

SJLA 110X: The Jesuit Magis

First-Year Seminar (FYS) & First-Year Writing (FYW) · Ignatian Core Curriculum Pilot · Fall 2026

[CYRUS OLSEN, D.PHIL.](#) · 3 credits · No prerequisite (First-Year Seminar)

Co-Instructor: [Dr. Tim Dulle, Executive Director, Jesuit Center](#)

Meetings: Section 1 — Tuesday/Thursday, 2:30–3:45 p.m. · Section 2 — Tuesday/Thursday, 4:00–5:15 p.m.

Location (both sections): Humanities Center, Saint Thomas Hall (STT) 305

Office hours: Tuesday/Thursday, 10:00–11:30 a.m. · Email: cyrus.olsen@scranton.edu

Course Description

This course fulfills both the First-Year Seminar (FYS) and First-Year Writing (FYW) requirements within the Ignatian Core Curriculum, and constitutes Level 1 of the SJLA program's four-year Eloquentia Perfecta (EP) sequence.

The Jesuit Magis takes up five texts in sequence (Plato's Euthyphro, Ignatius's A Pilgrim's Testament, Christian de Chergé's Spiritual Writings, At the Heart of the White Rose, and Pope Leo XIV's Magnifica Humanitas). Euthyphro opens the semester by putting the search itself on trial where we are reasoning together, out loud, toward a truth neither party already holds; it ends deliberately unresolved, in aporia wherein the search matters more than a settled answer. The four texts that follow trace a widening circle of that same question in practice: how do I live? (Ignatius); how do I live with others? (de Chergé); how do I live with my own conscience? (White Rose); and how do we live well, without demeaning self, world, or God? (Magnifica Humanitas). Five shared-lens terms travel across all five blocks: discernment, indifference, consolation/desolation, election, and magis. Each block closes by asking you to argue, in writing, for a real position, addressed to a reader you choose and justify.

Our aim throughout is twofold: to read well and to reason well together, in service of the Jesuit Eloquentia Perfecta tradition of forming people who communicate for the common good. Every formal paper uses the same four-move arrangement (Opening the Question, Grounding the Claim, the Other Case, and Where You Land) built from the Big Questions each text itself raises and the course's five shared-lens terms (discernment, indifference, consolation/desolation, election, magis). What changes over the semester is what 'the Other Case' has to accomplish: defeating a counter-position (Paper 1), holding one in an honest draw (Paper 2), and synthesizing one into something new (Paper 3). The Portfolio at semester's end asks you to look back at that arc and name what it taught you — the course's central discernment, offered only in hindsight.

Texts to Be Purchased

Listed in reading order.

Plato: Five Dialogues — Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Meno, Phaedo (Hackett Classics)

Plato (Author), John M. Cooper & G. M. A. Grube (Translators) — Hackett Publishing, 2nd Edition, Oct 1, 2002. ISBN-13: 978-0872206335.

A Pilgrim's Testament: The Memoirs of Saint Ignatius of Loyola — Revised Edition

Saint Ignatius Loyola (Author), Barton T. Geger (Editor, Introduction) — Institute of Jesuit Sources, June 1, 2020. ISBN-13: 978-1947617056.

Christian de Chergé: Spiritual Writings (Modern Spiritual Masters)

Christian S. Krokus (Editor), Habib Zanzana (Translator) — Orbis Books, April 2, 2025. ISBN-13: 978-1626986091.

At the Heart of the White Rose: Letters and Diaries of Hans and Sophie Scholl

Hans Scholl, Sophie Scholl (Authors), Inge Jens (Editor) — Plough Publishing House, May 9, 2017. ISBN-13: 978-0874860290.

Magnifica Humanitas: On Safeguarding the Human Person in the Time of Artificial Intelligence

Pope Leo XIV (Author) — Pauline Books & Media, June 25, 2026. ISBN-13: 978-0819846150.

Student Learning Outcomes

This course carries three sets of outcomes. FYS and FYW outcomes are listed in full below, as required for accreditation documentation. SJLA program outcomes are also listed; per program design, these are cumulative across the four-year SJLA sequence; this course contributes to them but is not expected to independently and fully evidence all four on its own.

ICC First-Year Seminar (FYS) Outcomes

Outcome	Primarily Evidenced Through
Engage intellectual questions through reading, critical thinking, and discussion.	Discussion Leadership (Appendix C); the Other Case move in Papers 1–3 and the Portfolio.
Articulate components of the Ignatian identity and mission of the University of Scranton grounded in the life of St. Ignatius of Loyola and including education for justice to form people for and with other people.	Ignatius block (Paper 1); de Chergé and White Rose blocks (Papers 2–3); Nov 19 capstone synthesis; Portfolio.
Apply appropriate skills necessary to acclimate to the academic and intellectual life of the university.	Weekly Tuesday acclimation check-in (Reflections category); Life of the Mind and Ethical Encounters engagement.

