PSYCHOPATHOLOGY AND MENTAL HEALTH
CIEP 413
SECOND SUMMER SESSION

Instructor: Pamela Fenning, Ph.D.
Instructor’s Work Phone: (312) 915-6803
Instructor’s Cell Phone: (847) 722-1134
Instructor’s E-mail: pfennin@luc.edu
Instructor’s Office: Lewis Towers 1028B (Water Tower Campus)
Instructor’s Office hours: Monday and Wednesday 2-3 and by appointment
Classroom: School of Communication (SOC) Room #01
Doctoral Clerk: Mr. Jessie Montes de Oca
Days and Time: Monday/Wednesday (June 29 –August 5th) 11:00 am -2:00 pm

CLASS READINGS REQUIRED


Required journal articles and related materials (e.g., national reports, position papers) will also be posted on Sakai by the instructor

PRIMARY PURPOSE AND GOALS OF COURSE

The purpose of this course is to develop a working knowledge of childhood/adolescent psychopathology from multiple theoretical perspectives. In addition, the interactions of individual diversity, families, communities, schools and mental health providers in either etiology and/or treatment planning will be considered. Set within an ecological framework, emphasis will be placed on understanding the relationship between various diagnostic systems (e.g., DSM-V and IDEA 2004, and their impact on societal conceptualizations of mental health/illness.

This class has two primary goals. The first goal is to provide an introduction to school-based mental health, with a particular emphasis placed on the ethics of school mental health service provision, as well as the provision of a social justice framework for considering how popular culture defines “abnormal.” The second goal of this course is for students to obtain a working knowledge of child/adolescent psychopathology, both in terms of diagnosis (including obtaining a working knowledge of the DSM-V) and in terms of prevention and intervention.
SPECIFIC COURSE OBJECTIVES

1. The concept of the normal/typical range of emotional development will be discussed. NASP/ISBE STANDARD 7;

2. Ethical issues related to mental health counseling, reporting, and service provision in schools will be explored. NASP/ISBE STANDARD 7;

3. School-based mental health and its contribution to prevention and treatment of mental health issues will be explored NASP/ISBE STANDARD 7;

4. Specific school factors that contribute to mental health services and disorders including: school climate, population, cultural values, and community resources will be explored. NASP/ISBE STANDARDS 4, 7;

5. Theoretical perspectives of mental disorder including: biological, psychological, social psychological, behavioral, and family systems will be explored. NASP/ISBE STANDARD 7;

6. Specific disorders commonly having child or adolescent onset will be studied including: pervasive development disorders, mood disorders, conduct disorders, ADHD, eating disorders, child abuse and neglect, and health related disorders. NASP/ISBE STANDARD 7;

7. Theoretical perspective on evaluation using both interviewing and behavioral ratings scales will be introduced. NASP/ISBE STANDARD 7;

8. Theories of family interaction and contribution to childhood disorders/resilience will be considered. NASP/ISBE STANDARD 8;

9. The concept of collaborating with families specifically around mental health issues will be discussed. NASP/ISBE STANDARD 8;

10. The DSM-IV-TR Diagnostic system will be related to the objectives above. NASP/ISBE STANDARD 7;

11. Classification procedures included in IDEA04 will be compared to the DSM-IV-TR system and legal and ethical implications of both systems will be considered. NASP/ISBE STANDARD 7

COURSE EVALUATION IDEA OBJECTIVES

The following course objectives are considered to be important objectives for the course:
• Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends).
• Learning fundamental principles, generalizations or theories.

