

MFT-PRN Standard Measures Across All Sites

Before First Session	All Case Types							
	Presenting Problems and Therapy Experience (all clients 12+)							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client chooses up to three presenting problems from a pre-populated list that was based on research about common presenting problems. • Who is responsible for presenting problems? • Pressure to attend therapy • Referral source 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently receiving therapy elsewhere? • Previous therapy experience (# of sessions, helpfulness of previous treatment) • Current physical health problems Current medications 					
	Demographics: Individual and Relational Background (all clients 12+)							
	Items asked based on age and relationship status							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age • Biological sex, Gender identity • Race/ethnicity: based on proposed changes to census • Education • Income • Religious/Spiritual preference, level of religiosity, family-based religious practices • Sexual orientation • Sexual attraction • Current relational status • Ever married? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current marital status • # of marriages • Sex of current partner • Parental status • # biological, step or adopted children under 18 living in home at least 50% of time • Total # of people in home • Adverse childhood experiences in family of origin • Current adverse experience in home • Coercive Control (PMWI) • Intimate Partner Violence screen (HITS) • Ongoing Abuse Screen (OAS) 						
Couple		Family		Individual Adult		Individual Adolescent		
Couple Relationship Scale (10 items)		Family Relationship Scale (10 items)		Individual Intersession Report (6 items)		Individual Intersession Report (6 items)		
Before Every Subsequent Session	Couple		Family		Individual Adult		Individual Adolescent	
	Progress on Presenting Problems (1-3 items)		Progress on Presenting Problems (1- 3 items)		Progress on Presenting Problems (1- 3 items)		Progress on Presenting Problems (1- 3 items)	
	Couple Relationship Scale (10 items)		Family Relationship Scale (10 items)		Individual Intersession Report (6 items)		Individual Intersession Report (6 items)	
	Intersession Alliance-Couple (4 items)		Intersession Alliance- Family (4 items)		Intersession Alliance- Indiv (4 items)		Intersession Alliance- Indiv (4 items)	

Optional Measures Available for Intake and Ongoing Assessment

Clinics can choose measures they would like to administer only at intake and measures they would like given on an ongoing basis (before intake, 4th, 8th, 12th, 16th, and multiples of 8 sessions thereafter)

Official Name	Construct	Available Languages	Sub-Scales	Range, Cut-off, and Change index	# Items	Recommended For	Reference
Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (GAD-7)	Anxiety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chinese (T) • English • Korean • Mandarin • Spanish • Turkish 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = More anxiety • Range 0-21 • Cutoffs: 0-4 minimal, 5-9 mild, 10-14 moderate, 15-21 severe • RCI=4 	7	Any client over the age of 12	Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. W., & Löwe, B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7. <i>Archives Of Internal Medicine</i> , 166(10), 1092-1097. doi:10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092
Ineffective Arguing Inventory (IAI)	Arguing Patterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chinese (T) • English • Korean • Mandarin 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = More ineffective arguing • Range 8-40 	8	Clients in committed relationships	Kurdek, L. A. (1994). Conflict Resolution Styles in Gay, Lesbian, Heterosexual Nonparent, and Heterosexual Parent Couples. <i>Journal Of Marriage & Family</i> , 56(3), 705-722.
Experiences in Close Relationships – Short Form (ECR-S)	Attachment--Adults	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chinese (T) • English • Korean • Spanish • Turkish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anxiety • Avoidance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = More attachment problems • Range 12-84 (6-42 for each subscale) 	12	Adults in committed relationships or adults with attachment problems	Wei, M., Russell, D. W., Mallinckrodt, B., & Vogel, D. L. (2007). The Experiences in Close Relationship Scale (ECR)-Short Form: Reliability, Validity, and Factor Structure. <i>Journal Of Personality Assessment</i> , 88(2), 187-204. doi:10.1080/00223890701268041
Brief Accessibility, Responsiveness, and Engagement Scale (BARE)	Attachment Behaviors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chinese (T) • English • Korean • Mandarin • Turkish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility • Responsiveness • Engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = More positive attachment behaviors • Range 12-60 	12	Adults in committed relationships or adults with attachment problems	Sandberg, J. G., Busby, D. M., Johnson, S. M., & Yoshida, K. (2012). The Brief Accessibility, Responsiveness, and Engagement (BARE) Scale: A tool for measuring attachment behavior in couple relationships. <i>Family Process</i> , 51(4), 512-526. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2012.01422.x
Revised Inventory of Parent Attachment (R-IPA)	Attachment-Parent/Child	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English • Korean 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust/avoidance • Communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = Better parent-child attachment • Range 22-110 	22	Parents	Johnson, L. N., Ketring, S. A., & Abshire, C. (2003). The Revised Inventory of Parent Attachment: Measuring attachment in families. <i>Contemporary Family Therapy</i> , 25, 333–349.
Inventory of Parent & Peer Attachment (IPPA)	Attachment-Adolescent/Parent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English • Korean • Mandarin • Turkish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust • Alienation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = better adolescent-parent attachment • Range 30-150 	30	Adolescents	Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. <i>Journal of Youth and Adolescence</i> , 16, 427–454.

Official Name	Construct	Available Languages	Sub-Scales	Range, Cut-off, and Change index	# Items	Recommended For	Reference
Ohio Scales	Child and Adolescent Functioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chinese (T) • English • Korean • Mandarin • Spanish • Turkish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem Severity • Functioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = more problems • Range 0-200 • Cutoffs: Problem severity = 25, Functioning (youth= 60; parents=50) • RCI: Problem=10, Functioning=8 	40	Adolescents or Parents rating their adolescent or child over the age of	Ogles, B. M., Melendez, G., Davis, D. C., & Lunnen, K. M. (2000). <i>The Ohio Youth Problem, Functioning, and Satisfaction Scales: Technical Manual</i> (pp. 1–55). Ohio University.
Co-Parenting Scale	Co-Parenting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chinese (T) • English • Korean • Mandarin • Turkish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation • Triangulation • Conflict 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = more of the subscale • Range 14=70 	14	Parents	Margolin, G., Gordis, E. B., & John, R. S. (2001). Coparenting: A link between marital conflict and parenting in two-parent families. <i>Journal of Family Psychology, 15</i> , 3–21. http://doi.org/10.1037//0893-3200.15.1.3
Communication Patterns Questionnaire (CPQ)	Communication Patterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constructive Communication • Demand Withdraw • Communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = more of the subscale • Range 23-207 	23	Clients in a committed relationship	Heavey, C. L., Larson, B., Christensen, A., & Zumtobel, D. C. (1996). The communication patterns questionnaires: The reliability and validity of a constructive communication subscale. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58</i> , 796-800.
Perceived Criticism (PC)	Criticism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chinese (T) • English • Korean • Mandarin 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = more criticism • Range 2-20 • Cutoffs: >4 on item 1 = 81% chance of relapse, >5 on item 2 = 91% chance of relapse 	2	All clients 12 and older	Hooley, J. M., & Teasdale, J. D. (1989). Predictors of relapse in unipolar depressives: Expressed emotion, marital distress, and perceived criticism. <i>Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 98</i> , 229–235.
Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)	Depression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English • Mandarin • Korean • Spanish • Turkish 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = more depression • Range 0-27 • Cutoffs: 1-4 minimal, 5-9 mild, 10-14 moderate, 15-19 moderately severe, 20-27 severe 	10	All clients 12 and older	Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. W. (2001). The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. <i>Journal of General Internal Medicine, 16</i> (9), 606–613. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x
Car, relax, alone, forget, friends, and trouble (CRAFT 2.0)	Drug/Alcohol-Adolescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English • Korean 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = more drug/alcohol problems and possible DSM diagnosis • Range 0-6 plus number of days used 	9	Adolescents	Knight, J. R., Sherritt, L. A., Schrier, L. A., Harris, S. K., & Chang, G. (2002) Validity of the CRAFT substance abuse screening test among adolescent clinical patients. <i>Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescence, 156</i> , 607-614.
NIDA Quick Screen	Drug/Alcohol-Adult	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English • Korean 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = more drug/alcohol problems • Range 0-16 	4	Adults	NIDA, (2010). <i>Screening for drug use in general medical settings: Resource guide</i> . Author.