ICC First-Year Writing (FYW) Outcomes

Outcome	Primarily Evidenced Through
Employ writing as a process by using flexible strategies for generating, organizing, revising, and editing writing of varying lengths and rhetorical styles.	Papers 1–3 feedback→revision cycle (Appendix A); Portfolio assembly (Dec 1/3/8).
Write for different rhetorical situations by considering audience, purpose, context, expectations, and conventions.	Per-paper student-declared audience (Appendix B; Portfolio Criterion 2).
Conduct research as a process of inquiry by responsibly finding, selecting, integrating, and documenting appropriate sources of information in their writing.	Portfolio's three-source structure — CST document, scholarly/reference source, OED etymology (Portfolio Criterion 3).
Reflect on how their developing writing skills contribute to their formation into people who communicate well for the benefit of the common good.	Portfolio Criteria 1 and 5 (Critical Reflection; Rhetorical Self-Examen).

SJLA Program Outcomes

Cumulative across the four-year SJLA sequence; not fully evidenced by this course alone.

Outcome	Primarily Evidenced Through
Display a comprehension of the history of and major texts in Western philosophy, theology, and literature.	Full five-text reading list (Euthyphro through Magnifica Humanitas).
Demonstrate eloquentia perfecta in speech and writing, stemming from a mastery of the elements of critical thinking, reading, and listening.	Four-move Big Questions rubric (writing); Discussion Leadership (speech/listening, partial — no individual oral presentation in this course).
Show evidence of personal formation — a thoughtful sense of their relationship to themselves, to others, and to God — and of the role of cultivated community in personal growth, discernment, and life-long learning.	Shared-lens vocabulary progression; Reflections category; Portfolio's Rhetorical Self-Examen.
Demonstrate, based upon study and on personal experience, the ideal of being men and women for and with others.	De Chergé and White Rose blocks (study); personal-experience component distributed across the SJLA four-year sequence, not concentrated in this course.

Grading Scale

A (4.00) 95–100 · A– (3.67) 90–94 · B+ (3.33) 87–89 · B (3.00) 83–86 · B– (2.67) 80–82 · C+ (2.33) 77–79 · C (2.00) 73–76 · C– (1.67) 70–72 · D+ (1.33) 67–69 · D (1.00) 60–66 · F (0.00) below 60

Grading Breakdown

Category	Weight	Due Date	Description
Attendance & Participation	10%	Every class	Presence and engagement across seminar and student-led discussion.
Low-stakes reflections & journal entries	15%	Throughout — daily	Ungraded/completion. First entry (Sept 3) retained as the AI-audit baseline. Includes the Euthyphro write-up. Beginning Week 2, Tuesday prompts include a brief acclimation check-in (workload, planning, sleep, social connection — reflective, not a tracked log). Periodic Tuesday prompts also invite reflection on Life of the Mind and Ethical Encounters engagement.
Paper 1 (Ignatius)	13%	Sun, Oct 4 (night)	~700 words, addressed to a student-declared, justified audience. Feedback returned promptly; revised as part of the Portfolio on Dec 1.
Paper 2 (de Chergé)	13%	Sun, Oct 25 (night)	~800 words, addressed to a student-declared, justified audience. Feedback returned promptly; revised as part of the Portfolio on Dec 3.
Paper 3 (White Rose)	13%	Sun, Nov 8 (night)	~1,000 words, addressed to a student-declared, justified audience. Feedback returned promptly; revised as part of the Portfolio on Dec 8, alongside peer review.
Portfolio / Paper 4 (Magnifica + capstone)	36%	Peer review Dec 8 · Due during Finals (Dec 15–19)	~2,000 new words + revision of Papers 1–3, assembled Dec 1/3/8. Addressed to the writer's own future self at Core Capstone. Graded on five criteria (Appendix D). Semester's most heavily weighted written work.

Class Routine

Every 75-minute class period follows a consistent rhythm: Voce (7 min) → Progymnasmata (8 min) → Discussion (50 min) → Reflection (10 min).

Each of the five core texts runs Tue/Thu, Tue/Thu — four meetings — followed by the essay's Sunday-night due date (Papers 1–3 only). Discussion-leader (DL) slots apply only to the five core texts.

What the rhythm actually feels like, minute by minute

The names are unfamiliar on purpose — you're not expected to know them yet. Here's what each one actually is:

Voce (7 min). “Voice.” One student — sometimes two — opens class by reciting a short poem from memory. No notes, no phone. This is memorization and performance practice: standing in front of the room and using your own voice before the day asks anything harder of you. A sign-up rotation runs across the semester so everyone gets at least one turn; you choose your own poem unless told otherwise. Same shape every day, so within a few weeks it stops feeling like a performance and starts just being how class begins.

Progymnasmata (8 min). “Mental warm-ups.” Progymnasmata is a two-thousand-year-old word for exactly what it sounds like: small, low-stakes reps that build the muscles a real argument needs, the same way stretching builds the muscles a run needs. Nobody is graded on these. You will do dozens of them before you ever notice you've gotten better at the thing they were quietly training — see Appendix E.

