were underweighted or were overweighted?</p>				
Co-parenting Inferences				
<p><u>Flawed Hostility-Dynamics Analysis</u> Are there situational and/or social influence factors that offer alternative explanations for a child's behavior than those suggested by these inferences?</p>				
<p><u>Flawed Co-Parenting Domains Analysis</u> Do these inferences suggest that certain domains of co-parenting functioning relevant in the matter were not addressed, were underweighted, or were overweighted?</p>				
Sibling/Extended Family/Friends Inferences				
<p><u>Flawed Sibling Analysis</u> Were custody-relevant dynamics related to sibling relationships not addressed, underweighted or over-weighted?</p>				
<p><u>Flawed Extended-Family Analysis</u> Do these inferences suggest that custody-relevant dynamics involving extended family members were not addressed, were underweighted or were overweighted?</p>				
<p><u>Flawed Step/Partner Analysis</u> Do these inferences suggest that dynamics involving stepfamily and new-partner issues were not addressed, were underweighted or were overweighted?</p>				
Access Plan Interference				
<p><u>Incomplete Access-Plan Analysis</u> Do these inferences suggest that there was an incomplete analysis by the evaluator of various access-plan options?</p>				
<p><u>Flawed Child Preferences Analysis</u> Do these inferences suggest that child preferences were not addressed, were underweighted or were overweighted in the final conclusions?</p>				
<p><u>Excessive Specificity</u> Are the details of the recommended access plan specific to a degree likely beyond the predictive capacity (i.e., beyond the empirical database) of mental health professionals?</p>				
<p><u>Insufficient Child Needs Focus</u> Do these inferences suggest an insufficient focus on a child's psychological needs?</p>				

Dimension D: Reasoning Adequacy (Apply to inferences listed in Step 6 above)

	Reliability Threat Present	Reliability Threat Absent	Cannot Tell	Not applicable
<p><u>Insufficient Relocation Analysis</u> Do these inferences suggest a lack of thoroughness in the analysis of the psychological implications of a parent's desire to relocate away from the other parent?</p>				
Decision-Making Inferences				
<p><u>Overly Global DM (Decision-Making) Analysis</u> Do these inferences suggest that parental decision-making capacity was analyzed in an overly global (insufficiently specific) manner?</p>				
<p><u>DM Domain Missed</u> Do these inferences suggest that one or more relevant sub-domains of decision making were not analyzed?</p>				
<p><u>Questionable DM Weighting</u> Do these inferences suggest that certain limitations or strengths for effective parental decision making were underweighted or overweighted?</p>				
Intervention Inferences				
<p><u>Relevant Interventions Missed</u> Do these inferences suggest that certain potentially helpful interventions relevant to the matter were not adequately considered?</p>				
<p><u>Poor Intervention Match</u> Do these inferences suggest that an intervention suggested for one or more of the parties or children is poorly matched to their emotional, behavioral or skill deficits or to the family's circumstances?</p>				

