

Cognitive Therapy Rating Scale (CTRS)

Therapist's name: _____

Date: _____

Patient's name: _____

Date of session: _____

Tape ID: _____

Rater: _____

Date of rating: _____

Session: _____

Method of observation:

- Videotape
- Audiotape
- Live observation

Directions:

For each time, assess the therapist on a scale from 0 to 6, and record the rating on the line next to the item number. Descriptions are provided for even- numbered scale points. If you believe the therapist falls between two of the descriptors, select the intervening odd number (1, 3, 5). For example, if the therapist set a very good agenda but did not establish priorities, assign a rating of a 5 rather than a 4 or 6. If the descriptions for a given item occasionally do not seem to apply to the session you are rating, feel free to disregard them and use the more general scale below.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Poor	Barely Adequate	Mediocre	Satisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent

Please do not leave any item blank. For all items, focus on the skill of the therapist, taking into account how difficult the patient seems to be.

	<p>1. Agenda</p>
	<p>0: Therapist did not set agenda</p> <p>2: Therapist set agenda that was vague or incomplete</p> <p>4: Therapist worked with patient to set a mutually satisfactory agenda that included specific target problems (e.g. anxiety at work, dissatisfaction with marriage.)</p> <p>6: Therapist worked with patient to set an appropriate agenda with target problems, suitable for the available time. Established priorities and then followed agenda.</p>
	<p>2. Feedback</p>
	<p>0: Therapist did not ask for feedback to determine patient's understanding of, or response to, the session.</p> <p>2: Therapist elicited some feedback from the patient, but did not ask enough questions to be sure the patient understood the therapist's line of reasoning during the session or to ascertain whether the patient was satisfied with the session.</p> <p>4: Therapist asked enough questions to be sure that the patient understood the therapist's line of reasoning throughout the session and to determine the patient's reactions to the session. The therapist adjusted his/her behavior in response to the feedback, when appropriate.</p> <p>6: Therapist was especially adept at eliciting and responding to verbal and non- verbal feedback throughout the session (e.g., elicited reactions to session, regularly checked for understanding, helped summarize main points at end of session).</p>
	<p>3. Understanding</p>
	<p>0: Therapist did not ask for feedback to determine patient's understanding of, or response to, the session.</p> <p>2: Therapist elicited some feedback from the patient, but did not ask enough questions to be sure the patient understood the therapist's line of reasoning during the session or to ascertain whether the patient was satisfied with the session.</p> <p>4: Therapist asked enough questions to be sure that the patient understood the therapist's line of reasoning throughout the session and to determine the patient's reactions to the session. The therapist adjusted his/her behavior in response to the feedback, when appropriate.</p> <p>6: Therapist was especially adept at eliciting and responding to verbal and non- verbal feedback throughout the session (e.g., elicited reactions to session, regularly checked for understanding, helped summarize main points at end of session).</p>

	<p>4. Interpersonal effectiveness</p>
	<p>0: Therapist had poor interpersonal skills. Seemed hostile, demeaning, or in some other way destructive to the patient.</p> <p>2: Therapist did not seem destructive, but had significant interpersonal problems. At times, therapist appeared unnecessarily impatient, aloof, insincere or had difficulty conveying confidence and competence.</p> <p>4: Therapist displayed a satisfactory degree of warmth, concern, confidence, genuineness, and professionalism. No significant interpersonal problems.</p> <p>6: Therapist displayed optimal levels of warmth, concern, confidence, genuineness, and professionalism, appropriate for this particular patient in this session.</p>
	<p>5. Collaboration</p>
	<p>0: Therapist did not attempt to set up a collaboration with patient.</p> <p>2: Therapist attempted to collaborate with patient, but had difficulty either defining a problem that the patient considered important or establishing rapport.</p> <p>4: Therapist was able to collaborate with patient, focus on a problem that both patient and therapist considered important, and establish rapport.</p> <p>6: Collaboration seemed excellent; therapist encouraged patient as much as possible to take an active role during the session (e.g., by offering choices) so they could function as a “team”.</p>
	<p>6. Pacing and efficient use of time</p>
	<p>0: Therapist made no attempt to structure therapy time. Session seemed aimless.</p> <p>2: Session had some direction, but the therapist had significant problems with structuring or pacing (e.g., too little structure, inflexible about structure, too slowly paced, too rapidly paced).</p> <p>4: Therapist was reasonably successful at using time efficiently. Therapist maintained appropriate control over flow of discussion and pacing.</p> <p>6: Therapist used time efficiently by tactfully limiting peripheral and unproductive discussion and by pacing the session as rapidly as was appropriate for the patient</p>