<u>Official Name</u>	<u>Construct</u>	<u>Available Languages</u>	<u>Sub-Scales</u>	<u>Range, Cut-off, and Change index</u>	<u># Items</u>	<u>Recommended For</u>	<u>Reference</u>
Multidimensional Measure of Emotional Abuse (MMEA)	Emotional Abuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean Mandarin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive Engagement Hostile Withdrawal Denigration Dominance/Intimidation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more emotional abuse Range 0-168 	28	Adults in a committed relationship or adults in an emotionally abusive relationship	Murphy, C. M., & Hoover, S. A. (1999). Measuring emotional abuse in dating relationships as a multifactorial construct. <i>Violence and Victims</i> , 14, 39–53.
Child Self Regulation (CSR)	Emotional Regulation-Child	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean Mandarin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emotional regulation Behavior regulation Cognitive regulation Impulsivity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more regulation ability Range 13-65 	13	Parents rating their child's behavior	Novak, S. P., & Clayton, R. R. (2001). The influence of school environment and self-regulation on transitions between stages of cigarette smoking: A multilevel analysis. <i>Health Psychology</i> , 20, 196- 207.
Difficulties in Emotional Regulation Scale (DERS-S)	Emotional Regulation—Adult/Adolescent Short Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean Mandarin Spanish Turkish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nonacceptance Difficulty w/ goal directed behavior Impulse control difficulties Lack of emotional awareness Limited regulation strategies Lack of emotional clarity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more regulation problems or more of the subscale Range (score 1-5) 	18	All clients over the age of 12	Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotional regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the difficulties in emotional regulation scale. <i>Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment</i> , 26, 41-54.
SCORE-15 Index of Family Functioning and Change	Family Functioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean Mandarin Spanish Turkish 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Scores = better family functioning Range 15-75 	15	Clients attending therapy as a family	Stratton, P., Lask, J., Bland, J., Nowotny, E., Evans, C., Singh, R., et al. (2013). Detecting therapeutic improvement early in therapy: Validation of the SCORE-15 index of family functioning and change. <i>Journal of Family Therapy</i> , 36(1), 3–19. http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.12022
Financial Behaviors Scale (FMBS)	Financial Problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean Mandarin 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = better financial behaviors Range 17-85 	17	Adults	Dew, J., & Xiao, J. J. (2011). The Financial Management Behavior Scale: Development and validation. <i>Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning</i> , 22, 43–59.
Health Related Quality of Life (HRQOL-4)	Functional Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Korean 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall general health # healthy days # of activity restricted days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = better general health # of day scores are based on a 30-day reporting period 	4	Adults	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2000). Measuring healthy days: Population assessment of health-related quality of life. Atlanta, GA: CDC.

<u>Official Name</u>	<u>Construct</u>	<u>Available Languages</u>	<u>Sub-Scales</u>	<u>Range, Cut-off, and Change index</u>	<u># Items</u>	<u>Recommended For</u>	<u>Reference</u>
Gratitude Questionnaire (GQ-6)	Gratitude	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean Mandarin 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more gratitude Range 6-42 	6	All clients over the age of 12	McCullough, M. E., Emmons, R. A., & Tsang, J.-A. (2002). The grateful disposition: A conceptual and empirical topography. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82</i> (1), 112–127. http://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.82.1.112
Healthcare Utilization (HCU)	Healthcare use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean Mandarin 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more healthcare use 	4	Adults	Developed by D. Russel Crane.
Hopelessness Scale (HS)	Hopelessness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Korean 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more hopelessness Range 0-6 	6	Developed for adolescents but can also be used for adults	Bolland, J. M. (2003). Hopelessness and risk behaviour among adolescents living in high-poverty inner-city neighbourhoods. <i>Journal of Adolescence, 26</i> (2), 145–158. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-1971(02)00136-7
K6-Scales	Mental Illness-General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Mandarin 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more mental illness Range 0-24 	6	All clients over the age of 12	Kessler, R. C., Barker, P. R., Colpe, L. J., Epstein, J. F., Gfroerrer, J. C., Hiripi, E., et al. (2003). Screening for serious mental illness in the general population. <i>Archives of General Psychiatry, 60</i> , 184–189.
Multicultural Orientation (MCO)	Multicultural Orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Korean 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comfort Humility Missed opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = appropriate use of culture Range 35-175 	35	All clients over the age of 12	Owen, J., Tao, K. W., Drinane, J. M., Hook, J., Davis, D. E., & Kune, N. F. (2016). Client perceptions of therapists' multicultural orientation: Cultural (missed) opportunities and cultural humility. <i>Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 47</i> (1), 30.
Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ-21)	Parenting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean Mandarin Turkish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authoritative Authoritarian Permissive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more of the subscale Range 0-4 on each subscale 	21	Parents	Robinson, C.C., Mandleco, B., Olsen, S.F., Hart, C.H. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: development of a new measure. <i>Psychological Reports, 77</i> (3), 819-830.
Physical Affection (PA)	Physical Affection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Korean 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more physical affection Range 6-30 	6	Adults	Developed by Dr. Juliann Holt-Lunstad. Not yet published.
Revised University of Rhode Island Change Assessment (R-URICA)	Process of Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean Mandarin Spanish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action Seeking assistance Ambivalence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more of the construct Range 	14	All clients over the age of 12	Tambling, R. B., & Ketring, S. A. (2013). The R-URICA: A confirmatory factor analysis and a revision to the URICA. <i>Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal</i> , doi:10.1007/s10591-013-9279-x