Discussion (50 min). The actual seminar. Most days, two of your classmates — that day's Discussion Leaders — open the conversation before the instructor steps back in.

Reflection (10 min). A few minutes of low-stakes writing before you leave, so the day’s thinking doesn’t evaporate the second you walk out the door.

A sample day — Thursday, September 10 (Euthyphro, Meeting 2)

Nothing special is happening on this day — which is exactly why it’s the example. This is what an ordinary 75 minutes looks like once the rhythm has settled in.

Time	Segment	What’s happening
2:30–2:37	Voce	Today’s reciter stands and delivers a short poem from memory — their own choice, prepared in advance from the semester sign-up. No discussion of it yet; the room just listens.
2:37–2:45	Progymnasmata	A three-sentence written warm-up, done alone, not shared, not graded: “In three sentences, explain why Euthyphro’s third definition matters to someone who’s never heard of it.” Pencils down after 8 minutes whether you’re finished or not.
2:45–3:35	Discussion	Today’s Discussion Leaders (Pair #1 of 13) open with a question tracing Definitions 1–3 and run the room for roughly the first 15–20 minutes before the instructor steps back in to deepen or redirect.
3:35–3:45	Reflection	A few sentences in your low-stakes journal: what shifted in your own thinking today. Ungraded, completion-only — the same category the Sept 3 baseline entry belongs to.

A note on the Voce rotation: this assumes a simple sign-up sheet (first-come or randomly assigned) ensuring every student recites at least once across the semester, with poems self-selected unless you’d rather curate an approved list — confirm which before this goes to students.

Discussion Leadership

Each core text’s Meetings 2, 3, and 4 include a Discussion Leadership (DL) component: a pair of students opens and facilitates a defined portion of that day’s conversation before the instructor resumes. Meeting 1 of each text stays fully instructor-led. The two in-class film screenings (de Chergé Meeting 3, Oct 20; White Rose Meeting 3, Nov 3) carry no DL pair — the screening occupies the period, and the DL rotation resumes at each block’s Meeting 4.

Fifteen core-text meetings normally carry a DL slot (Meetings 2–4 across five texts), minus the two film-screening days — 13 DL days × two students per day = 26 leadership slots. With 15 students, this does not divide evenly into two turns apiece: expect most students to lead twice, each time with a different partner, with a smaller number leading once. Stays inside the existing 10% Attendance & Participation weight. Scored with the rubric in Appendix C.

Orientation

Tuesday, September 1, 2026

Text: none

Day: Course launch, syllabus walkthrough. Class routine introduced.

Writing: none

Thursday, September 3, 2026

Text: Walter Ong, SJ, “A.M.D.G.”: Dedication or Directive? (excerpt) + O’Malley excerpt

Day: Two low-stakes cases back to back. Shared-lens term formally named: discernment.

Writing: First low-stakes reflection entry (ungraded/completion) — retained on file as the semester’s authentic-voice AI-audit baseline.

Core Text I — Euthyphro

What does it mean to reason together, out loud, toward a truth neither party already holds? — 4-meeting block, no paper

Tuesday, September 8, 2026

Text: Plato, Euthyphro, full dialogue (Grube trans., pp. 2–20)

Day: Meeting 1 — Intro + seminar-led discussion. Live read-aloud.

Writing: none

Thursday, September 10, 2026

Text: Euthyphro, continued

Day: Meeting 2 — student-led discussion. Definitions 1–3 traced.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #1 of 13

Writing: none

Tuesday, September 15, 2026

Text: Euthyphro, continued

Day: Meeting 3 — student-led discussion. Definitions 4–5; the collapsed loop.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #2 of 13

Writing: none

Thursday, September 17, 2026

Text: Euthyphro, concluded

Day: Meeting 4 — conclusion, processing, writing strategy. IVA Lecture tonight (Fr. James Martin, SJ).

Discussion Leaders: Pair #3 of 13

Writing: Euthyphro write-up assigned (~150–250 words, ungraded/completion) — where does a Definition actually fail, and why does the search matter more than a settled answer? Due Sunday night.

Sunday, September 20, 2026 — Euthyphro write-up due (night)

Low-stakes, ungraded/completion — folded into the 15% Reflections category. Peer-exchanged at the start of Ignatius Meeting 1 (Sept 22).

Core Text II — Ignatius

How do I live? — 4-meeting block · Paper 1

Tuesday, September 22, 2026

Text: A Pilgrim's Testament, opening chapters

Day: Meeting 1 — Intro + seminar-led discussion. The Pamplona wounding. First few minutes: brief peer exchange of Euthyphro write-ups.