7. Guided discovery

0: Therapist relied primarily on debate, persuasion, or “lecturing.” Therapist seemed to be “cross-examining” patient, putting the patient on the defensive, or forcing his/her point of view on the patient.

2: Therapist relied too heavily on persuasion and debate, rather than guided discovery. However, therapist’s style was supportive enough that patient did not seem to feel attacked or defensive.

4: Therapist, for the most part, helped patient see new perspectives through guided discovery (e.g., examining evidence, considering alternatives, weighing advantages and disadvantages) rather than through debate. Used questioning appropriately.

6: Therapist was especially adept at using guided discovery during the session to explore problems and help patient draw his/her own conclusions. Achieved an excellent balance between skillful questioning and other modes of intervention.

8. Focusing on key cognition behaviors

0: Therapist did not attempt to elicit specific thoughts, assumptions, images, meanings, or behaviors.

2: Therapist used appropriate techniques to elicit cognitions or behaviors; however, therapist had difficulty finding a focus or focused on cognitions/behaviors that were irrelevant to the patient’s key problems.

4: Therapist focused on specific cognitions or behaviors relevant to the target problem. However, therapist could have focused on more central cognitions or behaviors that offered greater promise for progress.

6: Therapist very skillfully focused on key thoughts, assumptions, behaviors, etc. that were most relevant to the problem area and offered considerable promise for progress.

9. Strategy for change

(Focus on the quality of the therapist’s strategy for change, not on how effectively the strategy was implemented/whether change actually occurred.)

0: Therapist did not select cognitive-behavioral techniques.

2: Therapist selected cognitive-behavioral techniques; however, either the overall strategy for bringing about change seemed vague or did not seem promising in helping the patient

4: Therapist seemed to have a generally coherent strategy for change that showed reasonable promise and incorporated cognitive-behavioral techniques.

	<p>6: Therapist followed a consistent strategy for change that seemed very promising and incorporated the most appropriate cognitive-behavioral techniques.</p>
	<p>10. Application for Cognitive-Behavioral Techniques</p>
	<p>0: Therapist did not apply any cognitive-behavioral techniques.</p> <p>2: Therapist used cognitive-behavioral techniques, but there were significant flaws in the way they were applied.</p> <p>4: Therapist applied cognitive-behavioral techniques with moderate skill.</p> <p>6: Therapist very skillfully and resourcefully employed cognitive-behavioral techniques.</p>
	<p>11. Homework</p>
	<p>0: Therapist did not attempt to incorporate homework relevant to cognitive therapy.</p> <p>2: Therapist had significant difficulties incorporating homework (e.g., did not review previous homework, did not explain homework in sufficient detail, assigned inappropriate homework).</p> <p>4: Therapist reviewed previous homework and assigned “standard” cognitive therapy homework generally relevant to issues dealt with in session. Homework was explained in sufficient detail.</p> <p>6: Therapist reviewed previous homework and carefully assigned homework drawn from cognitive therapy for the coming week. Assignment seemed “custom tailored” to help patient incorporate new perspectives, test hypotheses, experiment with new behaviors discussed during session, etc.</p>
	<p>Total Score</p>

Scoring Interpretation:

The total score is calculated by adding up the scores for each item. The overall score reflects the quality of the session and the therapist's adherence to cognitive therapy principles. Generally, higher scores indicate better adherence to CBT techniques, while lower scores may suggest areas for improvement.

0 to 40: Low adherence and poor quality of cognitive therapy.

41 to 70: Moderate adherence and quality; some room for improvement.

71 to 100: Good adherence and quality; therapist is skilled in cognitive therapy techniques.

101 and above: Excellent adherence and high-quality cognitive therapy.

Additional notes: