Investigate at least two different spiritual assessment tools and analyze the ease of use and comprehensiveness of the data collected. Report on the validity and reliability of the tool. Explain how the spiritual assessment would be used in a health assessment.

Write a 1,000–1,250-word paper on the items listed above. Include at least four professional references excluding your texts.

Prepare this assignment according to the guidelines found in the APA Style Guide, located in the Student Success Center. An abstract is required.

This assignment uses a rubric. Please review the rubric prior to beginning the assignment to become familiar with the expectations for successful completion.

You are required to submit this assignment to Turnitin. Please refer to the directions in the Student Success Center.

**Spiritual Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1No Submission0.00%**  | **2Unsatisfactory75.00%**  | **3Less than Satisfactory80.00%**  | **4Satisfactory88.00%**  | **5Good92.00%**  | **6Excellent100.00%**  |
| **70.0 %Content** |  |
| **10.0 %Spiritual Assessment Tools Description** | None. | Does not describe selected spiritual assessment tools. Assignment criteria has not been met.  | Minimally describes selected spiritual assessment tools. Not all parameters are described. Lacks both scope and clarity. | Describes selected spiritual assessment tools. Includes rationale. Description is lacking in scope or clarity. | Clearly describes selected spiritual assessment tools. Includes brief rationale. | Thoroughly and comprehensively describes selected spiritual assessment tools. Includes in-depth details. Presents rationale for selection. Information and evidence are accurate, appropriate, and supported. |  |
| **20.0 %Analysis** | None. | Analysis of each tool?s ease of use and comprehensiveness of data collected is not outlined or is outlined poorly. | Ignores or superficially evaluates each tool?s ease of use and comprehensiveness of data collected. Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions. | Surface level of evaluation each tool?s ease of use and comprehensiveness of data collected is offered. Claims and ideas are supported. | Analysis is direct, competent, and appropriate. Examines each tool?s ease of use and comprehensiveness of data collected. Some details are provided.  | Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major points of each tool?s ease of use and comprehensiveness of data collected. Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions. Information and evidence are accurate, appropriate. |  |
| **20.0 %Validity and Reliability**  | None. | Description of each tool?s validity and reliability is either not present or incomplete. Assignment criteria has not been met. | Minimally describes each tool?s validity and reliability. Data lacks details and/or is incomplete. Discussion significantly lacks depth. | Outline each tool?s validity and reliability. Statements may lack depth of understanding or detail. | Provides a basic clear description of each tool?s validity and reliability. Some details are provided. Evidence is supportive. | Thoroughly presents complete information of each tool?s validity and reliability. Describes in-depth and with supporting evidence Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions. Information and evidence are accurate, appropriate. |  |
| **20.0 %Explain How the Spiritual Assessment Would Be Used in a Health Assessment**  | None. | Fails to explain how the spiritual assessment would be used in a health assessment. Fails to defend rationale. | Briefly lists how the spiritual assessment would be used in a health assessment. Does not adequately defend rationale. | Outlines in-depth how the spiritual assessment would be used in a health assessment. Provides adequate rationale with minimal detail.  | Clearly explains how the spiritual assessment would be used in a health assessment. Provides solid reasoning. | Thoroughly and comprehensively explains how the spiritual assessment would be used in a health assessment. Provides supportive and thorough rationale. |  |
| **20.0 %Organization and Effectiveness** |  |
| **7.0 %Thesis Development and Purpose** | None. | Paper lacks any discernible overall purpose or organizing claim. | Thesis and/or main claim are insufficiently developed and/or vague; purpose is not clear.  | Thesis and/or main claim are apparent and appropriate to purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are clear and forecast the development of the paper. It is descriptive and reflective of the arguments and appropriate to the purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are comprehensive. The essence of the paper is contained within the thesis. Thesis statement makes the purpose of the paper clear. |  |
| **8.0 %Argument Logic and Construction** | None. | Statement of purpose is not justified by the conclusion. The conclusion does not support the claim made. Argument is incoherent and uses non-credible sources. | Sufficient justification of claims is lacking. Argument lacks consistent unity. There are obvious flaws in the logic. Some sources have questionable credibility. | Argument is orderly, but may have a few inconsistencies. The argument presents minimal justification of claims. Argument logically, but not thoroughly, supports the purpose. Sources used are credible. Introduction and conclusion bracket the thesis.  | Argument shows logical progression. Techniques of argumentation are evident. There is a smooth progression of claims from introduction to conclusion. Most sources are authoritative.  | Clear and convincing argument presents a persuasive claim in a distinctive and compelling manner. All sources are authoritative. |  |
| **5.0 %Mechanics of Writing (Includes spelling, punctuation, grammar, and language use.)**  | None. | Surface errors are pervasive enough that they impede communication of meaning. Inappropriate word choice and/or sentence construction are used. | Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistencies in language choice (register), sentence structure, and/or word choice are present. | Some mechanical errors or typos are present, but are not overly distracting to the reader. Correct sentence structure and audience-appropriate language are used.  | Prose is largely free of mechanical errors, although a few may be present. A variety of sentence structures and effective figures of speech are used.  | Writer is clearly in command of standard, written, academic English. |  |
| **10.0 %Format** |  |
| **5.0 %Paper Format (Use of appropriate style for the major and assignment.)**  | None. | Template is not used appropriately, or documentation format is rarely followed correctly. | Appropriate template is used, but some elements are missing or mistaken. A lack of control with formatting is apparent. | Appropriate template is used. Formatting is correct, although some minor errors may be present.  | Appropriate template is fully used. There are virtually no errors in formatting style. | All format elements are correct.  |  |
| **5.0 %Research Citations (In-text citations for paraphrasing and direct quotes, and reference page listing and formatting, as appropriate to assignment and style.)**  | None. | No reference page is included. No citations are used. | Reference page is present. Citations are inconsistently used. | Reference page is included and lists sources used in the paper. Sources are appropriately documented, although some errors may be present. | Reference page is present and fully inclusive of all cited sources. Documentation is appropriate and citation style is usually correct.  | In-text citations and a reference page are complete and correct. The documentation of cited sources is free of error. |  |
| **100 %Total Weightage** |   |  |