# Revising AI Ethics Course Prompts

Share  
In Part 1, you identified your ethical dilemma and the roles that create competing obligations. Now you need to uncover the decision-making patterns that actually guide your behavior in each role—not what you think should guide you, but what actually does. You'll work with AI as an interviewer to d  
pasted  
Based on your conflict map, you’ll now begin to chart your learning path through different ethical models. Some will feel familiar; others may feel uncomfortable or even contradictory. With AI's help, you’ll decide which ethical frameworks to explore, in what order, and for what purpose, based on ho  
pasted  
**C**  
I am trying to revise a series of AI prompts to help students work through a multi-part project in an online Ethics course. The current prompts are, for lack of a better term, a hot mess. Here are two revised prompts that I think work as samples for style, approach, and tone. The third is the next unrevised prompt that needs a lot of help...  
Edit  
I can see you're working on improving these AI prompts for your Ethics course. The first two prompts show a clear, structured approach that guides students through self-discovery and mapping their ethical tensions. I notice they have:

* Clear role definitions for the AI
* Step-by-step conversation flows
* Specific interviewing techniques
* Realistic expectations about discomfort and time investment
* Concrete deliverables

Looking at the third prompt (Part 3: Learning Roadmap), I can see it needs significant revision to match the clarity and user-friendliness of your first two examples. The current version is overly complex, has confusing instructions, and doesn't flow as smoothly as Parts 1 and 2.  
Would you like me to help revise the Part 3 prompt to match the style and effectiveness of your first two examples? I can:

1. Simplify the AI role and instructions
2. Create a clearer conversation flow
3. Make the framework selection process more intuitive
4. Ensure it builds naturally on Parts 1 and 2
5. Match the tone and structure of your successful prompts

What specific aspects of the Part 3 prompt are you most concerned about, and would you like me to create a revised version?  
Retry  
**C**  
Please revise Part 3 to align in style, layout, and approach to Parts 1 and 2. Thank you!  
Edit  
Part 3: Your Learning Roadmap - Revised  
Document  
# Part 3: Your Learning Roadmap

In Part 2, you discovered the decision-making patterns that guide your behavior in different roles. Now you need to create a personalized sequence for exploring ethical frameworks that will help you examine and refine  
I've revised Part 3 to match the style and structure of your first two prompts. Here are the key changes I made:  
Structure & Layout:

* Simplified the complex role description into a clear, concise coaching prompt
* Removed the overwhelming strategic planning consultant language
* Created the familiar three-section format (AI prompt box, offline guide, after-session instructions)

Tone & Approach:

* Made the language more student-friendly and less academic
* Removed jargon and overly complex instructions
* Focused on guided discovery rather than strategic planning

Content Improvements:

* Streamlined the reflection questions to one-at-a-time format
* Presented all 10 frameworks in a simple, clean list
* Removed the confusing "reordered list" concept
* Made the final deliverable clearer (a sequence with explanations)

Consistency with Parts 1 & 2:

* Maintained the collaborative AI relationship
* Kept the realistic time expectations
* Preserved the emphasis on personal discovery over prescribed solutions
* Used the same supportive, process-focused language

The revised version maintains all 10 frameworks while making the sequencing process much more intuitive and aligned with your successful prompt style.  
Retry  
**C**  
Can we return to the Conflict Map guide for a moment?  
Edit  
Of course! I see the Conflict Map guide in your documents - it's the section that comes after the heuristics discovery interview in Part 2.  
Are you looking to revise that section as well to better align with the style of the other prompts, or do you have specific concerns about how the Conflict Map process is currently structured?  
I notice it has a similar format to the other prompts but might benefit from some refinement to match the clarity and flow you've achieved in the other sections.  
What would you like to focus on with the Conflict Map guide?  
Retry  
**C**  
Let's revise first, then move onto the other question I have...  
Edit  
Part 2: Your Conflict Map - Revised  
Document  
# Part 2: Your Conflict Map

In your heuristics discovery interview, you uncovered the decision-making patterns that actually guide your behavior in different roles. Now you need to identify where these patterns clash with each other—the tensions tha  
I've revised the Conflict Map guide to match the style and structure of your other prompts. Key improvements include:  
Streamlined Structure:

* Simplified the AI coaching prompt to be more direct and user-friendly
* Removed redundant explanations and focused on clear next steps
* Maintained the three-section format (prompt box, offline guide, after-session instructions)

Clearer Instructions:

* Made the AI's role more straightforward (help identify conflicts, don't solve them)
* Simplified the questioning approach to one-at-a-time format
* Removed confusing references to "whatever format works best" and made it more concrete

Better Flow:

* Reorganized the final deliverables section to be clearer about what the map should contain
* Moved the "what you're creating" content to a more logical place
* Made the connection to future framework exploration more explicit

Consistent Tone:

* Matched the supportive, process-focused language of the other prompts
* Maintained realistic expectations about discomfort and time
* Kept the emphasis on honest self-examination rather than perfect solutions

The revised version maintains the core purpose while making the process much more accessible and aligned with your successful prompt style.  
What's your other question about this material?  
Retry  
**C**  
One of the things I have been thinking about when it comes to the Conflict Map, as well as in other aspects of the course we haven't talk about yet, I want to allow students to feel a lot of license in terms of how they create, format, and express the conflict map. It can be text based, like an essay, a mind map, or something really crazy like a photo collage or even clips from movies that help to articulate or express the tensions between roles, etc., or expressions that help to express the priorities or values of ethical models. The sky is the limit. I wonder if we might want them to think about and plan on how they want to approach that option before they get too far along in the process?  
Edit  
That's a brilliant insight! Giving students creative license to express their ethical tensions in whatever format resonates with them could make the process much more engaging and authentic. And you're absolutely right—they should think about their preferred mode of expression before diving into the mapping process itself.  
This could be especially powerful because ethical dilemmas are often deeply personal and emotional, and traditional academic formats might not capture the full complexity of how these tensions actually *feel* to students.  
Should we add a preliminary step to the Conflict Map process where students first reflect on how they want to approach this creative expression? Something like:

* A brief reflection prompt about their preferred ways of processing and expressing complex ideas
* Examples of different formats they might consider (written analysis, visual mind map, photo collage, playlist, video clips, drawings, etc.)
* A moment to choose their approach before starting the conflict identification process

This way, the AI could adapt its coaching based on their chosen format—asking different kinds of questions if someone wants to create a visual map versus someone planning a written reflection versus someone thinking about a multimedia approach.  
Would you want to build this creative planning step into the beginning of the Conflict Map section, or create it as a separate preliminary step? And should we also consider how this creative flexibility might apply to other parts of the course you mentioned?  
Retry  
**C**  
I don't know that it needs its own separate step, so inserting it into Part 3, but one of the challenges is that this is a pilot course, so I have no worked examples for students to examine or review. So the AI interview will need to help students to conceptualize this for themselves. Additionally, opening up the creative faucet might have some students opting for projects that are overdemanding, technology-wise, or that might prioritize presentation over depth and significance. Can these concerns be included in this section?  
Edit  
Absolutely! Those are really important considerations. Let me revise the Conflict Map section to include this creative planning component while addressing your concerns about scope and depth.  
Part 2: Your Conflict Map - Revised  
Document ∙ Version 2  
Before we start mapping conflicts, help me think about how I want to create and express my Conflict Map. Ask me:  
- "How do you naturally process complex, emotional information—through writing, visuals, lists, stories, or something else?"  
- "What form  
Part 2: Your Conflict Map - Revised  
Document ∙ Version 3  
Don't try to resolve these conflicts or suggest solutions. The goal is to map them clearly so I can see where my ethical thinking gets complicated.

