# Ethics Course Reasoning Framework
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This appears to be a comprehensive course guide for an ethics class that takes a practical, applied approach to ethical reasoning. The document outlines a structured method for working through genuine ethical dilemmas using what they call an "algorithmic" approach.  
The key elements I notice are:  
Core Philosophy: Ethics is framed as a systematic reasoning process rather than a set of rules or cultural norms. The course emphasizes that ethical dilemmas involve genuine competing values where there's no obvious "right" answer.  
The Algorithmic Approach: Students develop their own decision-making process (algorithm) that includes steps like identifying ethical dimensions, assessing values, considering roles, analyzing stakeholders, and reflecting on outcomes.  
Integration Method: Rather than treating dilemmas, roles, and ethical models as separate topics, the course weaves them together throughout the semester. Students apply multiple ethical frameworks to the same personal dilemma, seeing how each model offers different insights.  
Practical Focus: Students work with a real dilemma they're personally wrestling with, examining it through different role perspectives (professional, family member, citizen, etc.) and various ethical frameworks.  
Visual Mapping: Students create evolving visual maps of their reasoning process, adding layers as they explore new models and refine their thinking.  
The approach seems designed to build genuine ethical reasoning skills rather than just theoretical knowledge. Students develop their own integrated approach to handling complex ethical situations they'll actually encounter.  
Is there a particular aspect of this framework you'd like to discuss or explore further? Are you working through the course yourself or considering how to apply these concepts?  
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Based on this broad introduction, I am checking other supplemental content in the course syllabus to check for internal consistency and then finally to see if there are additional elements or scaffolding that need to be added to the course to support student learning.  
Edit  
That's a smart approach to course design - checking for internal consistency across all materials and identifying gaps in scaffolding. This introduction sets up some specific expectations and commitments that need to be supported throughout the course.  
Key elements that would need consistent support across your syllabus materials:  
Assessment Alignment: The introduction promises an integration approach where students develop one evolving analysis rather than separate assignments. Your assessment structure would need to reflect this - perhaps through portfolio development, iterative submissions, or kanban board tracking rather than traditional separate papers.  
Scaffolding for Dilemma Selection: Since the document emphasizes this is "measure twice, cut once" and warns against poor choices, you'd want early scaffolding - maybe guided reflection exercises, peer consultation processes, or instructor check-ins before students commit.  
Model Application Structure: The course surveys "8-10 different ethical frameworks" but students aren't required to adopt or use all of them. Your weekly schedule and assignments would need to balance thorough exploration with student choice about which tools to integrate.  
Visual Mapping Support: If ethical mapping is central, students will need guidance on what effective maps look like, tools for creation, and criteria for evaluation.  
Role Complexity Navigation: The introduction acknowledges role tensions are inherent but doesn't resolve them. Your course materials would need strategies for helping students work productively with these tensions rather than getting paralyzed by them.  
What specific supplemental materials are you reviewing? I'd be happy to help you look for consistency issues or suggest additional scaffolding based on what you're seeing in other parts of the syllabus.  
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This second document shows strong internal consistency with the introduction, and I can see how the pedagogical approach is carefully integrated. Here's my analysis:

## **Strong Consistency Elements**

Living Document Approach: The "Conflict Map" perfectly aligns with the integration philosophy from the introduction - students aren't writing separate papers but developing one evolving analysis that layers ethical models onto their dilemma.  
Kanban Board System: This elegantly solves the scaffolding challenge I mentioned. It provides structure and feedback opportunities while maintaining student autonomy. The privacy protection addresses the sensitive nature of personal dilemmas.  
Self-Assessment Framework: The six dimensions directly map to the course's key components (dilemma complexity, role integration, model engagement, etc.) and emphasize process over product, which aligns with the "ethics as algorithm" approach.

## **Potential Areas for Additional Scaffolding**

Dilemma Quality Assurance: While the kanban system provides feedback, you might need earlier intervention points. Consider requiring a "dilemma validation" checkpoint before students invest weeks in analysis - perhaps peer consultation or brief instructor approval.  
Model Sequencing Guidance: Students choose their own sequence for exploring ethical frameworks, but some models might build on others more effectively. You could provide suggested pathways without requiring them.  
Peer Learning Optimization: The podcast system is thoughtful, but you might want protocols for ensuring productive conversations - perhaps question prompts or facilitation guidelines to prevent sessions from becoming merely progress reports.  
Technical Support: The visual mapping and kanban board approach assumes technological comfort. Consider providing tutorials or alternatives for students who struggle with these tools.  
Synthesis Support: The final integration step is complex. Students might benefit from intermediate synthesis checkpoints or examples of how integration looks different from mere compilation.  
What specific areas are you most concerned about in terms of student support or potential implementation challenges?  
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This self-assessment document demonstrates excellent alignment with the course philosophy and creates a sophisticated approach to evaluation. Here's my analysis:

## **Strong Consistency Elements**

Philosophy Alignment: The assessment perfectly embodies the course's emphasis on "authentic intellectual effort over academic performance." The language explicitly states this isn't a test or performance, but genuine reflection.  
Process Over Product: The rubric focuses on approaches and growth rather than specific outcomes, which aligns with the "ethics as algorithm" framework and the idea that there are no predetermined right answers.  
Evidence Integration: The approach to evidence mirrors the course's integration philosophy - asking students to contextualize and connect rather than simply compile artifacts.  
Collaborative Final Conference: This adds a crucial human element that supports the authentic reflection process while providing accountability.

## **Sophisticated Assessment Design**

Honest Struggle Validation: The explicit acknowledgment that struggle, inconsistency, or "missing the mark" can lead to valuable learning removes the performative pressure that might undermine genuine reflection.  
Student Language Creation: Allowing students to "create your own language" for work not captured by the rubric shows remarkable pedagogical maturity and respects individual learning journeys.  
AI Integration: Including "Use of AI" as a dimension recognizes contemporary learning realities while emphasizing reflective rather than mechanical engagement.

## **Areas That Strengthen the Overall Course**

Metacognitive Skill Development: This assessment teaches students to evaluate their own learning - a crucial professional skill that extends well beyond the course.  
Narrative Coherence: Asking for an "authentic narrative" that connects evidence to journey helps students synthesize their semester-long experience into meaningful understanding.  
Flexible Evidence Standards: The emphasis on explanation over volume prevents the kind of superficial documentation that can undermine genuine reflection.

