


2.00 credits

15.0 h

Q2

Teacher(s)	Vannuscorps Gilles ;				
Language :	English				
Place of the course	Louvain-la-Neuve				
Learning outcomes					
Evaluation methods	<p>The assessment aims to evaluate the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, in particular the students' ability to mobilize theoretical knowledge to critically analyze case studies in cognitive neuropsychology. It will take the form of an in-class thematic debate on the relevance and limitations of case studies of brain-damaged patients.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation (50%): Each student will prepare, based on the course material and the reading of scientific articles, a concise written argument (1–2 pages) addressing one of the following critical issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replicability (uniqueness of cases, scientific status of the results); • Generalizability (premorbid variability, relevance to the general population); • Neuroplasticity (validity of the subtractivity assumption, interpretation of results). • Active participation in the debate (50%): Students will be invited to defend and discuss their position in interaction with their peers, drawing on the knowledge acquired during the course and on scientific references. The quality of their contributions will be assessed according to clarity, relevance, and ability to engage with opposing arguments. <p>Students will be evaluated according to the following rubric:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Preparation (50%)</td> <td>Clear, well-structured, and Correct argument but Incomplete, descriptive, or well-referenced written sometimes incomplete or off-topic work. Few or no argument (scientific articles insufficiently developed. references to the course or and course concepts). Some references or readings. Criticisms are reformulated concepts are used, but not precisely and discussed in a always critically. nuanced manner.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Participation in the debate (50%)</td> <td>Relevant, clear, and well-Understandable Minimal or absent articulated contributions. contributions, but limited participation. Difficulty Ability to defend one's or sometimes only loosely sustaining reasoning or point of view with connected to the issues engaging in dialogue with strong arguments, while under debate. Adequate others. integrating and discussing defense of one's view but opposing positions. little interaction with peers.</td> </tr> </table>	Preparation (50%)	Clear, well-structured, and Correct argument but Incomplete, descriptive, or well-referenced written sometimes incomplete or off-topic work. Few or no argument (scientific articles insufficiently developed. references to the course or and course concepts). Some references or readings. Criticisms are reformulated concepts are used, but not precisely and discussed in a always critically. nuanced manner.	Participation in the debate (50%)	Relevant, clear, and well-Understandable Minimal or absent articulated contributions. contributions, but limited participation. Difficulty Ability to defend one's or sometimes only loosely sustaining reasoning or point of view with connected to the issues engaging in dialogue with strong arguments, while under debate. Adequate others. integrating and discussing defense of one's view but opposing positions. little interaction with peers.
Preparation (50%)	Clear, well-structured, and Correct argument but Incomplete, descriptive, or well-referenced written sometimes incomplete or off-topic work. Few or no argument (scientific articles insufficiently developed. references to the course or and course concepts). Some references or readings. Criticisms are reformulated concepts are used, but not precisely and discussed in a always critically. nuanced manner.				
Participation in the debate (50%)	Relevant, clear, and well-Understandable Minimal or absent articulated contributions. contributions, but limited participation. Difficulty Ability to defend one's or sometimes only loosely sustaining reasoning or point of view with connected to the issues engaging in dialogue with strong arguments, while under debate. Adequate others. integrating and discussing defense of one's view but opposing positions. little interaction with peers.				
Teaching methods	Lectures, readings of scientific articles and discussions/debates.				
Content	Introduction to single-case studies Introduction to the logical and methodological foundations of the approach Introduction to the main types of statistical analyses appropriate to single-cases Introduction to the main advantages and limits of the approach				
Inline resources	The Moodle platform				
Other infos	The course and evaluations are in English.				
Faculty or entity in charge	EPSY				

Programmes containing this learning unit (UE)				
Program title	Acronym	Credits	Prerequisite	Learning outcomes
Master [120] in Psychology	PSY2M	2		
Master [120] in Education (shift schedule)	FOPA2M	2		