Guide me to create my map in whatever format I chose, adapting your questions and suggestions to matc  
Part 2: Your Conflict Map - Revised  
Document ∙ Version 4  
## An Offline Guide: What to Expect

Creating your Conflict Map typically takes 30-45 minutes. This process can feel uncomfortable as you explicitly name the places where your values and roles pull you in different directions.

\*\*Choosing Your Format  
I've integrated the creative planning component into the Conflict Map section while addressing your concerns about scope and depth. The key additions:  
Creative Planning Questions: The AI now helps students think about their natural processing style and choose an appropriate format before diving into conflict identification.  
Emphasis on Simplicity: Multiple reminders that simple approaches often work better than complex ones, and that students should use tools they're already comfortable with.  
Depth Over Presentation: Clear messaging that the goal is honest self-reflection, not impressive design, and that substance matters more than style.  
Adapted Coaching: The AI will adjust its approach based on the student's chosen format while keeping them focused on meaningful content.  
Realistic Time Adjustment: Increased the time estimate to 30-45 minutes to account for the format planning component.  
This approach should encourage creative expression while preventing students from getting lost in overly complex projects or prioritizing form over substance. The AI becomes a guide that adapts to their chosen medium while maintaining focus on the core learning objectives.  
Retry  
**C**  
In the Offline section, you suggest that the Conflict Map only takes 30-45 minutes. This is just the initial representation; they will continually revise this as they examine the heuristics and suggested values and priorities of the various ethical models, so perhaps reframe this as the initial expression of the Conflict Map?  
Edit  
Part 2: Your Conflict Map - Revised  
Document ∙ Version 5  
## An Offline Guide: What to Expect

Creating your initial Conflict Map typically takes 30-45 minutes. This process can feel uncomfortable as you explicitly name the places where your values and roles pull you in different directions.  
Part 2: Your Conflict Map - Revised  
Document ∙ Version 6  
## After Creating Your Initial Map

Save your Conflict Map in a format that allows for easy revision and updating. This initial version becomes your starting point for the rest of the semester—as you explore ethical frameworks, you'll likely discover  
Perfect! I've reframed this as the "initial" Conflict Map and updated the follow-up section to emphasize that it's a living document that will evolve throughout the semester. The revision now:

* Clarifies that the 30-45 minutes is for the initial creation
* Emphasizes saving it in a format that allows for revision
* Explains that the map will evolve as they engage with different ethical frameworks
* Sets the expectation that they'll discover new tensions or reframe existing ones as their understanding develops

This better reflects the iterative nature of ethical reflection and positions the map as a working document rather than a one-time deliverable.  
Retry  
**C**  
This being the case, perhaps Part 4: The Learning Roadmap only needs the newly formed Conflict Map (Part 3) as it encompasses both Part 1 (Dilemma) and Part 2 (Heuristics and Algorithms)?  
Edit  
That's a really smart observation! You're absolutely right—if the Conflict Map (Part 3) is built from both the original dilemma (Part 1) and the heuristics discovery (Part 2), then it becomes a comprehensive synthesis that contains all the essential information needed for creating the Learning Roadmap.  
The Conflict Map would naturally include:

* The core dilemma (from Part 1)
* The specific decision-making patterns and role conflicts (from Part 2)
* The mapped tensions between them (Part 3)