Writing: none

Thursday, September 24, 2026

Text: A Pilgrim's Testament, continued

Day: Meeting 2 — student-led discussion. Shared-lens term: indifference.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #4 of 13

Writing: none

Tuesday, September 29, 2026

Text: A Pilgrim's Testament, continued

Day: Meeting 3 — student-led discussion. Discernment of spirits; consolation/desolation.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #5 of 13

Writing: none

Thursday, October 1, 2026

Text: A Pilgrim's Testament, concluded

Day: Meeting 4 — conclusion, processing, writing strategy. Shared-lens term: election.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #6 of 13

Writing: Paper 1 assigned; due Sunday night. New this version: state your chosen audience and a one-line justification for why this argument suits that reader (not the instructor) — see Appendix B.

Sunday, October 4, 2026 — Paper 1 due (night)

~700 words. Feedback returned promptly (Appendix A); revision deferred to Dec 1 as part of the Portfolio.

Core Text III — de Chergé

How do I live with others? — 4-meeting block, split by Fall Break · Paper 2

Tuesday, October 6, 2026

Text: de Chergé, selected writings — context

Day: Meeting 1 — Intro + seminar-led discussion. Tibhirine, Algeria.

Writing: none

Thursday, October 8, 2026

Text: de Chergé, the Testament itself

Day: Meeting 2 — student-led discussion. Safety versus fidelity introduced.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #7 of 13

Writing: none

Tuesday, October 13, 2026 — FALL BREAK

No class.

Thursday, October 15, 2026 — Big Question & Five Lenses Day

Text: none (process day, not a de Chergé meeting)

Day: Formal introduction of the four-move Big Questions arrangement (Opening the Question → Where You Land; Appendix B), using Paper 1 as the worked example. Previews Paper 2's harder 'the Other Case ends in a draw' demand.

Writing: none

Tuesday, October 20, 2026

Text: Of Gods and Men (dir. Beauvois, 2010) — curated cut, ~60–75 min

Day: Meeting 3 — in-class screening + brief same-day dialogue. No outside attendance required. No Discussion Leadership pair scheduled today — screening occupies the period; DL rotation resumes Meeting 4.

Writing: none

Thursday, October 22, 2026

Text: de Chergé, concluded

Day: Meeting 4 — conclusion, processing, writing strategy. Disputation: safety versus fidelity, now informed by the film.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #8 of 13

Writing: Paper 2 assigned; due Sunday night. State your chosen audience and justification — see Appendix B.

Sunday, October 25, 2026 — Paper 2 due (night)

~800 words. Feedback returned promptly; revision deferred to Dec 3 as part of the Portfolio.

Core Text IV — White Rose

How do I live with my own conscience? — 4-meeting block · Paper 3

Tuesday, October 27, 2026

Text: The White Rose leaflets, in full

Day: Meeting 1 — Intro + seminar-led discussion. Primary documents, not commentary.

Writing: none

Thursday, October 29, 2026

Text: Newman, 'The Testimony of Conscience'

Day: Meeting 2 — student-led discussion. Recalls the 1 Peter 3:15 line from Week 1.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #9 of 13

Writing: none

Tuesday, November 3, 2026

Text: Sophie Scholl: The Final Days (dir. Rothmund, 2005) — curated cut, ~60–75 min

Day: Meeting 3 — in-class screening + brief same-day dialogue. No Discussion Leadership pair scheduled today — screening occupies the period; DL rotation resumes Meeting 4.

Writing: none

Thursday, November 5, 2026

Text: White Rose, concluded

Day: Meeting 4 — conclusion, processing, writing strategy. Disputation: purity versus practicality.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #10 of 13

Writing: Paper 3 assigned; due Sunday night. State your chosen audience and justification — see Appendix B.

Sunday, November 8, 2026 — Paper 3 due (night)

~1,000 words. Feedback returned promptly; revision deferred to Dec 8 as part of the Portfolio, alongside peer review.

Core Text V — Magnifica Humanitas

How do we live well without demeaning self, world, or God? — 4-meeting block, then Portfolio assembly

Tuesday, November 10, 2026

Text: Pope Leo XIV, Magnifica Humanitas (selections)

Day: Meeting 1 — Intro + seminar-led discussion.

Writing: none

Thursday, November 12, 2026

Text: Magnifica Humanitas, continued + Leo XIII, Rerum Novarum, in dialogue

Day: Meeting 2 — student-led discussion. Continuity of Catholic Social Teaching across a century.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #11 of 13

Writing: none

Tuesday, November 17, 2026

Text: Magnifica Humanitas, continued

Day: Meeting 3 — student-led discussion.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #12 of 13

Writing: none

Thursday, November 19, 2026

Text: Magnifica Humanitas, concluded

Day: Meeting 4 — conclusion, processing, writing strategy. Capstone synthesis begins: students write their own account of magis using the five shared-lens terms. Geger assigned, to be read before Dec 1.

Discussion Leaders: Pair #13 of 13

Writing: Portfolio / Paper 4 assigned. Addressed to your own future self at the point of Core Capstone — see Appendix D (Rhetorical Self-Examen). Requires 2–3 outside sources per the structure in Appendix D, Criterion 3.