## **One Potential Addition**

Consider providing a few sample self-assessment excerpts (anonymized from previous semesters) that demonstrate different approaches - honest struggle, significant growth, creative language use. This could help students understand the level of candor and depth you're seeking without constraining their individual approaches.  
The course design shows remarkable coherence across all three documents. The assessment genuinely serves the learning rather than just measuring it.  
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The Wreck Room  
*“In all affairs it's a healthy thing now and then to hang a question mark on the things you have long taken for granted.”* – Bertrand Russell  
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🧠 What Is the Wreck Room?  
The Wreck Room is a special segment in our weekly podcast where one Honors student takes the spotlight—not to explain or apply a model, but to test its limits.  
This is your chance to step into the role of ethical stress-tester. We’re not here to dunk on the model or dismiss it; we’re here to identify what it hides, what it avoids, and what it struggles to address. It’s about thinking beyond mastery and toward critique.  
↑ Back to Top  
🎙️ What Honors Students Do  
Each Honors student will lead two Wreck Room segments across the semester. These segments follow an ethical model of their choice and should:  
\* Raise a significant tension, contradiction, or omission within the model  
\* Articulate the risk or cost of using that model in a real ethical situation  
\* Pose an open-ended question that invites further inquiry  
These are not debates or takedowns. Think of them as diagnostics—we're checking for weaknesses before applying the model to something serious. And perhaps suggesting resolutions or solutions for those concerns...  
You’ll have the freedom to follow your own interests and philosophical leanings. Just make sure your segment pushes the model to reveal something new, unstable, or unspoken.  
↑ Back to Top  
🧩 Why It Matters for Everyone  
The Wreck Room isn’t just for Honors students. It’s a shared intellectual resource for the entire class.  
Every time you listen to a segment, you’ll hear a model under pressure. Sometimes it’ll hold. Sometimes it won’t. Either way, the friction reveals blind spots, shaky foundations, or contradictions you might miss in a cleaner application.  
Good ethical thinking isn’t just about using models well. It’s about recognizing when they break down. The Wreck Room shows that in real time.  
↑ Back to Top  
🗺️ Conflict Maps and Wreck Room Integration  
Wreck Room segments might be optional content for some of you, but they can be incredibly useful as you develop your Conflict Maps. Here’s how you might use them:  
\* In Your Own Work (Honors students): If your Wreck Room segment uncovered a blind spot in the model, you’re encouraged to reference it in your map. This can look like: *“As I noted in my Wreck Room segment, this model struggles with questions of autonomy when cultural values conflict.”*  
\* In Any Student’s Work: If a peer’s Wreck Room segment challenged your thinking, feel free to name it. This is a high-level engagement move. Example: *“The critique raised by Jamie in Week 6 helped me realize that this model's emphasis on utility can suppress marginalized voices.”*  
\* In Self-Assessment: Thoughtful integration of Wreck Room ideas (not name-dropping, but genuine synthesis) will often reflect well in your self-evaluation. This isn't going to work as a self-assessment shortcut—it’s just one way to show what deeper thinking looks like.  
You're not required to track every segment, but the more you weave these critiques into your thinking, the more dynamic your ethical reasoning becomes.  
↑ Back to Top  
📅 Calendar & Assignments  
You’ll be assigned to two models over the course of the semester. These dates will be visible on the shared Wreck Room calendar in the main Course Hub. Assignments are roughly every 4–5 weeks, and you’ll never have two segments back-to-back.  
If you want to propose a swap or request a specific model based on your interests, just reach out in the first two weeks.  
↑ Back to Top  
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This "Wreck Room" document adds a sophisticated critical thinking layer that significantly strengthens the course design. Here's my analysis:

## **Excellent Course Integration**

Philosophical Consistency: The Wreck Room perfectly embodies the course's commitment to "authentic intellectual effort" and "respectful engagement with diverse perspectives." It asks students to engage seriously with models while developing critical evaluation skills.  
Algorithm Enhancement: This component directly strengthens students' ethical algorithms by forcing them to consider model limitations before applying them to real situations. The "diagnostic" framing is particularly effective.  
Conflict Map Integration: The clear guidance on how to incorporate Wreck Room insights into individual projects prevents this from becoming isolated busy work and instead makes it a genuine learning resource.

## **Sophisticated Pedagogical Design**

Constructive Critique Framework: The emphasis on "diagnostics" rather than "takedowns" maintains respect for the models while developing critical thinking. This prevents cynical dismissal while encouraging genuine intellectual challenge.  
Shared Learning Resource: Making the segments valuable for all students, not just Honors participants, creates a collaborative knowledge base that enriches everyone's work.  
Self-Assessment Integration: The guidance about referencing segments in self-assessment shows students how critical engagement translates to demonstrated learning.

## **Addresses Previous Gaps**

Model Sequencing Support: While students still choose their own sequence, the Wreck Room provides insights about model limitations that can inform those choices.  
Synthesis Complexity: By exposing model tensions early, this component helps students understand why integration is challenging and valuable.  
Peer Learning Depth: This elevates the podcast format beyond progress sharing to genuine intellectual collaboration.

## **One Consideration**

The success of this component depends heavily on modeling what "good" Wreck Room segments look like. Consider providing examples (perhaps from pilot implementations) that demonstrate the difference between productive critique and superficial criticism.  
The four documents together create a remarkably coherent and sophisticated course design that genuinely develops ethical reasoning capacity rather than just covering ethical content. The progression from introduction through assessment shows careful attention to how students actually learn complex thinking skills.  
Retry  
Table of Contents Why Are We Using AI? Which AI? How Do I Use AI? What Are AI Checkpoints? How to Create Checkpoints Pro Tips for AI Use Why Checkpoints Matter Checkpoint File Name Examples Why Are We Using AI? In this course, AI is more than a productivity tool — it’s a thinking partner.  
pasted  
**C**  
Edit  
This AI integration document demonstrates thoughtful pedagogical design that aligns excellently with the course philosophy. Here's my analysis:

## **Strong Philosophical Alignment**

AI as Thinking Partner: Framing AI as a collaborative thinking tool rather than a productivity shortcut perfectly matches the course's emphasis on "authentic intellectual effort" and process over product.  
Growth-Oriented Approach: The focus on experimentation, reflection, and self-awareness aligns with the course's commitment to developing ethical reasoning algorithms rather than finding predetermined answers.  
Professional Skill Development: Positioning critical AI use as a civic and professional skill shows forward-thinking course design that prepares students for their actual working lives.

## **Sophisticated Implementation**

Checkpoint System: This is brilliant practical pedagogy. It solves the technical problem of AI memory limitations while creating a metacognitive learning tool. Students can review their own thinking evolution, which supports both the conflict map development and self-assessment processes.  
Process Documentation: The checkpoint and transcript requirements provide rich evidence for self-assessment while making the AI collaboration transparent and reflective rather than hidden.  
Student Agency: Allowing choice of AI platforms while providing clear guidance respects student autonomy while ensuring productive use.

## **Integration with Course Components**

Self-Assessment Support: The checkpoint system creates exactly the kind of process evidence students need for their reflective self-assessments.  
Conflict Map Development: AI can help students explore different perspectives on their dilemmas and test their reasoning across multiple ethical frameworks.  
Wreck Room Preparation: AI could be particularly valuable for Honors students developing critiques of ethical models.

## **One Enhancement Suggestion**

Consider providing a few examples of effective AI prompts for different course tasks:

* "Help me identify potential blind spots in this ethical framework..."
* "I'm struggling with competing role obligations. Can you help me think through..."
* "Challenge my reasoning about this dilemma from the perspective of..."