The following course objective is considered to be an essential objective for the course:

• Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)

ACADEMIC HONESTY

Academic honesty is an expression of interpersonal justice, responsibility and care, applicable to Loyola University faculty, students, and staff, which demands that the pursuit of knowledge in the university community be carried out with sincerity and integrity. The School of Education’s Policy on Academic Integrity can be found at: http://www.luc.edu/education/academics_policies_integrity.shtml. For additional academic policies and procedures refer to: http://www.luc.edu/education/academics_policies_main.shtml

ACCESSIBILITY

Students who have disabilities which they believe entitle them to accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act should register with the Services for Students with Disabilities (SSWD) office. To request accommodations, students must schedule an appointment with an SSWD coordinator. Students should contact SSWD at least four weeks before their first semester or term at Loyola. Returning students should schedule an appointment within the first two weeks of the semester or term. The University policy on accommodations and participation in courses is available at: http://www.luc.edu/sswd/

ETHICS LINE REPORTING HOTLINE

Loyola University Chicago has implemented EthicsLine Reporting Hotline, through a third party internet & telephone hotline provider, to provide you with an automated and anonymous way to report activities that may involve misconduct or violations of Loyola University policy. You may file an anonymous report here on-line or by dialing 855-603-6988. (within the United States, Guam, and Puerto Rico)

The University is committed to the highest ethical and professional standards of conduct as an integral part of its mission of expanding knowledge in the service of humanity through learning, justice and faith. To achieve this goal, the University relies on each community member's ethical behavior, honesty, integrity and good judgment. Each community member should demonstrate respect for the rights of others.
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The School of Education, as part of a Catholic, Jesuit University, espouses social justice as a unifying conceptual framework that is designed to prepare teachers and other school personnel to practice “professionalism in the service of social justice” (see below). In concert with the rest of Loyola University Chicago and with the precepts of the Society of Jesus, an effort is made to prepare professionals who understand and seek to advance distributive justice. We prepare individuals to strive toward equity and fairness in their future professional roles. CIPE 413 maintains this focus on social justice with training in the provision of school-based mental health services. The four components of the conceptual framework of the School of Education are addressed within the context of four areas of study:

1. **Knowledge**: candidates pursue justice by being knowledgeable in their specialized disciplines and well educated in general so that they can offer the highest quality of service.
2. **Skills**: candidates pursue justice by being competent professionals and offering their well-developed skills in the service of others—particularly the sick, the poor, and the young.
3. **Ethics**: candidates know and practice the ethical standards of their professions.
4. **Service**: from whatever faith tradition they may come, candidates strive to be "persons for others."

PROFESSIONALS IN SERVICE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Jesuit education is founded on a 400-year tradition of academic excellence emphasizing the unique bond between teachers and learners. The School of Education prepares educators, administrators and school psychologists to be competent in the exercise of professional skills, to display a respect for diversity, to embrace distributive justice as social justice, and to recognize that education is a life-long process. Loyola University’s School of Education seeks to develop professionals who use their scholarship to evaluate actions and decisions in light of their ramifications and impact on students, school organizations, and the broader community. We see the professionals of the future as thoughtful persons able to analyze situations, set goals, plan and monitor actions, evaluate results, and reflect on their own professional thinking.

Professionals are responsive to the long-term social and ethical implications of their decisions and actions. The School of Education develops persons of conscience devoted to the service of others. The faculty of the School of Education seeks to develop professionals able to develop and offer educational opportunities for children,
adolescents, and adults that enable them to contribute to and benefit from the social, political, and economic opportunities in their lives and to promote social justice. Professional educators in service of social justice will know the subjects they teach and how to convey content of those subjects to learners; engage in disciplined inquiry based on informed reason, reflect on experiences of self and others, consider alternative perspectives, and pursue a problem-solving orientation; evidence respect for and ability to respond to differences in learners’ personal, social, economic and cultural experiences; evaluate the effects of their decisions on others (learners, families, and other professionals in the learning community); provide learning opportunities to support all learners’ intellectual, social, and personal development; possess the knowledge and skills to teach all learners well and with rigor; create a learning environment that promotes positive social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation; and maintain standards of professional conduct.

The content of this course is consistent with this framework in that understanding school-based mental health from a prevention and social justice perspective and understanding the range of social, emotional and behavioral problems of children and adolescents helps professional school psychologists bring a more competent and therefore just approach to the services they render to diverse populations.