<u>Official Name</u>	<u>Construct</u>	<u>Available Languages</u>	<u>Sub-Scales</u>	<u>Range, Cut-off, and Change index</u>	<u># Items</u>	<u>Recommended For</u>	<u>Reference</u>
Marital Power Scales (POS)	Relationship Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = one person in relationship uses more power Range 9-45 	9	Adults in a committed relationship	Bogue, A., Miller, R. B., & Day, R. D. (2008). The development of a measure of couples relationship power. Poster presented at the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy, Memphis, TN.
Couple Satisfaction Index (CSI-16) CSI-4 is also available but only for family or individual assessment packets (couples must take the 16 item version)	Relationship Satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean Mandarin Spanish Turkish 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = better relationship satisfaction Range 0-81 Cutoff: lower than 51.5 = clinical distress RCI = 9.4 & 2.8 	16	Adults in a committed relationship	Funk, J. L., & Rogge, R. D. (2007). Testing the ruler with item response theory: Increasing precision of measurement for relationship satisfaction with the Couples Satisfaction Index. <i>Journal of Family Psychology, 21</i> (4), 572-583. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.21.4.572
Trauma Symptom Checklist-Sexual Problems Subscale (TSC-SP)	Sexual Problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Korean Spanish 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more sexual problems Range 0-24 	8	All adults	Briere, J. (1996), Psychometric review of the Trauma Symptom Checklist-40, in B.H. Stamm (Ed.). <i>Measurement of stress, trauma, and adaptation</i> . Lutherville, MD: Sidran Press.
Sexual Satisfaction (SS)	Sexual Satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Korean 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more sexual satisfaction Range 1-5 	3	Adults in committed relationship	Not an established measure but contains items that are on most sexual satisfaction questionnaires
Perceived Stress Scale (PSS)	Stress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Mandarin Korean Spanish Turkish 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more sleep problems Range 0-40 National average (men=12.1, SD=5.9; women=13.7, SD=6.6) 	10	All clients over the age of 12	Cohen, S., & Janicki-Deverts, D. (2012). Who's Stressed? Distributions of Psychological Stress in the United States in Probability Samples from 1983, 2006, and 2009. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42</i> (6), 1320-1334. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00900.x
Suicide Behaviors Questionnaire (SBQ-R)	Suicide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chinese (T) English Korean Mandarin 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more suicidality Range 3-18 Cutoff: scores on item 1 > 2 and total score > 8 for suicidality 	4	All clients over the age of 12	Osman, A., Bagge, C. L., Gutierrez, P. M., Konick, L. C., Kopper, B. A., & Barrios, F. X. (2001). The Suicidal Behaviors Questionnaire-Revised (SBQ-R): Validation with clinical and nonclinical samples. <i>Assessment, 8</i> , 443-454.