Tuesday, November 24, 2026 — NO CLASS

Cancelled (pre-Thanksgiving buffer).

Thursday, November 26, 2026 — THANKSGIVING

No class.

Portfolio Assembly & Final Class

Tuesday, December 1, 2026 — Portfolio Assembly, Paper 1

Text: Barton Geger, SJ, 'What Magis Really Means' (excerpt) — brief tie-in, ~10 min

Day: Revise Paper 1 (Ignatius) using returned feedback and the semester's hindsight — the Other Case as defeat, and audience-fit (Appendix B). AI-audit oral micro-conferences (4–5 students/section) — register variation across papers is expected and by design; compare against the Sept 3 baseline and each paper's own declared audience.

Writing: Paper 1 revision in progress, for the Portfolio.

Thursday, December 3, 2026 — Portfolio Assembly, Paper 2

Day: Revise Paper 2 (de Chergé) — the Other Case as draw, and audience-fit. AI-audit oral micro-conferences (4–5 students/section).

Writing: Paper 2 revision in progress, for the Portfolio.

Tuesday, December 8, 2026 — Portfolio Assembly, Paper 3 + Peer Review

Day: Revise Paper 3 (White Rose) — the Other Case as synthesis, and audience-fit. Portfolio peer review. AI-audit oral micro-conferences (4–5 students/section).

Writing: Paper 3 revision in progress; portfolio draft peer-reviewed.

Thursday, December 10, 2026 — Final Class

Text: none

Day: Open and celebratory. No new content, no deadline. Light capstone orations — a line or takeaway from each student's magis reflection.

Writing: none

After the Semester

Portfolio / Final Paper 4 due during Final Exams period (Dec 15–19; Final Grades due Dec 22 by 12:30 p.m.). ~2,000 new words, plus revision of Papers 1–3 — assembled across Dec 1, 3, and 8. This is the only assignment with peer review, and the semester's most heavily weighted written work.

Criterion 2 of the Portfolio rubric (Appendix D) revisits the audience-fit first graded in each paper's October Opening-the-Question and Where-You-Land scores, now assessed after revision — the same formative-then-summative pattern Criterion 4

already applies to revision depth generally. This is not a second grade for the same thing; it is a check on whether audience-fit held or improved through the semester's hindsight.

Appendix A: Feedback & Revision Rhythm

Feedback turnaround

Paper	Due	Feedback returned by	Revised (Portfolio)
Paper 1 (Ignatius)	Sun, Oct 4	~Oct 11	Tue, Dec 1
Paper 2 (de Chergé)	Sun, Oct 25	~Nov 1	Thu, Dec 3
Paper 3 (White Rose)	Sun, Nov 8	~Nov 15	Tue, Dec 8

AI-Audit Guidance

Note for AI-audit micro-conferences: because Papers 1–3 each address a different, deliberately-chosen audience (see Appendix B and Portfolio Criterion 2), register and vocabulary shifts across the three papers are expected and by design. Compare each paper against the student's Sept 3 baseline entry and its own declared audience, not against the tone of the student's other two papers.

Appendix B: Big Questions Rubrics

All three rubrics share the same four-move arrangement — Opening the Question, Grounding the Claim, the Other Case, and Where You Land — scored Absent (0) / Emerging (1) / Present (2) / Skilled (3) — 12 points possible per paper. The arrangement is built from the Big Question each text itself raises and the course's five shared-lens terms, not imported rhetorical vocabulary. What changes across papers is what 'skilled' requires of the Other Case: defeat (Paper 1) → draw (Paper 2) → synthesis (Paper 3). Each move table below names the specific counter-position at stake in brief; the full assignment-sheet prompt for each paper lives on its own standalone sheet.

Paper 1 (Ignatius, ~700 words) — the Other Case ends in defeat

Full assignment-sheet language for this paper — including the counter-position prompt in full and audience-declaration instructions — lives on the standalone Paper 1 assignment sheet. The table below summarizes each move and the counter-position engaged in the Other Case.

Move	What it should do here	Skilled (3) looks like
Opening the Question	Establishes why Ignatius's discernment matters to this reader	Hook tied to the semester's shared-lens terms — and legible and compelling specifically for the paper's declared audience, not just thematically apt in the abstract.
Grounding the Claim	Selects wounding/convalence facts and builds the case via consolation/desolation and indifference	Selection reveals interpretive judgment; terms extended beyond the text — student's own application.
The Other Case	Engages the trauma-not-vocation counter-reading fairly	Counter-position sharpens the paper's own claim before being defeated
Where You Land	Closes on the election — a decision, not a summary	Ending reframes the opening's stakes in light of what's been shown — the reframe would land for the declared audience specifically, not only for a general academic reader.

Move	Absent (0)	Emerging (1)	Present (2)	Skilled (3)
Opening the Question	No audience is named, or the opening doesn't orient the reader to why Ignatius's discernment would matter to anyone in particular.	States a topic or thesis but doesn't yet function as a hook — reads as an announcement ("This paper is about...") rather than something that draws a specific reader in.	Names the declared audience and opens with a hook connected to Ignatius's discernment, but the connection is generic — it would work for most readers, not calibrated to this one specifically.	Hook tied to the semester's shared-lens terms — legible and compelling specifically for the declared audience, not just thematically apt in the abstract.
Grounding the Claim	Summary is inaccurate, absent, or unconnected to any claim being built.	Retells Ignatius's convalescence largely in sequence, without clear selection or connection to the shared-lens terms.	Selects relevant wounding/convalescence facts and uses the shared-lens terms accurately, but stays close to summarizing the text rather than extending the terms into new application.	Selection reveals interpretive judgment; terms (consolation/desolation, indifference) extended beyond the text into the student's own application.
The Other Case	No counter-position is named or engaged; this section just restates the paper's own claim.	Gestures at a counter-reading but strawmans it — flattens it enough that defeating it costs the paper nothing.	States the trauma-not-vocation counter-reading accurately and takes it seriously, but the refutation leans on an outside argument (e.g., "well, he became a saint") rather than Ignatius's own evidentiary standard.	Counter-position sharpens the paper's own claim, then is defeated using Ignatius's own criterion — which thought leaves lasting consolation, which leaves restlessness — not an argument imported from outside the text.
Where You Land	No clear position is reached, or the ending contradicts the claim built earlier.	Restates the thesis without meaningfully returning to the opening's stakes or the declared audience.	Closes with a clear position, but functions more as a summary of the argument than a reframing that shows a decision was made.	Ending reframes the opening's stakes in light of what's been shown — the reframe would land for the declared audience specifically. Feels like a decision has been made.

Paper 2 (de Chergé, ~800 words) — the Other Case ends in a draw

Full assignment-sheet language for this paper — including the counter-position prompt in full and audience-declaration instructions — lives on the standalone Paper 2 assignment sheet. Calibration note: a confident, fully-resolved conclusion here is a regression, not a strength.

Move	What it should do here	Skilled (3) looks like
Opening the Question	Establishes the stakes of safety vs. fidelity for de Chergé specifically	Connects to the declared audience's own sense of what's owed to a stranger/neighbor — the connection is calibrated to that specific reader, not a generic one.
Grounding the Claim	Selects Tibhirine/Testament/film facts and builds one horn of the tension using specific passages	Selection foreshadows the Other Case to come; passages chosen also anticipate its counter-force.
The Other Case	Takes the other horn seriously enough that the tension stays live — the safety-over-fidelity case, that remaining endangered the neighbors who sheltered them	Reader isn't sure which side the writer favors
Where You Land	Closes without false resolution	Ending reframes 'unresolved' as itself a form of fidelity — in terms that would resonate with the declared audience specifically.

Paper 3 (White Rose, ~1,000 words) — the Other Case ends in synthesis

Full assignment-sheet language for this paper — including the counter-position prompt in full, the semester's named throughline, and audience-declaration instructions — lives on the standalone Paper 3 assignment sheet. The table below summarizes each move and the counter-position engaged in the Other Case.

Move	What it should do here	Skilled (3) looks like
Opening the Question	Justifies why purity and practicality belong in one argument	Justification previews the paper's real interpretive stake — framed for the declared audience's own stake in the question, not only the writer's.

Move	What it should do here	Skilled (3) looks like
Grounding the Claim	Draws proportionately on the leaflets, Newman, and the film, putting the sources in genuine conversation	Selection from each source is chosen because it speaks to the others; the conversation generates a claim no single source states alone.
The Other Case	Engages the ‘moral clarity cost them effectiveness’ counter-position	Counter-position sharpens exactly why the synthesis holds
Where You Land	Closes on what the synthesis reveals, not a summary of either side	Ending rehearses the Portfolio’s own bookend logic — closing in a register the declared audience would recognize as addressed to them.

Appendix C: Discussion Leadership Rubric

Same 0–3 scale as the Big Questions rubrics (Absent / Emerging / Present / Skilled). Used on all 13 DL days; scored per pair, not per individual, except where partnership itself is the criterion.

Move	What it should do here	Skilled (3) looks like
Framing	Opens with a question or passage that orients the room	The opening question surfaces the day’s real interpretive stakes, not just a summary prompt
Facilitation	Invites and builds on peers’ contributions rather than lecturing	Actively redirects the floor; visible listening, not just waiting to talk
Textual grounding	Keeps discussion anchored to specific passages/moments	Returns the room to the text when discussion drifts into generality
Partnership	Co-leads share the floor and build on each other	Visible hand-off between partners; neither one carries the whole day

A strong DL day simply confirms full Attendance & Participation credit for that period — it is a formative check folded into the existing 10%, not a separate grade.

Appendix D: Portfolio Rubric

Calibrated to Level 1 (first-semester FYS): the Novice column is a genuine floor — non-attempt or non-comprehension — not merely the weakest version of competent work. Every cell states an observable marker a grader can point to in the text.

Criterion	Distinguished (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Novice (1) — does not yet meet Level 1 FYS expectations
Critical Reflection & Metacognition <i>Weight: 20%</i>	Quotes specific language from both an earlier draft and its Portfolio revision side by side. Explains the reasoning behind each cited revision choice, not just what changed. Explicitly connects at least one revision choice to a writing pattern or goal noticed across multiple papers this semester.	Quotes specific draft/revision language for at least two revision choices. Explains why each cited change was made. Discussion may stay within a single paper rather than tracing a pattern across the semester.	Names what was changed without quoting the original or revised language. Offers a general reason (“to make it clearer”) not tied to a specific writing goal.	Describes revision only in general terms not connected to any specific paper or passage. Or: reflection does not address revision at all.

Criterion	Distinguished (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Novice (1) — does not yet meet Level 1 FYS expectations
Rhetorical Purpose & Audience (Papers 1–3) <i>Weight: 20%</i>	Each of the three papers' prompt responses states a chosen audience and a brief justification for why that argument suits that reader. Vocabulary, tone, and assumed background knowledge remain consistent with the stated audience throughout, with no lapses into instructor- or seminar-directed language.	Each paper states its chosen audience. Execution is consistent with that audience in most passages, with at most one lapse across all three papers combined.	Audience is stated for at least two of the three papers, but execution is inconsistent — several passages assume an unstated reader, often the instructor or seminar.	Audience is not stated for any paper. Or: writing addresses the instructor/seminar directly in multiple papers.
Rhetorical Self-Examen (Portfolio) <i>Weight: 20%</i>	Addresses the writer's own future self at Core Capstone; names the audience chosen for each of Papers 1–3 and identifies a specific pattern across the three choices, explaining what that pattern reveals about the writer's own decision-making.	Addresses the future-Capstone-self audience; names each paper's audience and identifies at least one pattern, though the explanation may be brief. Defines magis at first use and applies it consistently, with at most one minor drift.	Addresses the future-self audience but lists the three prior choices without identifying a pattern connecting them. Uses magis without a clear definition, or defines it once and then uses it inconsistently.	Does not address the future-self-at-Capstone audience as specified, or does not reference the three papers' audience choices at all. Does not define magis, or uses it in contradictory ways.
Discerning Inquiry & Source Integration <i>Weight: 20%</i>	Integrates all three source types: one CST document beyond those assigned in class, one scholarly/reference source, and the OED etymology of at least one shared-lens term — each correctly cited (MLA or APA), with the library's persistent proxy URL (ezp.scranton.edu) included for the OED entry and any database source. Each source is introduced, summarized in the student's own words, and explicitly tied to a specific claim — no source appears without surrounding original analysis.	Integrates at least two of the three source types, correctly cited, including the persistent proxy URL where applicable. Sources are summarized accurately, though connection to specific claims is sometimes implicit.	Integrates one or two sources, but citation format contains errors, or the proxy URL is missing where required. Or: a source is quoted at length without surrounding original analysis ("quote-dropping").	Uses zero outside sources. Or: uses a source without citation, or an OED/database source accessed via a free public site rather than the library's proxy link — treated as unvetted regardless of content accuracy.
Revision Depth & Textual Control <i>Weight: 20%</i>	Comparing draft and Portfolio versions shows changes to structure, argument sequence, or scope — not just word-level edits — in at least two	Comparing draft and Portfolio versions shows at least one change beyond word-level substitution in at least one revised paper. Occasional errors are	Changes are limited to word-level substitutions and typo correction. Errors are frequent enough to occasionally require re-reading a sentence.	Portfolio versions of Papers 1–3 are identical or nearly identical to the originally submitted drafts. Errors are frequent enough to impede understanding in multiple passages.

Criterion	Distinguished (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Novice (1) — does not yet meet Level 1 FYS expectations
	of the three revised papers. Prose contains no errors that impede meaning.	present but do not impede meaning.		

Assigned audience, Papers 1–3: per-paper, student-declared and justified (Criterion 2) — not the instructor. Assigned audience, Portfolio: the writer's own future self at the point of Core Capstone (Criterion 5, "Rhetorical Self-Examen").

Source structure (Criterion 3): one Catholic Social Teaching document beyond those assigned in class, one scholarly or reference source, and the OED etymology of at least one shared-lens term, introduced via brief embedded segments on Nov 19 and Dec 1 rather than a dedicated library day.

Course Policies

These policies are written to support your learning, to communicate expectations clearly, and to express my commitment to your success — in a spirit of collaboration, fairness, and *cura personalis*, care for the whole person.