So for Part 4 (Learning Roadmap), the AI coaching prompt could be simplified to just ask students to share their Conflict Map, since that document already captures their complete ethical landscape in a more refined and focused way.  
This would also make the process more streamlined for students—instead of having to re-share three separate pieces of work, they just need to present their evolved Conflict Map, and the AI can help them design their framework sequence based on that synthesized understanding.  
Should we revise the Learning Roadmap prompt to reflect this change? It would make the opening much cleaner: "First, ask me to share my Conflict Map so you understand my ethical tensions and patterns" rather than asking for all three previous parts.  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, please. Additionally, this makes me think that we need to create two separate items in Part 4: the artistic expression of the Conflict Map and a more condensed markdown version that can be constantly resubmitted to AI as students work on the next sections. Trying to upload a visually intensive map is untenable for working with AI...  
Edit  
Excellent point! That's a very practical consideration. Students need the creative freedom to express their tensions authentically, but they also need a working document that's AI-friendly for the rest of the course.  
Let me revise the Learning Roadmap prompt to reflect both changes, and we should probably also update the Conflict Map section to include creating both versions.  
Part 3: Your Learning Roadmap - Revised  
Document ∙ Version 2  
You're helping me create a personalized learning sequence for exploring 10 ethical frameworks based on my Conflict Map. Your job is to help me decide which frameworks to tackle first, which to save for later, and why.

First, ask me to share my Confl  
Part 3: Your Learning Roadmap - Revised  
Document ∙ Version 3  
Then help me reflect on my Conflict Map by asking one question at a time:  
- Which tensions feel most urgent or uncomfortable to address?  
- Which patterns do I feel confident about and want to strengthen?  
- Which conflicts keep me most stuck in my dil  
Now let me add the dual-format requirement to the Conflict Map section:  
Part 2: Your Conflict Map - Revised  
Document ∙ Version 7  
## After Creating Your Initial Map

Create two versions of your Conflict Map:

1. \*\*Your Creative Expression:\*\* This is your primary conflict map in whatever format you chose—visual, written, multimedia, etc. This version prioritizes authenticity and  
Perfect! I've updated both sections to reflect these important changes:  
Learning Roadmap (Part 4) Changes:

* Now asks only for the Conflict Map rather than all previous parts
* Specifies the "condensed markdown version" for AI compatibility
* Updated reflection questions to focus on the synthesized tensions rather than separate discoveries

Conflict Map (Part 3) Changes:

* Added requirement for two versions: creative expression and working document
* Specified what the markdown working document should include
* Emphasized that both versions will evolve throughout the semester
* Made it clear the working document is for AI conversations while the creative version is for personal reflection

This dual approach gives students creative freedom while ensuring they have a practical tool for the rest of the course. The markdown working document becomes their portable summary that they can easily share with AI as they work through different ethical frameworks.  
Retry  
**C**  
OK. In my thinking in creating these prompts, I decided that what would be helpful to most students is selecting virtue ethics as the first ethical model. It is pretty accessible to most individuals and so it could serve as a good scaffolded model for what they will do for the rest of the models.  
In Part 5.1, we start your ethical framework exploration with Virtue Ethics. This structured AI guide will walk you through the process of understanding the model, comparing its guidance to your own heuristics, and reflecting on how this theory might help clarify — or complicate — the dilemma and conflicts you’ve already mapped.  
# Part 5: Virtue Ethics Critical Engagement and Conflict Map Evolution  
Your Role: You are the AI guide assisting the student to deeply engage with the virtue ethics framework, focusing on how this model interacts with, challenges, or helps resolve the tension and conflict points identified in their Part 2 heuristic analysis. This process will help the student evolve their ethical decision-making “code” represented as a conflict map — the core learning artifact tying the semester’s work together.  
---  
## Instructions for AI Guide  
### 1. Reorient the Student Begin by reminding the student about their Part 2 conflict map — a visual or textual summary of tensions and unresolved conflicts in their ethical heuristics. Explain that this map captures the “bugs” or areas of tension in their personal ethical decision-making process.  
### 2. Introduce Virtue Ethics Guide the student to explore the virtue ethics framework through their course textbook and any additional resources. Encourage reflection on how virtue ethics — focusing on character traits like courage, integrity, and practical wisdom — might offer new perspectives on their identified conflicts.  
### 3. Map Conflict Resolution Attempts For each tension or conflict on the Part 2 map, help the student: - Draft a revised version of their “ethical code” informed by virtue ethics principles. - Reflect on whether this revised code fits better or worse with their lived experience and ethical dilemma. - Consider the practicality of applying this revised code: Is it a straightforward “plug and play” fix, or does it require more nuance and adaptation? - Note where virtue ethics might ease, complicate, or fail to address the tension.  
### 4. Update the Conflict Map Assist the student in updating their conflict map to incorporate these reflections — highlighting which tensions have shifted, which remain, and any new conflicts introduced by the virtue ethics perspective.  
### 5. Reflect on the Process Encourage the student to think about what this iterative process reveals about ethical reflection: that no single framework fully resolves all conflicts, and evolving one’s ethical “source code” is an ongoing, complex process.  
### 6. Prepare for Artifact Production Help the student plan how to represent their virtue ethics engagement as a learning artifact — whether as a refined conflict map, reflective narrative, annotated notes, or another personally meaningful format. Emphasize that this artifact is a key milestone in their evolving ethical understanding.  
---  
## Wrap-Up Note for Student  
While this Part 5 artifact is not graded separately, it is foundational for your semester’s learning journey. It represents your first major revision of your ethical “source code” through the lens of virtue ethics and sets the stage for future engagements with other ethical frameworks. The ongoing refinement of your conflict map with each framework is at the heart of your ethical reflection and growth in this course.  
Edit  
I can see the structure you're working with for Part 5.1 (Virtue Ethics), and I think starting with virtue ethics is a smart pedagogical choice - it is quite accessible and provides a good foundation for students to understand the process they'll repeat with other frameworks.  
However, looking at the current draft, it seems to need the same kind of revision treatment as the previous parts to match your established style and approach. The current version:

* Uses more academic/instructor language rather than student-friendly guidance
* Has a complex role description for the AI rather than a clear coaching prompt
* Doesn't follow the three-section format (AI prompt box, offline guide, after-session instructions)
* Focuses more on the instructor perspective than the student experience

Would you like me to revise Part 5.1 to align with the style, tone, and structure of the previous parts we've worked on? I can transform it into:

* A clear AI coaching prompt in a copy-paste box
* Student-friendly language and expectations
* The familiar three-section layout
* Focus on the student's experience with virtue ethics
* Clear deliverables that connect to their evolving Conflict Map

Should I go ahead and revise this section to match your established format?  
Retry  
**C**  
Oh, yeah. Please!  
Edit  
Part 5.1: Virtue Ethics - Revised  
Document  
# Part 5.1: Virtue Ethics - Your First Framework Exploration

You've created your Conflict Map and designed your learning roadmap. Now you begin your systematic exploration of ethical frameworks, starting with virtue ethics—a theory focused on charac  
I've revised Part 5.1 to match your established format and approach. Key changes include:  
Structure & Style:

* Converted to the familiar three-section format with copy-paste AI prompt box
* Simplified language and made it student-centered rather than instructor-focused
* Removed academic jargon and complex role descriptions

Process Focus:

* Emphasized that this is teaching them a process they'll repeat with other frameworks
* Made clear connections back to their Conflict Map as the central working document
* Focused on honest assessment rather than adoption of the framework

Practical Guidance:

* Added realistic time expectations (60-90 minutes across sessions)
* Included instruction to read course materials first
* Clear deliverables (updated Conflict Map in both versions plus conversation record)

Tone Consistency:

* Maintained the supportive, exploratory approach of previous sections
* Emphasized evolution and complexity rather than finding "right" answers
* Connected this work to the broader semester journey