This would help students understand how to leverage AI as a genuine thinking partner rather than just a question-answering tool.  
The five documents together create a remarkably coherent course design that thoughtfully integrates contemporary tools while maintaining focus on deep learning objectives. The AI component enhances rather than replaces critical thinking, which is exactly what effective educational technology should do.  
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How-To Guide  
This guide gives you step-by-step instructions for using the tools in this class—especially ClickUp and your AI assistant. You’ll learn how to create, organize, and update your ClickUp tasks, and how to interact effectively with AI agents.  
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ClickUp: What You Need to Know  
ClickUp is the main project management tool we’ll use to keep track of your ethics work. You’ll be invited to join a shared public board with all class members. Each major assignment or “Part” in this course will have its own task card. As you work, you’ll move your tasks through status columns to show your progress.  
\* Task Cards: Represent Parts 1–5 of your project.  
\* Columns: To-Do, In Progress, Blocked / Need Help, Complete.  
\* Subtasks: Track work sessions for each Part.  
\* Assignments: Cards are assigned to individuals to make them private to you and the instructor.  
Back to Top ↑  
ClickUp Setup: How to Get Started  
1. Accept Your Invitation  
You’ll receive an email invitation to join the shared class ClickUp board. Click the link and sign in with your student email address. If you don’t have an account, it will prompt you to create one.  
2. Locate Your Task Cards  
Once inside the board, look for cards labeled Part 1, Part 2, Part 3... through Part 5. These are the major project stages you'll complete during the semester. Each card will be assigned to you, which makes your work visible only to you and the instructor.  
3. Understand the Columns  
Each task moves through the columns as your work progresses:  
\* To-Do: You haven’t started this Part yet.  
\* In Progress: You’re actively working on this Part.  
\* Blocked / Need Help: You’re stuck and need instructor guidance.  
\* Complete: You’ve submitted and reflected on this Part.  
Back to Top ↑  
How to Use ClickUp Effectively  
Creating a Task Card (if needed)  
1. Click the + New Task button.  
2. Name your task something like Part 3 – Role Analysis.  
3. Assign it to yourself so only you and the instructor can view it.  
4. Select the appropriate status column (e.g., To-Do).  
Moving a Card to a New Column  
1. Click and hold your task card.  
2. Drag it to the next status column (e.g., from “To-Do” to “In Progress”).  
3. Release to drop it into place.  
Adding a Subtask for a Work Session  
1. Open your main task card (e.g., Part 2).  
2. Click + Subtask.  
3. Give it a title like Brainstorming ethical stakeholders – July 31.  
4. Repeat this whenever you work on that Part. Try to add at least one subtask per week (by Sunday), or more often as needed.  
Marking a Task as Blocked  
1. Drag your card into the Blocked / Need Help column.  
2. Optionally, add a comment explaining the issue so the instructor can respond more quickly.  
Back to Top ↑  
AI Agent Basics  
You are free to use any platform-agnostic AI assistant (such as ChatGPT, Claude, or Perplexity) during this course. You’ll interact with your chosen AI to help you analyze dilemmas, reflect on your thinking, and test ideas from different ethical frameworks.  
Important: The AI doesn’t have memory between sessions. If you want to preserve your progress, you’ll need to create and paste back in checkpoints (see the “Why AI?” tab).  
Back to Top ↑  
Best Practices for Interacting with AI  
\* Be clear about your goals. Tell the AI what you’re trying to do.  
\* Talk through your ideas, not just ask for answers.  
\* Use checkpoints every 8–10 turns to save progress.  
\* Keep AI responses focused—don’t let it wander or overgeneralize.  
\* If confused, ask the AI to restate or simplify its explanation.  
\* Paste previous checkpoints into a new session to restore context.  
Back to Top ↑  
Edit  
This How-To Guide completes the course documentation set with practical implementation details. Here's my analysis of how it fits with the overall design:

## **Excellent Practical Integration**

ClickUp as Kanban System: This clearly implements the "kanban board" approach mentioned in the earlier documents. The four-column structure (To-Do, In Progress, Blocked/Need Help, Complete) provides exactly the progress visualization and feedback mechanism described in the course philosophy document.  
Privacy Protection: The assignment system that makes cards visible only to individual students and the instructor addresses the confidentiality concerns raised about personal ethical dilemmas.  
Subtask Tracking: The weekly subtask creation requirement provides the granular progress tracking mentioned in the assessment approach while supporting the "living document" development process.

## **Supports Key Course Elements**

Scaffolding Structure: The "Blocked/Need Help" column provides the timely feedback mechanism promised in the course overview, ensuring students don't struggle in isolation.  
Evidence Generation: The subtask system creates the kind of process documentation students need for their self-assessments, showing consistent engagement over time.  
AI Integration: The guide reinforces the checkpoint system from the AI document while providing basic interaction guidance.

## **Potential Areas for Enhancement**

Conflict Map Connection: The guide doesn't explicitly connect ClickUp use to the development of the conflict map document. You might add guidance about how to link ClickUp updates to document evolution.  
Part Definitions: The guide references "Parts 1-5" without explaining what these represent. Students may need clearer connections between ClickUp tasks and actual course components.  
Collaboration Elements: While individual cards are private, the guide doesn't explain how students might share insights or seek peer support within the system.  
Weekly Rhythm: The guide mentions updating by Sunday but could be clearer about how this connects to the Monday-Tuesday instructor feedback cycle mentioned in earlier documents.

## **Overall Assessment**

The six documents together create a remarkably coherent and well-scaffolded course design. Each component supports the others while maintaining focus on the core learning objectives. The progression from philosophical framework through practical implementation shows careful attention to how students actually develop complex thinking skills.  
The course successfully balances student autonomy with supportive structure, uses technology to enhance rather than replace critical thinking, and creates authentic assessment that serves learning rather than just measuring it.  
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Could you compile all the recommendations and perceived gaps into a summary version I can review?  
Edit