Attendance and Participation

I hope you will join us for all class sessions, since your voice and presence enrich our shared learning — this is especially true given the Discussion Leadership structure, where your presence on a DL day is part of a partnership another student is counting on. If you need to miss class for health, family, work, or other important reasons, please let me know and we will make a plan to keep you connected to the material, your peers, and (if you are scheduled to co-lead) your DL partner. Consistent engagement is essential; please note that more than six absences results in a course failure ("F").

Late Work

Unexpected circumstances arise. If you anticipate difficulty submitting on time, communicate with me in advance whenever possible. Late work remains eligible for partial credit (typically 50%). The goal is to balance fairness to the class with flexibility, so you can still demonstrate your learning even when timing is difficult.

Office Hours

I warmly invite you to office hours — not only for questions about assignments but for conversation about your interests, challenges, or how this course connects to your life. If the posted times do not work, email me and we will arrange an alternative.

Artificial Intelligence Use & the AI-Audit Protocol

This course reads *Magnifica Humanitas*, on safeguarding the human person in the time of artificial intelligence — so questions about AI and authentic voice are not incidental to the syllabus, they are part of what we study. Your Sept 3 low-stakes reflection entry and Sept 17 handwritten Euthyphro exercise are retained as authentic-voice baselines. AI-audit oral micro-conferences (2–3 minutes, 4–5 randomly selected students per section per paper) during Portfolio Assembly (Dec 1/3/8) are anchored to specific rubric moves in your own papers — not a general integrity interrogation — and are designed with the expectation that your register and vocabulary will vary across Papers 1–3, since each addresses a different declared audience (see Appendix A). Speak with me directly if you have questions about what AI use is or is not appropriate for a given assignment.

Academic Honesty and Integrity

Our class follows the University's Honor Code, and I assume your best intentions. Part of academic honesty is giving credit to the ideas and words of others; if you are ever unsure how to cite a source, please ask. The Academic Code of Honesty is set forth in The University of Scranton Student Handbook.

My Reporting Obligations as a Required Reporter

All faculty members are required to report incidents of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct involving students. I cannot keep such information confidential, but I will keep it as private as I can and will not report anything without first discussing it with you. I would bring it to the University's Associate Vice President for Institutional Compliance & Title IX, Elizabeth M. Garcia, or a Deputy Title IX Coordinator, Diana M. Collins-Gilmore. The University's Counseling Center (570-941-7620) is a confidential resource; counselors have no obligation to report to the Title IX Coordinator.

Non-Discrimination

The University is committed to an educational, residential, and working environment free from harassment and discrimination based on race, color, creed, religion, ancestry, gender, sex, pregnancy and related conditions, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, sex characteristics, sex stereotypes, age, disability, genetic information, national origin, ethnicity, family responsibilities, marital status, veteran or military status, citizenship status, or any other status protected by applicable law. Concerns may be directed to Elizabeth M. Garcia, AVP for Institutional Compliance & Title IX (570-941-6645, elizabeth.garcia2@scranton.edu) or Deputy Title IX Coordinator Diana M. Collins-Gilmore (570-941-6645, diana.collinsgilmore@scranton.edu).

Mental Health

Many students experience mental health challenges in college, and seeking help is the smart and courageous thing to do. Resources include: the Counseling Center (6th Floor, O'Hara Hall; 570-941-7620) for free, confidential counseling; confidential online Mental Health Screenings; the Dean of Students Office (201 DeNaples Center; 570-941-7680) for private support; and the Center for Health Education & Wellness (CHEW) for skills-based well-being programs.

Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities may be eligible for reasonable academic and non-academic accommodations, with relevant and current documentation. Please contact the Office of Student Support and Success (disabilityservices@scranton.edu, 570-941-4038) to determine eligibility for academic accommodations; for non-academic accommodations, contact the Office of Institutional Compliance and Title IX (non-academic-accom@scranton.edu, 570-941-6645). I am glad to help you connect with these resources.

Writing Center

The Writing Center offers one-on-one feedback from trained peer consultants at any stage of the writing process — including help thinking through your declared audience and the four-move arrangement for Papers 1–3. Make an appointment through the [my.scranton](https://my.scranton.edu) portal (OSSS Card > Writing Center Scheduler) or contact writing-center@scranton.edu.

First-Generation College Students

First-generation students are those whose parents/guardians have not completed a four-year degree. This course is designed to support all students, including first-gen students. Please visit me during office hours with any questions — even if I'm unsure of the answer, I'll connect you to resources. For more, contact Dr. Shaefny Grays, THRIVE Program Coordinator (thr1ve@scranton.edu).

Land Acknowledgement

The University of Scranton campus was built on land formerly cared for by the Lenape, the Monsey, the Shawnee, and the Susquehannocks. As we live, learn, and love on this campus, may we be ever mindful of their absence from this place and commit ourselves to stewarding this land with care and compassion as we navigate our communities toward justice grounded in knowledge and wisdom.

Pronouns

Using the pronouns a person has indicated is both professional and polite, and I ask that all members of our class do so. If you have questions, feel free to look up more information at mypronouns.org or email me.