EDCP 633: Diagnostic Appraisal of Children and Adolescents  
Instructor: Hedwig Teglasi, Ph.D., ABPP  
Spring 2013  
Tuesdays 10:30am- 1:15pm (ARC 1121)  
Office hours: Tuesdays and Thursdays, 2:00-4:00 and by appointment  
Phone: 301-405-2867  
Email: hteglasi@umd.edu

Course description

This course introduces students to basic concepts and methods of personality assessment, and in accordance with the scientist practitioner model of training, combines theory, research and practice in reference to personality appraisal of children and adolescents.

Expected student outcomes:

1. Understand the interplay of cognitive and affective processes in the conceptualization and assessment of personality.
2. Apply frameworks for interpretation of narratives told to picture stimuli.
3. Use storytelling techniques to assess socio-emotional-cognitive schemas.
5. Integrate “performance-based” measures of personality with “report-based” measures.
6. Integrate performance based measures of ability and of personality.

Student Evaluation:

1. Students are expected to have read the assigned readings for class and to be prepared to participate in class discussions.
2. Each student will lead a short discussion (no more than 20 minutes) of two articles from the required readings during the semester. Students will develop visual aids and handout (may be done electronically) to facilitate the communication of key points and to raise questions for discussion. 10 points each, 20 total
3. Each student will “teach” the main principles of a questionnaire measure, chosen with prior approval of instructor. 20 points
4. Students will hand in five assignments requiring coding and interpretation of TAT protocols, when due, each worth 10 points, total of 50. For full credit, each assignment is to be submitted electronically by noon the Monday before it is discussed in class.
5. Two quizzes-each worth 50 points
6. Mini paper and class presentation-50 points
7. Open book exam-50 points

Total points: 240

Mini paper: Choose a construct that has been targeted for intervention (such as anger management; executive functioning) and compare at least two different approaches to assessment of outcomes. Discuss these outcome measures in reference to the intervention approaches from which they flow and to functioning in real world settings (as per the articles on arbitrary metrics). Due date for the paper is May 9.
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Test presentation: Choose a child/adolescent questionnaire measure designed to be completed by self, parent, or teacher that is commonly used currently for clinical purposes, checking first with the instructor (among the options are: BASC; RCMAS; BDI; EF; Conners; autism rating scales; adaptive functioning). How to proceed: choose the most recent version of a questionnaire that is in current use; obtain this measure so you can examine the items and the Manuals. After reading the Manual and a few studies about the measure and the construct it is designed to assess, consider the items in relation to the definition of the construct posed by the author(s). Also consider the items on the measure in relation to other views about the constructs in question. What to present: 1. Background about the purpose of the scale, constructs assessed, nature of items (a handout with sample items for each subscale), norms and psychometric properties. Please note, much of this information can be conveyed via handouts. 2. How should scales on this instrument be interpreted? 3. What are limitations or strengths for clinical use? Overall, your presentation should convey to the audience: when and how to use the questionnaire and what are some caveats.

Criteria for leading the discussion on articles:
1) Clearly conveying the central point – use of handouts, including visual or tabular summaries. The presentation should be about 10 minutes and discussion 10 minutes.
2) Accurate/Critical evaluation of the evidence presented or the quality of reasoning
3) Engaging the class in critical thinking and synthesis of implications of the article for assessment/intervention

Grading Plan for Papers: Roughly, papers will be graded on the following criteria:

a. Organization (e.g., logical flow of material, judicious use of headings, clear definition of the topic and summary of what the paper said).

b. Application of concepts from assigned articles regarding “arbitrary metrics” and other measurement considerations in ways that lend cohesiveness to the paper.

c. Depth of coverage/complexity of discussion (synthesis and critique of the material, in addition to helpful synopsis of key findings in the literature.)

d. Originality -- extent to which the paper represents an interesting or compelling perspective on the literature in order to shed light on what is known in the field and what else needs to be known.

e. Clarity -- writing that is easy to follow, easy to understand, well composed and readable; includes but not limited to mechanics (spelling, grammar, punctuation, and explanation of unusual terms).
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f. Overall cohesiveness—points are made convincingly and ideas cohere around the central message of the paper.

### Schedule of Topics and Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week: Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings; Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/29</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>Constructs and metrics in assessment</td>
<td>Text: chapters 1 &amp; 2; Reading set one Student led article discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>Narrative methods of assessment of schemas and social cognition:</td>
<td>Text, chapters 3 &amp; 4; Reading set two;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19</td>
<td>Narrative Assessment of Cognition</td>
<td>Review assignment 1; (submitted prior Monday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26</td>
<td>Narrative Assessment of Cognition Continued,</td>
<td>Reading set three; Review assignment 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>Narrative Assessment of Emotion</td>
<td>Text, Ch. 5; Reading set four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>Narrative Assessment of Relationships;</td>
<td>Reading set five; Text, Ch. 6; Review assignment 3;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19</td>
<td>Spring break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26</td>
<td>Quiz 1 (administered at home)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>Narrative Assessment of Motivation and Self regulation:</td>
<td>Reading set five, Text, Ch. 7; Review assignment 4; (Test presentation 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/9</td>
<td>Motivation and self-regulation continued,</td>
<td>Text, Ch. 8, 9, 10; (Test presentation 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>Motivation and self-regulation continued; Report</td>
<td>Review assignment 5; (Test presentation 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/23</td>
<td>Drawings, Bender-Gestalt;</td>
<td>Reading set six (Test presentation 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/30</td>
<td>Rorschach and Child Interview;</td>
<td>Reading set seven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>Quiz 2 (in class)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Reading Sets:** *means required.

**Set One: Constructs and metrics of assessment**
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**Set Two: Personality assessment in perspective**
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Set Three: Social cognitions, schemas, and narrative assessment
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**Set Four: Emotions, coping, and Relationships**


*Teglas, Locraft and Felgenhauer, 2008, Empathy, Handbook of Clinical Scoring Systems for the TAT, Erlbaum

*Teglas, et al (2008); Coding Empathy, in above volume


**Set Five: Self-regulation and motivation**
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**Set Six**


**Set Seven: Interview, Human Figure Drawings, and Bender-Gestalt**


**Set Seven: Rorschach**

University Policy on Instructional Modifications:
Students who have a disability or condition, which may impair their ability to complete assignments or otherwise satisfy course criteria, are encouraged to meet with the course instructor to identify, discuss, and document any feasible instructional modifications or accommodations. The student should notify the instructor no later than the end of the second week of the term in which the course is offered or no later than the end of the second week after such a disability or condition is diagnosed.

Academic Integrity:
The University has a nationally recognized Honor Code, administered by the Student Honor Council. The student Honor Council proposed and University Senate approved an Honor Pledge that is hand written and signed on the front cover of all papers, projects or other academic assignments submitted for evaluation. The Honor Pledge reads:

“I pledge on my honor that I have not given or received any unauthorized assistance on this assignment/examination.”

Any member of the campus community can report allegations of academic dishonesty directly to the Honor Council (314-8206).

Religious Observation:
Students should inform the instructor of any intended absences for religious observances in advance. Prior notification of an absence is especially important in connection with final examinations, since failure to reschedule a final examination before conclusion of the final examination period may result in being unable to complete the course in a timely fashion.

Student Course Evaluation:
As a member of our academic community, you as a student have a number of important responsibilities. One of these responsibilities is to submit your course evaluations each term though CourseEvalUM in order to help faculty and administrators improve teaching and learning at Maryland. The link at which you can access the submission system is www.courseevalum.umd.edu. More information is at: https://www.irpa.umd.edu/Assessment/CourseEval/stdt_faq.shtml.