DISPOSITIONS

Dispositions are an essential component of becoming a school-based professional, such as a school psychologist or special education. The School of Education dispositions of professionalism, fairness and a belief that all students can learn is evaluated with specific behaviors and professional skills that are contained in the School Psychology graduate program rubric, which is located for those in the PhD School Psychology program at: http://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/education/pdfs/handbk_spsy-phd-2014.pdf and for those in the Ed.S. School Psychology program at: http://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/education/pdfs/handbk_spsy-eds.pdf

Dispositions for school psychology graduate students are assessed in each course. In this course, students should demonstrate and understanding of ethical practice as it relates to the provision of school-based mental health diagnosis and practice. Students should also show competencies in the application of ethical principles to the solution of dilemmas related to school-based mental health issues.

TECHNOLOGY

The use of technology is infused in the course through the applied required assignments, which include the use of data-based literature searches as part of the scholarly literature review as well as the use of visual technology (e.g., power point) as part of the class DSM-V presentation. In addition, technology such as google groups will be used by the instructor and the students enrolled in the course.
ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

The School of Education faculty, students and staff respect each other’s rights, privacy and access to electronic resources, services, and communications while in the pursuit of academic and professional growth, networking and research. All members of the university community are expected to demonstrate the highest standards of integrity, communication, and responsibility while accessing and utilizing technology, information resources, and computing facilities. A link to the Loyola University Chicago and School of Education official policies and guidelines can be found at:

http://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/education/pdfs/SOE_Cyberbullying_Policy.pdf

DIVERSITY STATEMENT

Culturally responsive service delivery that addresses the needs of our most vulnerable students, inclusive of those with mental health concerns, is a primary component of this course. Children from under-represented groups, particularly children of color, those who are in poverty and from families who are disenfranchised from the school system, are the least likely to be on the receiving end of appropriate mental health services. A major focus of the course will be on how as school psychologists, we can advocate for appropriate diagnostic and intervention services for those who require mental health supports. Our advocacy for appropriate mental health diagnostic, intervention and evaluation services is a component of our mission and commitment to social justice. Thus, psychopathology and school-based mental health is not something done “to” and individual or family, but rather in terms of how school psychology practice can focus on mental health needs as part of a larger context. The importance of our shared growth and understanding of how the larger context might impact students who reside in a society where inequity may exist for some is a significant event that will occur during the course.

CLASS ASSIGNMENTS

1) Class Participation- 15% (15 points)

There are a number of planned in-class activities and discussions. In-class activities are designed to achieve various learning goals but implicit in all in-class activities is the idea that often the best way to learn new material is through active engagement. You cannot be actively engaged in classroom-based learning if you are not in class and/or are consistently late. As such, students with two or more absences and/or who frequently miss parts of classes are subject to a “0” for their class participation grade and perhaps a failing grade for the course depending on severity. In addition, it is also my expectation that you do not engage in checking e-mail, texting or other activities unrelated to class during class time. I am fine with you having your computers in class if you are following along on a presentation that is being covered in class. However, working on activities unrelated to class is not acceptable.
2. **“What Should You Do If” Paper -30%: SOE CF 8 (30 points)**

   Culturally responsive mental health service delivery involves, among other things, a thorough knowledge of the ethics code of your profession, being clinically savvy, and having the ability to think on your feet. While some situations are relatively clear in terms of the proper ethical/legal/clinical response (e.g., teacher asks you for confidential information about a student), other situations are not quite as clear (e.g., student drops by your office many times for personal “chats” but parents do not consent to counseling). For this assignment, you are to first generate an ethical “what if” situation that could plausibly occur in your role as a school psychologist and then write a short paper that takes the following format:

   1) begin with a short vignette containing the “what if” situation
   2) follow with a description of the pertinent law/ethical principles involved in this situation and a summary of at least two pertinent scholarly writings that address this topic
   3) analyze how you would approach this situation if you were a school based mental health professional confronted with this “what if.” What steps would you take and why? What would be the potential risks and benefits to your approach and are there any contingencies that would alter your course? What ethical and legal guidelines would apply in making your decision, as well as current best practices in the field?

   Your paper, due on **July 15th**, will be evaluated based on several factors, including the clarity with which the “what if situation was presented, the thoroughness and accuracy of your review and application of pertinent laws/ethics and scholarly writings, and the degree to which your proposed approach fits with the above. The scoring rubric for this assignment is appended in this syllabus. Please include a copy of the rubric when you submit your assignment. Please note that this assignment has been designed to meet Loyola University Chicago's School of Education Conceptual Framework #8/Portfolio requirement. The assignment should be submitted through Sakai. Once the instructor returns the graded assignment via Sakai, then students should upload the graded assignment to LiveText. Once the graded assignment is submitted on LiveText, the instructor will complete a second Live-Test rubric to complete the assignment for the portfolio.

3. **Connecting the DSM-V Criteria to a Problem-Solving Framework- 30% (30 points)**

   Like other applied professions, the field of school psychology (and the school psychology program at Loyola) embraces a problem-solving orientation. According to a report put out by the Surgeon General, there is a significant shortage in mental health services provided to children, a shortage only exacerbated by the country's recent economic woes, and particularly in Illinois, cuts at the state level in mental health service provision. Children of ethnic minority status, English Language Learners (ELL), highly transient and homeless youth, and those in poverty experience significant disparities in access to appropriate health care, including mental health services,. When children do receive mental health services/support, the school is the most common setting where this takes place. Simply put, for many children, particularly children of lower socio-economic status, a school represents the most likely, and often the only location where they might receive needed mental health support/services. While many
professions have the knowledge base and skills to contribute in this regard, school psychologists, with their knowledge of school systems combined with their expertise in mental health assessment, problem-solving, and intervention, are in a unique position to facilitate needed support/services for students. As such, it is crucial that school psychologists not only are experts in the problem-solving model, but that they are able to connect this model with knowledge of psychopathology/mental health diagnoses for children who clearly meet DSM-V/IDEA criteria in order to best select interventions that have research support.

In this assignment, you are asked to demonstrate this link between problem-solving and command of the DSM-V criteria. Through a google document and in cooperation with a partner, you will be asked to rank order a minimum of three topics from the following list—ADHD, Anxiety Disorders, Mood Disorders, Behavior Disorders, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Intellectual Disability (Mental Retardation), Autism, Health-Related Disorders, Substance Use Disorders, Eating Disorders, Child Maltreatment—in terms of your preference for leading an in-class presentation and discussion related to this topic. You can also discuss a topic that is not on this list that might be of interest to you in collaboration with the course instructor and the doctoral clerk. You will work with a partner on each stage in the completion of this task including a joint presentation to the group.

The in-class presentation should take approximately 20 minutes (and no more than 30 minutes) and consist of two segments that are presented live to the entire class. The **first segment** should contain a problem identification/analysis interview in which one group member plays the role of a school psychologist/school based professional and the other group member plays a role that you and your partner designate (e.g., parent, teacher, school professional). The goal of this demonstration is to present how a school psychologist/school based professional might elicit information that would be consistent with a DSM-V diagnosis within a problem-solving framework. In the **second segment** of your presentation, you will **first debrief the interview** for the group in terms of what the school psychologist/school professional was thinking and how the information obtained fit within a DSM-V and a problem-solving framework. You will then describe **1-2 overall mental health case goals and 1-2 research-supported treatment approaches that could be integrated into a case conceptualization for the case.**

50 percent of your grade on this assignment will be based on your in-class interview. What I am looking for here is realism/instructional value (e.g., don’t just have your respondent describe DSM V criteria without any prompting, but rather start with the respondents describing an unclear picture and the school psychologist/school professional asking pertinent questions that make the diagnosis clearer over time) and the quality of your questions, not how good an actor you are. 30 percent of your grade will be based on your debrief of the interview, and the other 20% of your grade will be determined by your mental health case goals and research supported treatment goals as part of where you would head next in the case in terms of beginning treatment. The scoring rubric for this assignment is appended in this syllabus. **Students should submit their presentation through Sakai prior to their presentation.**
4. Scholarly Review of Literature- 25% (25 points)

For this assignment, students will write a scholarly review of a topic that falls within the general framework of child/adolescent psychopathology and is applicable to school-based mental health. **The purpose of this paper, due on July 29th, is to teach students how to write a well-organized and salient summary of prior knowledge on a particular topic.** Developing skills in presenting written information professionally is the purpose behind this assignment.

It is important to understand that in an applied field such as School Psychology that embraces a problem-solving orientation, emphasis must be placed on both theoretical concerns and treatment/practice applications. To be eligible for a grade of A, a paper must include both foci. Please be aware of this requirement when choosing topics. Topics should be cleared with the instructor prior to beginning your review and at least two weeks before this assignment is due through a google doc sign-up. This assignment will be submitted electronically through Sakai. Since this is a required portfolio assignment for the Ed.S. School Psychology students, once the instructor returns the graded assignment, the graded assignment should be uploaded into Live Text and the instructor will complete a second rubric on Live Text.

**Requirements**

Your paper will be scored out of 25 possible points
- Appropriate topic focus as explained above (4 points)
- A minimum of 20 relevant primary sources that have been published with the past 5-7 years (except “classics” or current research threads whose seminal article is longer than five years ago). (3 points)
- Critical thinking skills are evident. (5 points)
- Well organized; correct grammar and spelling; professional tone; avoid writing in the first person. (4 points)
- Conclusions regarding etiology and treatment are supported by the reviewed literature. (4 points)
- No new information is introduced in the Summary. (3 points)
- Maximum length: 15 typed double-spaced pages (excluding references) with a font size minimum of 12 pt. and page margins of at least one inch and in APA format. (2 points)

It is not sufficient to simply to track down a bunch of articles/book chapters and recite what is in each of the papers. The key point is to be able to make connections between the different ideas that you will be reading about. My primary suggestions for how best to do this are twofold. First, within the main body of your paper, you should use transition sentences and references to other articles/chapters that you cite as much as possible (e.g., similar to the findings of Smith (2010), Jones and his colleagues also reported…). Second, I would strongly urge you include in your paper a section just ahead of your conclusion section in which you critique existing research as it relates to your topic. If the research is clear, complete and consistent, say so and why. It is more likely that the research contains conflicting findings and is incomplete in some areas.
So, you would want to describe these inconsistencies/limitations and their implication for practice. The scoring rubric for this assignment is appended in this syllabus. The assignment will be submitted electronically through Sakai.

Grades:
A= 92.5 total points or more
A-= 89.5-92.49 total points
B+= 87.5-89.49 total points
B= 82.5-87.49 total points
Etc.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Note: All reading is to be completed by the day it is assigned. Schedule, assignments, and reading subject to change at instructor’s discretion. All additional required readings (e.g., articles) will be posted to the Sakai site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 2015</td>
<td>Introduction to the Course and School-based Mental Health; Case Conceptualization and Formation; Beginning Problem Solving Stages in Addressing Mental Health Issues</td>
<td>Wilmshurst, Introduction and Part 1 (pages 1-35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| July 1, 2015 | Case Conceptualization/Formation and Beginning Problem Solving Stages in Addressing Mental Health Issues; Ecological Perspectives in Mental Health Treatment | Wilmshurst, Part 1 (pages 37-64)
Burton, Chapter 3 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Burton, Chapters 1 and 2  
Wilmhurst (Appendix B; Pages 383-398) |
| July 13, 2015| Behavioral Disorders: Oppositional Defiant Disorder and Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder | Wilmhurst, Chapter 2 (pages 71-80) and Wilmhurst Chapter 3 (pages 149-164)  
| July 15, 2015 | Autism Spectrum Disorder/Learning Disabilities and Mental Retardation/Cognitive Disabilities | Wilmhurst, Chapter 2 (pages 81-100) and Wilmhurst Chapter 2 (pages 101-143)  
| July 20, 2015 | Behavioral Disorders: Conduct Disorder/Gang Affiliation/Chronic Community Violence |  |
Readings:

Wilmhurst, Chapter 3 (pages 165-176)

Burton, Chapters 6 & 8


July 22, 2015  Emotional Disorders: Affective Disorders

Readings:

Wilmhurst, Chapter 5 (pages 241-270)


July 27th, 2015  Suicide Prevention and Intervention

Readings:

Wilmhurst, Chapters 16 (pages 225-240)


July 29th, 2015  Emotional Disorders: Anxiety Disorders

Readings:

Wilmhurst, Chapter 4 (pages 177-218)


August 3rd, 2015  Eating Disorders/ Health-Related Issues/Wellness

Readings:

Wilmhurst, Chapter 6 (279-294)


August 5th, 2015  Substance Use Disorders/Post Traumatic Stress Disorder/Child Maltreatment

Readings:

Willmhurst, Chapter 6 (267-278) and Wilmhurst, Chapter 7 (pages 295-312 and 325-340)


Appendix A: Rubrics for Class Assignments

“What Should You Do If” Paper?

Name: ___________________________________

Grading Rubric for Live-Text (30 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity of “What If” Vignette (5 points)</strong></td>
<td>Ethical conundrum is extremely clear.</td>
<td>Ethical conundrum is mostly clear.</td>
<td>Ethical conundrum is somewhat clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thoroughness of Review (4 points)</strong></td>
<td>Literature selected provides professional level coverage of pertinent topic.</td>
<td>Literature selected provides average graduate level coverage of pertinent topics.</td>
<td>Literature selected provides coverage below the level expected in a graduate-level paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy of Review (4 points)</strong></td>
<td>All scholarship selected speaks directly to ethical conundrum.</td>
<td>Most scholarship selected speaks directly to ethical conundrum.</td>
<td>Only some or no scholarship selected speaks directly to ethical conundrum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit of Suggested Approach to Literature Review (4 points)</strong></td>
<td>Suggested approach perfect fit to scholarship cited.</td>
<td>Suggested approach mostly a fit to scholarship cited.</td>
<td>Suggested approach not a good fit to scholarship cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness of Key Variables (5 points)</strong></td>
<td>Suggested approach always takes key variables, such as application to school-based practice, into consideration.</td>
<td>Suggested approach mostly takes key variables, such as application to school-based practice, into consideration.</td>
<td>Suggested approach mostly does not take key variables, such as application to school-based practice, into consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Writing Quality (4 points)</strong></td>
<td>Writing done at a professional level (e.g., no typos, well-phrased, well-organized)</td>
<td>Writing done at an acceptable graduate level.</td>
<td>Writing done at a level below that which would be expected of a graduate student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Performance (4 points)</strong></td>
<td>Score of “target” in all six areas</td>
<td>Rating of “acceptable” or “target” in all six areas</td>
<td>Rating of “unacceptable” in one or more areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connecting the DSM-V Criteria to a Problem-Solving Framework (30 points)

Name: ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Class Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Realism/Instructional Value</td>
<td><strong>Total Possible=15 (50%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Debriefing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Summary of Interview Debriefing</td>
<td><strong>Total Possible =6 (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accurate Portrayal of Interview Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three Possible Treatment Approaches</td>
<td><strong>Total Possible =9 (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responses to Questions from Classmates/Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Rubric for Evaluating Scholarly Review of Literature

**Name:** __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Points Possible</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate Topic/Focus</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Topic Not Appropriate (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topic Marginally Appropriate (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topic Adequate Fit (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topic Excellent and Appropriate Fit (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Minimum of 20 Relevant Primary Sources</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inadequate Number and Irrelevant Citations (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimally Relevant Citation but Adequate Number (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citations are Very Relevant and Adequate Number (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Weak Critical Thinking (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marginal Critical Thinking (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate Critical Thinking (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of Sound Critical Thinking (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of Outstanding Critical Thinking (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well-Organized, Correct Grammar and Spelling, Professional Tone</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grammar and Spelling Weak and Detracts from Writing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some Grammar Errors present (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar Adequate; Professional Tone Acceptable (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Free of Grammar Errors and Written in a Highly Professional Manner (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions Regarding Etiology and Treatment Supported by Literature</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conclusions not Research Based or Supported by Literature (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak or Marginal Support for Conclusions (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate Research Support for Conclusions (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong and Solid Research Support for Conclusions (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No New Information is Introduced in the Summary</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Concepts Introduced in the Summary/ Weak Summary (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No New Concepts in the Summary, but Summary is Minimally Content to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary Fits the Major Concepts in the Literature Review/ No New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA Format Followed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>APA Format Not Followed (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points Earned:

Comments: