

PSYC 4340 – Law and Psychology – Fall 2014

Prof. Barry Rosenfeld
Rosenfeld@Fordham.edu
Tel: 718-817-3794

Office: Dealy Hall 340
Office Hours: M, R 9-10 am
Other hours by appointment

Course Description: Law and Psychology focuses on a range of legal issues that are informed by social science research in general, and psychology in particular. The course addresses a range of topics that are divided into two broad categories: societal-level concerns such as fairness and justice, and individual-level concerns such as individual rights. As a Values seminar/EP4, we delve deeply into the topics, with both a broad overview provided by the text as well as individual readings drawn from the scientific literature. We also survey a range of subdomains of psychology, including clinical, cognitive, developmental and social psychology. Across each of these topics, we consider issues of culture, gender and age as they pertain to the specific topics.

Course Structure and Expectations: The course will be both lecture and discussion format. Attendance and ACTIVE class participation are expected of all students. Students are expected to have read the course material BEFORE each class, and be prepared to discuss these readings in some detail during class (note: students will not be assigned readings, but rather will be asked – often at random, to summarize or comment on the readings). Attendance will not be taken, but attendance/participation will weigh heavily in final grades and students who are not prepared to discuss the readings will be penalized accordingly. Students who miss more than 4 classes will receive no more than 10 of the possible 20 “attendance/participation” points (see below). There are two exams - a midterm and final exam, with the final exam being non-cumulative. In addition, – grades are based on attendance/participation, two brief article reviews, an in class article presentation, a final paper and the final exam.

Text: Costanzo, M. and Krauss, D. (2012). Forensic and legal psychology: Psychological science applied to law. New York: Worth

Grade Structure

Midterm Exam	20% - 40 points
Final Exam	20% - 40 points
Paper	25% - 50 points
Article Reviews	10% - 20 points
Oral Presentation	15% - 30 points
Attendance/Participation	10% - 20 points
Total Possible Points	200 points

Final Grade Point Structure

A =	186+ points
A- =	177-185 points
B+ =	168-176 points
B =	160-167 points
B- =	151-159 points
C+ =	142-150 points
C =	134-141 points
C- =	125-133 points
D =	120-124 points
F =	Below 120 points

Additional Policies: The Arts and Sciences Policy on Academic Integrity will be strictly enforced in this course. Any violation constituting a breach of academic integrity will result in disciplinary action consistent with this policy (www.fordham.edu/academics/handbooks_publicati/undergraduate_academ/undergraduate_ai_pol/index.asp).

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, all students, with or without disabilities, are entitled to equal access to the programs and activities of Fordham University. If you believe that you have a disabling condition that may interfere with your ability to participate in the activities, coursework, or assessment of the object of this course, you may be entitled to accommodations. Please schedule an appointment to speak with someone at the Office of Disability Services (Rose Hill-O'Hare Hall, Lower Level, x0655 or at Lincoln Center-Room 207, x6282).

Tentative Course Schedule

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Readings</u>
9/4	Intro/Overview of the Legal System	
9/8	Role of Psychology/ Social science evidence	Ch. 1
	-- Fairness and Justice --	
9/11	Therapeutic Jurisprudence	A, B*
9/15	Procedural justice	Ch. 15 (pp. 341-346) C*
9/18	Procedural justice cont.	D*
9/22	Competency to Stand Trial	Ch. 8, E*
9/25	Competency to Stand Trial (and related matters)	F*
9/29	Criminal Responsibility	Ch. 9, G
10/2	Criminal Responsibility	H, I*
10/6	Hypnosis	J*
10/9	Lie detection	Ch. 3, K*
	(Article review # 1 due 10/9)	
10/16	5 th Amendment: Right to silence (Confessions and false confessions)	Ch. 2
10/20	False confessions cont.	L*,M*
	(Peer Review of Outline)	
	-- Rights of Criminal Defendants --	
10/23	MID-TERM EXAM	
10/27	6 th Amendment: Right to a fair trial Jury Decision-making	Ch. 6, N*
10/30	Pretrial Publicity	Ch. 13, O*
11/3	Eyewitness Accuracy	Ch. 7 (pp. 164-183)
	(Turn In Paper Outline 11/3)	
11/6	Eyewitness Accuracy	P*
11/10	8 th Amendment: Cruel and Unusual Punishment (The Death Penalty)	Ch. 17
11/13	The Death Penalty cont.	Q*, R*
	(Article review # 2 due 11/7)	
11/17	Mental health courts	S*, T*

-- Individual Rights in Civil Settings --

11/20	Children's Rights (Paper Drafts Due 11/14)	U*, V*
11/18	Child Custody	Ch. 12, W*
11/24	Autonomy and medical decision making	X, Y*
12/1	End of life Issues	Z*
12/4	Torture, Asylum and International Human Rights	AA*, BB*
12/8	Final exam review	
12/12	Final Paper Due	

- Reading discussion to be led by assigned student

***** ALL ASSIGNMENTS ARE DUE AT THE BEGINNING OF CLASS *****

Additional Readings

- A. Daicoff, S., & Wexler, D.B. (2003). Therapeutic jurisprudence. In A. Goldstein & I. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology volume 11, forensic psychology* (pp. 561-580). New York: Wiley. NOTE: This chapter can be obtained from Netlibrary (<http://www.library.fordham.edu/database/ebooks.html>).
- B. Cattaneo, L. B. & Goodman, L. A. (2010). Through the lens of therapeutic jurisprudence: The relationship between empowerment in the court system and well-being for intimate partner violence victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 481-502.
- C. Heuer, L. (2005). What's just about the criminal justice system? A psychological perspective. *Journal of Law and Policy*, 13, 209-228.
- D. Tyler, T. R., Sherman, L., Strang, H., Barnes, G. C., & Woods, D. (2007). Reintegrative shaming, procedural justice and recidivism: The engagement of offenders' psychological mechanism in the Banberra RISE drinking-and-driving experiment. *Law and Society Review*, 41, 553-586.
- E. Morris, N. (1984). The brothel boy: A fragment of a manuscript. In L. A. Teplin (Ed.) *Mental Health and Criminal Justice*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications
- F. Kois, L., Pearson, J., Chauhan, P., Goni, M., & Saraydarian, L. (2012). Competency to stand trial among female inpatients. *Law and Human Behavior*, 37, 231-240.
- G. Slater, D. & Hans, V. P. (1984). Public opinion of forensic psychiatry following the Hinkley verdict. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 141, 675-679.
- H. Borum, R. & Fulero, S. (1999). Empirical research on the insanity defense and attempted reforms: Evidence toward informed policy. *Law and Human Behavior*, 23, 375-394.
- I. Manguno-Mire, G. M., Thompson, J. W., Bertman-Pate, L. J., & Thompson, H. W. (2007). Are release decisions *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 25, 43-55, DOI: 10.1002/bsl.724.
- J. Kebbell, M. R., & Wagstaff, G. F. (1998). Hypnotic interviewing: the best way to interview eyewitnesses? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 16, 115-129.

- K. Honts, C. R., & Kircher, J. C. (1994). Mental and physical countermeasures reduce the accuracy of polygraph tests. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 252-259.
- L. Russano, M. B., Meissner, C. A., Narchet, F. M., & Kassin, S. M. (2005). Investigating true and false confessions within a novel experimental paradigm. *Psychological Science, 16*, 481-486.
- M. Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., & Kronkvist, O. (2006). Strategic use of evidence during police interviews: when training to detect deception works. *Law and human behavior, 30*(5), 603-619.
- N. Lieberman, J. (2011). The utility of scientific jury selection: Still murky after 30 years. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*, 46-52.
- O. Otto, A. L., Penrod, S. D., & Dexter, H. R. (1994). The biasing impact of pretrial publicity on juror judgments. *Law and Human Behavior, 18*(4), 453-469.
- P. Wells, G. L., Memon, A. & Penrod, S. D. (2006). Eyewitness evidence: Improving its probative value. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 7*, 45-75.
- Q. Young, R. L. (1991). Race, conceptions of crime and justice, and support for the death penalty. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 54*, 67-75.
- R. Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P. G., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., & Johnson, S. L. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of Black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science, 17*, 383-386.
- S. McNeil, D. E., & Binder, R. L. (2007). Effectiveness of a mental health court in reducing criminal recidivism and violence. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 164*, 1395-1403.
- T. Seltzer, T. (2005). Mental health courts: A misguided attempt to address the criminal justice systems' unfair treatment of people with mental illness. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 11*, 570-586.
- U. Steinberg, L., Cauffman, E., Woolard, J., Graham, S., & Banich, M. (2009). Are adolescents less mature than adults? Minors' access to abortion, the juvenile death penalty, and the alleged APA "Flip-Flop." *American Psychologist, 64*, 583-594.
- V. Fischer, K. W., Stein, Z., & Heikkinen, K. (2009). Narrow assessments misrepresent development and misguide policy: Comment on Steinberg, Cauffman, Woolard, Graham and Banich (2009). *American Psychologist, 64*, 595-600.
- W. Kelly, R. F., & Ramsey, S. H. (2009). Child custody evaluations: The need for systems level outcome assessments. *Family Court Review, 47*, 286-303.
- X. Pavlo, A., Bursztajn, H., & Gutheil, T. G. (1987). Christian Science and competence to make treatment choices: Clinical challenges in assessing values. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 10*(4), 395-401
- Y. Appelbaum, P. S., & Grisso, T. (1988). Assessing patients' capacities to consent to treatment. *New England Journal of Medicine, 319*, 1635-1638.
- Z. Rosenfeld, B. (2003). *Assisted suicide and the right to die: The interface of social science, public policy, and medical ethics*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association. (Chapter 9: The Oregon experience, pp. 147-164)
- AA. Silove, D. (1999). The psychosocial effects of torture, mass human rights violations, and refugee trauma: Toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 187*(4), 200-207.
- BB. Rasmussen, A., Rosenfeld, B., Keller, A., & Reeves, K. (2007). The effects of torture-related injuries on long-term psychological distress in a Punjabi Sikh sample. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 116*(4), 734-740.

The Final Paper

The goal of the final paper is to enable you to demonstrate a) a thorough grasp of an interdisciplinary topic, b) an ability to integrate diverse aspects of psychology into a cohesive thesis, and c) the ability to write a scholarly paper in the format typical of psychology research papers (i.e., APA style). To accomplish this goal, you will write a 15-20 page (including title page, Abstract, References, etc – 1" margins, 12 point font) review paper. The focus of this paper is your choice – provided it falls within the general umbrella of psychology/law, but should be based on *published psychology research studies* (not newspaper articles, websites, books, or interviews with mentally ill people you encounter on the subway). You should think of this paper as a way to address a question or provide expert consultation on a topic, summarizing what we (you) know about the topic and acknowledging the limitations of this research.

For example you might choose a topic that addresses a specific factual question (i.e., social adjudicative fact evidence). Example topics in this area could include: validity of risk assessment instruments used by mental health professionals to predict future violence, standards for conducting forensic interviews of child sexual abuse victims, effectiveness of specialized treatment programs for offender populations when they are court-ordered into treatment (substance abusers, sexual offenders), or effectiveness of expert witnesses in criminal or civil cases involving testimony concerning mental health issues.

Alternatively, you can select an area of legal/social policy (i.e., social framework evidence) that incorporates or is based on assumptions regarding psychological functioning and review how psychological research is consistent or inconsistent with the legal rules and/or social policy. Example topics in this area could include: reliability of child eyewitness testimony, civil commitment standards and application to sexually violent predators, psychological evidence for battered women's syndrome, efficacy of problem solving courts, and juror decision-making in specific types of criminal or civil cases.

Regardless of which topic you choose, your goal is to write a paper that provides (a) a clear statement of the problem, (b) identifies the relevance of the problem as an area of psycholegal theory/research, (c) critically reviews current social science research on the topic, and (d) concludes with a summary of your opinions on how the social science research is consistent or inconsistent with the legal standard or policy. Because most psycholegal topics involve disadvantaged populations and their interactions with the legal system and/or address standards of care/professional practice among psychologists, please be sure that the paper addresses conclusions regarding issues of fairness in treatment of disadvantaged populations and professional competence standards where appropriate (e.g., apply a therapeutic jurisprudence or procedural justice analysis).

Sections of the Paper

1. Statement of the Problem/Topic Area (i.e., *Introduction*)

- What are relevant statistics that define/describe the problem?
- What legal materials can be referenced that define the problem issue from the legal perspective (i.e., court cases/legislation/statutes/policy)?
- Why is the legal problem a relevant topic in psychology and law?

2. Social Science Research Review (*i.e., Method/Results*) – *NOTE: YOU MUST HAVE A MINIMUM OF 3 SOURCES FOR THIS SECTION (and preferably 4-5).*
 - What review articles and/or book chapters have been written that address the current thinking of the social scientists regarding the legal issue?
 - What empirical studies have been done that directly address the problem?
3. Summary and Conclusions (*i.e., Discussion*)
 - What conclusions can be drawn from the social science research findings and how do the findings relate to the legal framework and/or the legal problem?
 - Is the research consistent or inconsistent with the legal standard/policy?
 - Does the law and/or the social science evidence indicate disproportionate effects across different groups or populations?
 - How do fundamental concepts of therapeutic jurisprudence or procedural justice relate to the law or the results of empirical research?
 - What limitations exist in the current research and what are recommendations about ways the research could be improved?
 - What changes in the law might you recommend based on your review of the scientific research?

Structure and Grading

The paper assignment will count for 25% of your final grade – a maximum of 50 points. The outline and first draft will count for 5 points each out of the total 50 points. There are multiple points throughout the semester where you will receive feedback on your written work (two article reviews, paper outline, first draft) leading up to the final paper. Please refer to the article review guidelines for specific directions and grading criteria specific to the article review assignments. For the outline and first draft assignments, the attached paper grading criteria will be utilized to structure the review/feedback process.

Outline Requirements

- Follow the structure above in developing the outline and label each section of the outline using the headers above (e.g., 1. Statement of the problem/Topic Area). The outline will be graded based on completeness (*i.e.*, identification of sources, summary points and possible conclusions to be drawn).
- Your outline should contain sufficient information to demonstrate your knowledge of the topic, research that you have reviewed to date, and working conclusions that you can draw.
- Your outline **MUST** contain a preliminary list of references (formatted in APA style).
- A portion of one class period will be devoted to peer review of your outline. The purpose of this peer review is to receive suggestions as to clarity of the argument, discuss process for researching and identifying relevant literature, and identification of additional discussion points. Before turning in your final outline for feedback from the instructor, you will revise/edit your outline submitted for peer review noting how you incorporated peer-review feedback. Your original outline and revised outline will be turned in on the date designated on the syllabus.
- You will also receive written feedback from the instructor on each section of the outline in order to facilitate development of the first draft of your paper.

Paper Requirements

- Complete first drafts of the paper are due approximately one month before the final deadline. On this date you will submit a complete draft of the paper as well as an updated outline. You will receive written feedback on the paper from the instructor with the expectation that your final paper will incorporate the provided feedback.
- The final paper should be formatted in APA style (see Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association) and include a title page, Introduction (Section 1), Research Review (Section 2), Discussion (Section 3), and References (in APA format).

Point Allocation

- Outline – 5 points
- First Draft – 5 points
- Clear Review and Statement of the Problem – 10 points
- Review and Summary of Relevant Research – 10 points
- Synthesis, Summary, and Conclusions – 10 points
- Clarity in Writing – 5 points
- Adherence to APA Style – 5 points

Some Suggestions on Conducting Literature Reviews and Writing the Paper

- Don't wait! Choose your topic area now and begin your review of the research.
- Schedule an individual meeting to review topic and initial research prior to writing the outline.
- Your research into the problem should focus on identifying (a) relevant statistics that define/describe the problem, (b) legal cases/legislation/policy that relates to or impacts the problem, (c) review articles and/or book chapters by psycholegal scholars that address the current thinking of the field, and (d) empirical studies.
- Organize the outline for the paper by identifying the key sections according to the criteria reviewed above. Within each section, identify your key references and major summary points and conclusions.
- If you get stuck, come see me early in the process.

Do's and Don'ts in Writing Your Paper:

1. READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS (i.e., those above and below this line) VERY CAREFULLY
2. Don't quote excessively. Quotes should be used VERY sparingly in a research paper or article summary and, for most of you, not at all. The ONLY time you should be using a quote is when the author has said something using specific language this is critical. It should NEVER be used to simply repeat the author's description (e.g., because he or she said it well, or if you don't understand something but think it's probably important).
3. Include some of the data that the authors have provided. It's really helpful, in understanding a study, to see some numbers. BUT choose wisely, so that you're presenting numbers that are actually interpretable. A p value ($p < .05$) is meaningless, since all it tells us is that the results were significant. Giving us the means from 2 different samples, on the other hand, allows us to see how big the significant difference was. Likewise, a correlation coefficient or odds ratio, tells us how strong a relationship is. These are readily understandable numbers. Simply describing a study as "showing significant results" tells the reader very little.

Law and Psychology Paper Grading Sheet

Name _____ Total Points _____

Outline _____

Statement of the Problem

2 Poorly articulated framework and absence of a defined thesis statement	4 Framework established but no clear thesis statement	6 Non-specific thesis statement and global/indirect relevance/framework	8 Adequate legal framework and relevance established but vague thesis statement	10 Clear description of the legal framework regarding topic, clear/detailed thesis with identifiable relevance to psychology and law
---	--	--	--	---

Social Science Review

2 No clear review of empirical studies that relate to thesis	4 Limited selection of empirical studies; overreliance on narrative reviews/chapters	6 Studies selected only indirectly related to thesis ; general reviews	8 Adequate empirical studies chosen for review but lacking in descriptive detail across all studies	10 Complete and thorough descriptions of empirical studies that are directly relevant to thesis
---	---	---	--	--

Summary and Conclusions

2 No clear integration of study findings with the thesis; no clear recommendations for future research and/or policy	4 No clear integration of study findings with the thesis; limited recommendations	6 Review of research findings and only indirect reference to thesis; limited recommendations for future research	8 Good review of research results with the thesis; general implications and few suggestions for future research	10 Clear integration of studies with conclusions and implications for future research and recommendations
---	--	---	--	--

Clarity in Writing

1 Unclear or poor writing throughout the paper	2 Writing is unclear throughout the paper with grammar and spelling errors	3 Clear and concise writing in 1 out of 3 sections	4 Clear and concise writing in 2/3 sections	5 Clear and concise writing across all three sections
---	---	---	--	--

APA Formatting

1 Paper not written in APA Style	2 Problems in APA style throughout the paper; numerous reference problems	3 1 or 2 problems with APA style in paper and reference problems	4 Body of paper adheres to APA style but referencing problems	5 Entire paper adheres to APA style
-------------------------------------	--	---	--	--

Total _____

Article Reviews

The cornerstone of your final paper will be a review of published research that you have identified, read, and synthesized. A critical step toward developing a strong summary of the social science research is your ability to review empirical studies, extract key information from the study (i.e., hypotheses, methods, results) and then explain the results of the study so that individuals without a psychology background can understand the study. As part of your research leading to the final paper, you will complete two separate article reviews (in addition to the paper outline requirement described above) that will help ensure that you have developed an adequate foundation for the social science review section of the paper. Based on your topic, you will identify a relevant empirical study, read the article, and complete a narrative summary of the article that details your summary of key points from the Introduction, Methods and Results sections. The written summary will also include a summary and synthesis of key points from the Discussion section. The goal is not to simply extract text from the article but to succinctly summarize the key elements from within each section such that your review could serve as an expanded abstract of the study documenting what you are identifying as the key features/findings of the article.

Guidelines and Point Structure: Each article summary should be prepared with 4 separate paragraphs of text organized under separate section headings (e.g., Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion). Your goal is to extract the key points from each section so the reader can read the review and understand the purpose, rationale, method, results, and implications of the study (discussed in language a layperson can understand). The review must be **IN YOUR OWN WORDS!** Do not simply copy entire sentences directly from the article – prove to me that you can explain the key points. The following bullet points should be used to guide your reading of the article and writing each section of the summary.

You will receive feedback on your article review via the attached grading sheet to ensure that study content is being identified and referenced in addition to written comments on the narrative text that can be used to guide development of the outline and paper.

Introduction (2 points)

- What is the purpose of the article and how or why is the study important and/or relevant to law and psychology (broadly) and to your paper topic in particular?
- What are the main study hypotheses and/or research questions?

Methods (3 points)

- What sample was used and how was the sample obtained?
- What were the key independent and dependent variables in the study?
- How can the overall study be described in terms of research design (i.e., descriptive, observational, correlational, quasi-experimental, experimental)

Results (3 points)

- What were the key findings for each hypothesis or research question?
- Were findings significant, non-significant?
- What was the magnitude or strength of significant findings?
- Were any additional results obtained that were unexpected or contrary to the hypotheses or research questions?

Discussion (2 points)

- What conclusions did the authors reach regarding the results?
- What implications do the study findings have regarding forensic practice?
- What limitations are present?
- In your own words, what can you conclude from the study and why are the results of this study important?

In Class Presentations

Each student will be responsible for leading a discussion of one of the assigned “additional” (REQUIRED) readings. These presentations will allow you to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the intersection between psychology and law by critically reviewing a published article, synthesizing and summarizing what you believe to be the key learning points, and generating a discussion among your peers based on the reading. Your goal is to generate a 10-minute summary of the article, with the presentation providing enough depth and comprehension to enable other students to use their notes as a “study guide” for exam questions based on the material.

Grading will be based on: the depth and accuracy of your summary and your ability to communicate key findings through oral presentation and discussion. You are free to use visual aids (powerpoint presentation, handouts, figures, graphs, etc), or draw in additional references or materials. Note that incorporation of supplemental materials is optional (not required), but often results in a much stronger presentation (i.e., it’s a very good idea).

The general structure of your presentation should be as follows:

1. Overview, rationale and research question/hypotheses (i.e., What are the questions the authors set out to answer? How did they go about addressing these questions?)
2. Critical review of the methodology (what are the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology? Note that this question cannot be answered with a simple statement like “the methodology seemed good”).
3. Key findings related to the research questions/hypotheses (what did the study find?)
4. Contextual relevance of the reading with regard to the class topic (how does this paper/study fit with the focus of the class, the material being covered and other information that we have learned?).

You must send me an outline of your presentation ONE WEEK prior to your presentation. This outline should include any plans for handouts or other supplemental materials. I will provide feedback prior to your discussion to insure that you have adequately understood and covered the material. You are free to solicit additional feedback before or after this time, but you **MUST** receive approval prior to your presentation. **NOTE:** grades will be penalized if the outline is **NOT** submitted one week prior to the presentation.

The following outline will be used to grade oral presentations:

Domain 1: Overview/Rationale Research Questions				
1 Overview/rationale is missing or inaccurate to	2	3 Presentation addresses overview and rationale but does not identify research questions with sufficient detail	4	5 Presentation addresses rationale and identifies key research questions or hypotheses addressed in the reading to demonstrate a clear link to the assigned topic
Domain 2: Methodology				
1 Overview of methodology is limited or inaccurate	2	3 Presentation addresses important aspects of methods but does not clearly reference research design or pros/cons	4	5 Presentation addresses the methodology employed by the authors so students can clearly understand how the study was completed and any pros/cons associated the methodology
Domain 3: Key Findings				
1 Little to no information on results related to specific research questions or hypotheses	2	3 Presentation addresses key findings but does not integrate findings in a meaningful way	4	5 Presentation includes useful information about key study findings and references findings in a manner that promotes retention of results
Domain 4: Contextual Relevance				
1 Presentation reiterates findings as presented by the author or fails to summarize findings in a meaningful way.	2	3 Presentation highlights discussion points from the authors would no elaboration or linkage to the broader topic.	4	5 Clearly highlighted relevance of the findings and demonstrates how study aids understanding of law and psychology
Domain 5: In-Class Presentation				
1 Presentation style difficult to follow and no meaningful class discussion	2	3 Clear presentation but little effort at generating discussion	4	5 Clear and concise presentation with presenter including questions that generate discussion; well developed slides or handouts (if relevant)
Domain 6: Overall Quality of Presentation Materials				
1 Would have been just as easy to read the article. Presentation provided little new information beyond what was already available by simply reviewing the abstract	2	3 Presentation provides basic coverage of material utilizing course resources only. No incorporation of additional resources or information.	4	5 Presentation provides an excellent resource for future work and includes relevant information across all domains