<u>Official Name</u>	<u>Construct</u>	<u>Available Languages</u>	<u>Sub-Scales</u>	<u>Range, Cut-off, and Change index</u>	<u># Items</u>	<u>Recommended For</u>	<u>Reference</u>
Couple, or Family Alliance Scale (ITAS, CTAS, FTAS)	Therapy Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Korean (CTAS and FTAS only) Spanish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bonds Goals Tasks Within System alliance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = better therapy alliance Range (Total score = 13-91) 	13	Individuals Couples Family Members	Pinsof, W. M., Zinbarg, R., & Knobloch-Fedders, L. M. (2008). Factorial and construct validity of the revised short form Integrative Psychotherapy Alliance Scales for family, couple, and individual therapy. <i>Family Process, 47</i> (3), 281-301. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2008.00254.x
Conflict Tactics Scale-Violence Subscale	Violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = more violence Range 0-42 	6	Clients in a committed relationship	Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family, 41</i> , 75-88.
Expectations for Couple Therapy Scale	Couple Therapy Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Korean 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome Roles Preferences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = Positive expectations for couple therapy Range 9-45 	15	Couples	Friedlander, M. L., Muetzelfeld, H., Re, S., Colvin K. F. (2019). Introducing the expectations and preference scales for couple therapy (EPSCT): Development, psychometric evaluation, and suggested use in practice and research. <i>Family Process</i> .
Barriers to Access to Care	Barriers to patients' access to care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treatment Stigma 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = Stronger barriers preventing care 	30	All adults	Clement, S., Brohan, E. Jeffery, D., Henderson, C., Hatch, S. L. & Thornicroft, G. (2012). Development and psychometric properties the Barriers to Access to Care Evaluation scale (BACE) related to people with mental ill health. <i>BMC Psychiatry, 12</i> , 1-11.
International Trauma Questionnaire	PTSD and Self-Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Disturbances in Self-Organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = More severe PTSD symptoms 	20	All adults	Hyland, P., Shevlin M., Brewin C.R., Cloitre M., Downes A.J., Jumbe, S.,...Roberts, N.P. (2017). Validation of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and complex PTSD using the International Trauma Questionnaire. <i>Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica. 136</i> , 313-322. doi: 10.1111/acps.12771.
Differentiation of Self Inventory-Revised	Differentiation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emotional Reactivity Emotional Cutoff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Scores = Greater differentiation 	23	All clients over the age of 12	Skowron, E. A., & Schmitt, T. A. (2003). Assessing Interpersonal Fusion: Reliability and Validity of a New DSI Fusion with Others Subscale. <i>Journal of Marital and Family Therapy 29</i> , 209-222.
Attitudes about God Scale	Attitude toward God	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anger towards God Comfort by God 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher scores = Great anger towards God or comfort by God 	9	All clients over the age of 12	Wood, B. T., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Exline, J. J., & Yali, A. M. (2009). Attitudes toward God Scale-9: Psychometric development, refinement, and validation.

Every Session Assessments
Complete Before Every Session After Intake

<u>Construct</u>	<u>Available Languages</u>	<u>Official Name</u>	<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Range, Cutoff, and Change Index</u>	<u># Items</u>	<u>Completed By</u>	<u>References</u>
General/Relational Functioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English 	Individual Intercession Report, Couple or Family Relationship Scale	Individuals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anxiety Depression Positive Sentiment Sleep Relationships Couples and Families <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emotional Closeness Commitment Trust Safety Teamwork Criticism Conflict Physical Affection All <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall well-being General Relationship Happiness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	6 for Individuals 10 for Couples and Family Members	Individuals Couples Family Members	
Presenting Problem Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English 	Presenting Problem Progress (PPP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range 1-7 for each presenting problem 	3	Individuals Couples Family Members	Anderson, Johnson, et al.
Therapy Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Spanish 	Intercession Alliance (Individuals, Couples and Family)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bonds Goals and Tasks Within System alliance Safety in the system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	4	Individuals Couples Family Members	

Therapist Questions
Completed at Various Times During Treatment

<u>Construct</u>	<u>Languages Available</u>	<u>Official Name</u>	<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Range, Cutoff, and Change Index</u>	<u># Items</u>	<u>Completed By</u>	<u>References</u>
Diagnosis	• English	Treatment Plan—ICD 10 Code	N/A	N/A	1	Therapists as part of the treatment plan	PRN form
Progress on Goals	• English	Termination Summary	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Scores = more progress • Range 1-7 for each goal 	3	Therapists as part of the termination summary	PRN form
Session Information	• English	Case Note Report (CNR)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions about session content, flow, homework completion etc. 	6	Therapists after every session	PRN form
Termination Reasons	• English	Termination Summary—Termination Question	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five categorical choices 	1	Therapists as part of the termination summary	PRN form
Treatment Goals	• English	Treatment Plan—Up to 3 treatment goals	N/A	Up to 3 treatment goals	3	Therapists as part of the treatment plan	PRN form
Treatment Model-	• English	Termination Summary—Influential models for current case	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chose up to 3 influential models from drop down menu 	3	Therapists as part of the termination summary	PRN form