

CLINICAL ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT CHRISTIAN EVALUATION FORM (CAICEF)

Name of the assessment instrument:

PURPOSE

According to the manual, what is the purpose of the assessment instrument?

Does this purpose align with the clinical needs of my client base?

YES NO

TEST DEVELOPMENT

Is the assessment instrument *norm-referenced* or *criterion-referenced*? (check one)

Norm-referenced

Is the size of the norming population adequate?

YES NO

Does the norming population adequately represent the demographics and relevant characteristics of my client base? (i.e., age, gender, race)

YES NO

Rate the overall appropriateness of the norming population:

Very Inappropriate Inappropriate Average Appropriate Very Appropriate Not Applicable

Explain any norming population concerns:

Criterion-referenced

Rate the overall appropriateness of the criterion:

Very Inappropriate Inappropriate Average Appropriate Very Appropriate Not Applicable

Criterion concerns:

ITEM ANALYSIS

Consider the items of the assessment instrument.

Multidimensional evaluation

Does the assessment instrument contain items that evaluate physiological distress? YES NO

Does the assessment instrument contain items that evaluate psychological distress? YES NO

Does the assessment instrument contain items that evaluate social distress? YES NO

Does the assessment instrument contain items that evaluate spiritual distress? YES NO

Faith-sensitive items

Does the assessment instrument contain any faith-sensitive items? YES NO

If yes, please specify:

Given the belief system of my client base, rate the probability that these faith-sensitive items will skew the results of the assessment instrument:

Very Low Low Average High Very High Not Applicable

PSYCHOMETRICS

Reliability

Rate the acceptability of each of the following types of reliability:

Test re-test reliability: Is individual performance on the first administration consistent with performance on the second administration?

Very Unacceptable Unacceptable Average Acceptable Very Acceptable Not Applicable

Alternate or parallel forms: Is individual performance consistent between the two forms?

Very Unacceptable Unacceptable Average Acceptable Very Acceptable Not Applicable

Internal consistency: Is the assessment instrument internally consistent?

Very Unacceptable Unacceptable Average Acceptable Very Acceptable Not Applicable

Inter-rater reliability: Is there sufficient evidence that the scoring is consistent among raters?

Very Unacceptable Unacceptable Average Acceptable Very Acceptable Not Applicable

Rate the overall acceptability of reliability:

Very Unacceptable Unacceptable Average Acceptable Very Acceptable

Reliability concerns:

Validity

Rate the acceptability of each of the following types of validity:

Face validity: Based on the appearance and style of the assessment instrument, are items likely to invite reasonable client responses, particularly from clients with Christian faith convictions?

Very Unacceptable Unacceptable Average Acceptable Very Acceptable

Content relevance and structure: Does the assessment instrument cover a representative sample of the specified skills and knowledge? Does factor analysis support the subscales, the precision of the measure, and its freedom from distracting embedded variables?

Very Unacceptable Unacceptable Average Acceptable Very Acceptable

Redemptive validity: Does the instrument reveal aspects of a client's self-narrative that have implications for Christian identity and/or spiritual development? Do items raise awareness on matters that may invite reflection from a gospel lens (i.e., creation, fall, redemption, consummation)? YES NO

Construct representation: How well does the assessment instrument reflect and measure the intended construct?

Very Unacceptable Unacceptable Average Acceptable Very Acceptable

Redemptive validity: Does the assessment instrument contribute to a more detailed understanding of the central condition of the human heart or reveal ways that core affections (i.e., attachment, ethical motivation, awe, hope, etc.) may need to further rest in the grace of God? YES NO

If yes, please specify:

Concurrent validity: Is the assessment instrument systematically a good indicator of a condition, and is there evidence that it does it as well or better than other measures?

Very Unacceptable Unacceptable Average Acceptable Very Acceptable Not Applicable

Redemptive validity: Does the assessment instrument provide insight into life issues or existential matters that reveal personality concerns (patterns of thinking, feeling, and acting) that indicate areas for potential growth in spiritual development? Does the measure point to a character matter that the Holy Spirit may also be addressing? YES NO

If yes, please specify:

Does the assessment instrument measure behaviors, attitudes, or beliefs that Scripture directly addresses or reveal areas where an increased dependency upon the Creator for wisdom is warranted? YES NO

If yes, please specify:

Rate the overall acceptability of validity:

Very Unacceptable Unacceptable Average Acceptable Very Acceptable

Explain any validity concerns (e.g., construct underrepresentation or construct-irrelevance):

Rate the overall acceptability of redemptive validity:

Very Unacceptable Unacceptable Average Acceptable Very Acceptable

Redemptive validity concerns:

ADMINISTRATION, INTERPRETATION, AND SCORING

User qualifications

User qualification level required for administration and interpretation: A B C

Based upon the criteria of this user qualification level, am I competent to administer and interpret the test results of this assessment instrument? YES NO

Administration procedure

Is the administration procedure outlined in the manual compatible with the overall logistics and procedures of my organization? YES NO

Potential areas conflict:

Scoring

The assessment instrument requires: Hand-scoring Computerized scoring

Overall ease of scoring:

Highly Complex Complex Average Easy Very Easy

Scoring concerns:

Interpretation

Does the manual provide sufficient information to appropriately interpret the results of the assessment instrument?

YES NO

Does the manual provide sufficient information to assist in communicating results to clients in ways that will facilitate understanding of behavioral, internal, interpersonal, or spiritual areas in need of restoration and redemption?

YES NO

Overall ease of interpretation:

Highly Complex Complex Average Easy Very Easy

Interpretation concerns:

UTILITY

Is there a significant additional investment in time, resources, and training for my organization if this assessment instrument is adopted for us?

YES NO

If yes, please specify:

What information, benefit, risk reduction, or new efficiency is likely to be gained from the application of this assessment instrument?

If this assessment instrument is adopted by my organization, what supplemental questions should be asked in order to improve my conceptualization of the distress from a spiritual perspective?

Utility concerns:

TOTAL EVALUATION

Based on the information and concerns above, rate the overall appropriateness of assessment instrument:

Very Inappropriate Inappropriate Average Appropriate Very Appropriate

Provide a brief narrative summary, evaluation conclusion, and recommendations or qualifications for use: