In reviewing our courthouse systems or building new systems for a new program, we are frequently told to obtain stakeholder input. But, how many of us really know how to go about gathering and reviewing such feedback in a practical yet comprehensive way?

IAALS has an ongoing program called Court Compass that explores ways to make court systems for divorce more user-friendly and accessible. In pursuing this mission, Court Compass had developed a system for obtaining feedback from stakeholders in the systems ranging from self-represented litigants to inside and outside system professionals. They call it the Design Spring Process. They believe they have developed an excellent system for gathering useful stakeholder feedback that would apply to a wide variety of projects. The good news for us is that they have decided to share in this handy guide.

Judea Pearl and Dana MacKenzie, The Book of Why, the New Science of Cause and Effect

Judges, like researchers, routinely evaluate causation, always searching for the dividing line between correlation and causation. We do so daily in the most simplistic case ranging to the staggeringly complex. In The Book of Why, Prof. Pearl brings insight and analytical integrity to approaching a question of causation. While the book is written with the researcher in mind and can bog down in some dense language now and then, it is overall an enjoyable and illuminating read for anyone in the decision-making business. Prof. Pearl explains a multi-runged, ladder-of-causation framework. Possibly of most importance to us, Prof. Pearl helps explain what data can and cannot actually tell us. While the insights in this book will help you in your gatekeeper role for scientific evidence, it will also help you bring a new rigor and validity to your own causation analyses.

APA Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Boys and Men: August 2018

Judges are frequently required to provide some guidance, oversight, or evaluation of a litigant’s psychological treatment or of treatment programs. Most of us have been poorly equipped to play this role. One option for expanding my understanding of the practice side of treatment programs has been reading the bevy of thoughtful media pieces discussing the APAs recent release of guidelines for treatment of boys and men. On first blush, this sounds disturbing to our “fair and impartial” mindsets to segregate out males for special treatment. However, the latest set of treatment guidelines follow earlier guidelines released relating to females and LGBTQ. The guidelines and some of the discussion of those guidelines are enlightening regarding the particular challenges associated with treating these groups. Reviewing the discussion and the guidelines may just help you evaluate that next treatment methodology argument you hear in your courtroom. One accessible write-up of the issues can be found in The Atlantic at https://bit.ly/2QBv3jZ.