**Case Study Group Term Paper for an Online Course**

**Goal**: Students will gain a working understanding of the childhood disorders listed in the DSM V.

**Objective**: Students will be able to analyze and evaluate a case study by applying differential diagnoses of childhood disorders.

**Assignment**: With the other members of your Case Study Term Paper group, choose a **child or adolescent** fictional character or celebrity (*if you choose a celebrity that has become an adult, you must only consider their behavior prior to becoming an adult*) to be the subject of your case study. Provide a DSM V diagnosis and support your diagnosis with specific examples from the case. Discuss possible alternative diagnoses and why they were ruled out, including aspects where there may be insufficient information to make a definitive diagnosis.

**Paper Instructions:**

-Start by telling me which character you picked (and from where), and why you chose this person.

-Give an overview of the type of problems that the character exhibits, using simple descriptive words (sad, trouble-maker, angry) rather than psychological terms (repression, anhedonia, echolalia).

-Discuss the various DSM diagnoses you considered and why you ruled them out (or why you do not have enough information to decide). Even if you think there is only one possible diagnosis, consider alternative or secondary diagnoses and rule them out.

-Feel free to consider other diagnoses we have not gone over in this course, but are listed in the DSM-5.

-Take the most likely diagnosis and discuss each of the diagnostic criteria, specifying with examples, which ones s/he meets, which ones s/he does not meet, and which ones do you not have enough information to determine whether or not s/he meets.

-Sum it up by determining if s/he meets sufficient symptom criteria to warrant diagnosis (using DSM rules).

**-**Proofread for spelling and grammar.

-It should make sense to a non-psychology major.

-All group work should be done on the discussion board for your small group, including either a Google Doc or Page Tool within the course, so your relative contributions can be fully documented.

Grade:

Participation – Individual grade (50%)

50 points = Fully engaged in discussion, noting discrepancies, offering critiques and suggestions. Polite and professional (respectful, no anger, no putdowns, no bad language).

25 points = Not very active in discussion, lets others do most of the work, and/or hints of rudeness or slight lack of professionalism.

0 points = No involvement in discussion or completely lacking in professionalism. (Will also get a zero for Product)

Product – Group grade (50%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Poor**  **(0-17 points each)** | **Good**  **(18-22 points each)** | **Excellent**  **(23-25 points each)** | **Points**  **Earned** |
| **Differential Diagnosis** | Either fails to discuss alternative diagnoses or suggests alternatives that are so farfetched that they should not even be considered based on the details of the case. | Identifies plausible diagnoses, but either misses the most plausible, or inaccurately determines the differential diagnoses. | Identifies the most plausible alternative diagnoses and accurately chooses among them. |  |
| **Supports Diagnosis** | Does not support diagnosis with specific examples or does so in an inconsistent manner that misses major symptoms and leads to extremely faulty conclusions. | Leaves some criteria out, does not provide specific examples for each one, or misses some pertinent examples in case. | Gives a specific and accurate example for every criterion that is met. |  |
| **Spelling/**  **Grammar Reductions** | Massive spelling and/or grammatical errors.  (-10 points) | A number of spelling and/or grammatical errors. (-5 points) | Next to no spelling and/or grammatical errors. (no point deductions) | **minus** |
|  |  |  | Total points: |  |