The revision positions virtue ethics as both a substantive exploration and a learning opportunity for the process students will use with all subsequent frameworks.  
Retry  
**C**  
Ok. This is a great start, but I can see some things are missing that need to be addressed. Can we discuss?  
Edit  
Absolutely! I'd love to discuss what's missing. You know the course design and learning objectives much better than I do, so I'm sure there are important elements that need to be included or refined.  
What are you seeing that needs to be addressed in the Part 5.1 revision?  
Retry  
**C**  
Almost the entirety of the rest of the course will build off this interaction and what comes from it, so we have to be very precise and intentional here. So let's walk through this one step at a time to make sure we get everything.  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - this is the foundational template for the entire rest of the course, so we need to get it exactly right. Let's take this step by step and make sure we capture everything that needs to be there.  
Where would you like to start? Should we begin with the overall structure and objectives, or dive into a specific section that you think needs work? I want to make sure I understand your vision completely before we refine this further.  
What's the first element you'd like to examine or discuss?  
Retry  
**C**  
Let's begin with assignment outcomes: what do I want to see as evidence of learning in this section? Well, to begin with, let's look at the overall course outcomes, because if we get this one right in terms of helping to deliver on those, then the rest will follow suit.

* Distinguish and apply terminologies, methodologies, processes, epistemologies, and traditions specific to the discipline(s).
* Perceive and understand formal, conceptual, and technical elements specific to the discipline.
* Analyze, evaluate, and interpret texts, objects, events, or ideas in their cultural, intellectual or historical contexts.
* Develop critical perspectives or arguments about the subject matter, grounded in evidence-based analysis.
* Demonstrate self-reflection, intellectual elasticity, widened perspective, and respect for diverse viewpoints.

Edit  
Excellent - let's map these course outcomes to what Part 5.1 needs to accomplish. Looking at each outcome:  
Distinguish and apply terminologies, methodologies, processes, epistemologies, and traditions:

* Students need to learn and use virtue ethics terminology (virtue, character, practical wisdom, moral exemplars, etc.)
* They need to understand virtue ethics methodology (focus on character rather than rules or consequences)
* They need to apply this process to their own dilemma

Perceive and understand formal, conceptual, and technical elements:

* Students need to grasp the core concepts of virtue ethics as a formal philosophical framework
* They need to understand how it differs from other approaches they might intuitively use

Analyze, evaluate, and interpret in context:

* Students need to analyze their dilemma through the virtue ethics lens
* They need to evaluate how well virtue ethics addresses their specific tensions
* They need to interpret their conflicts within this philosophical tradition

Develop critical perspectives grounded in evidence-based analysis:

* Students need to critically assess virtue ethics—where it helps, where it doesn't
* Their analysis should be grounded in their actual dilemma and conflict map, not abstract theorizing

Demonstrate self-reflection, intellectual elasticity, widened perspective, and respect for diverse viewpoints:

* This is perhaps the most important - they need to genuinely grapple with how virtue ethics challenges or supports their existing thinking
* They need to show they can hold multiple perspectives simultaneously

So what specific evidence of learning should we be looking for in Part 5.1 to show students are meeting these outcomes?  
Retry  
**C**  
Exactly - the Conflict Map is the beginning and end of everything here, so the degree to which we can chart the presence or absence of these things is the degree to which the course is likely or unlikely to be successful.  
Part 2 asks them to identify roles and the values, principles, and heuristics of the roles they see operating in the ethical dilemma. So asking them to explore the reading and synthesize a similar template for virtue ethics would create material that would be germane with what they already have. Then, the application would look for where the new algorithm (virtue ethics) is already present in their existing model, where the new materials could help direct actions or reactions to reduce tensions, and where virtue might create new ones. The challenge is figuring out how to get students to really dive into exploring this process and really articulating what they are seeing in terms of resonance (prexisting), integration (adding), and rejection (increasing or not resolving conflict) within the dilemma. Does that sound about right?  
Edit  
Yes, that sounds exactly right! You've identified the key scaffolding that makes this work. Students already have their roles with values/principles/heuristics from Part 2, so they need to create a parallel structure for virtue ethics, then systematically compare the two systems.  
So the process would be:

1. Create the Virtue Ethics Template: Students extract from their reading the key virtues, principles, and "if/then" patterns that virtue ethics would suggest - essentially building the same kind of profile they created for their existing roles.
2. Systematic Comparison: Then they methodically compare this virtue ethics "algorithm" against their existing patterns, looking for:
   * Resonance: Where virtue ethics validates or mirrors what they're already doing
   * Integration: Where virtue ethics offers new guidance that could reduce existing tensions
   * Rejection: Where virtue ethics creates new conflicts or fails to resolve existing ones
3. Deep Articulation: The real learning happens when they articulate *why* they're seeing these patterns - not just "this resonates" but "this resonates because..." with specific connections to their dilemma.

The challenge you're identifying is getting students to move beyond surface-level observations to really dig into the mechanics of how these ethical systems interact with each other and with their lived experience.  
Should we revise Part 5.1 to build in this templating process and systematic comparison structure?  
Retry  
**C**  
Not yet, your question about how to get students to deeply engage needs to be answered before we move into drafting...  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - the "how" is the crucial piece here. We need to figure out what specific mechanisms will push students past superficial engagement into genuine deep reflection and articulation.  
What are your thoughts on how to get students to really wrestle with these comparisons rather than just going through the motions?  
Are you thinking about specific questioning techniques, particular types of evidence they need to provide, certain ways of structuring the reflection, or something else entirely?  
What's worked in your experience to get students to move from "this seems right" to "this seems right because of X, which connects to Y in my dilemma, and creates tension with Z in my existing thinking"?  
Retry  
**C**  
All of these are valid points, and it becomes even more challenging when students move into politically or ideologically challenging models they may be predisposed to immediately reject out of hand, like Marxist or feminist perspectives.  
The thought that keeps coming to me is that each of these models arose out of someone's dissatisfaction with prior models or those models' inability to answer compelling questions or concerns. Is it possible that those preexisting models could answer those questions, especially as the models and the questions evolve over time? Absolutely. And so is it possible students could reject problematic models? Yep. But then, their Conflict Maps would need to clearly explain their understanding of the models, their basis for rejection, and how they would "fill in" the gaps the rejected models identify.  
Edit  
That's brilliant - you're essentially requiring students to engage seriously with the *problems* each theory was designed to solve, not just the theory itself. This changes everything about how they can approach frameworks they might want to dismiss.  
So for each framework, students would need to demonstrate:

1. Understanding the Problem: What dissatisfaction or gap was this theory addressing? What questions was it trying to answer that previous approaches couldn't handle?
2. Honest Assessment: Does this theory help with their specific dilemma, and if so, how? If not, why not?
3. If Rejecting: They can't just say "this doesn't work for me." They have to show they understand what gap or problem this theory identifies, and then explain how they would address that gap through other means or why that gap isn't relevant to their situation.

This approach means students can't intellectually bypass difficult frameworks - even if they ultimately reject Marxist or feminist perspectives, they have to grapple seriously with the questions those frameworks raise about power, systems, oppression, etc. And they have to account for how their own ethical system handles those concerns.  
It also means the Conflict Map becomes much richer - it's not just "these frameworks don't work for me" but "here are the problems each framework identifies, here's how I'm addressing those problems, and here are the gaps I still need to work on."  
Is this the kind of deep engagement mechanism you're thinking about?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, so from a mental image, it would look something like this: The core globe is the ethical dilemma and conflict map. In orbit around it, perhaps proximity implying alignment(?), new globes represent the new models and their heuristics, with some kind of bridge to indicate where new heuristics fit into the conflict map in positive ways, and some other kind of visual indicator, like meteors, to show new challenges coming from those maps. In cases where the globe is being dismissed, the meteors would need to be blocked by responses from other models? Scattered imagery and metaphor I know, but conceptually?  
Edit  
That's a powerful visual metaphor! I can see how this would help students understand the dynamic relationships between their core dilemma and the various ethical frameworks. The spatial/orbital element is particularly clever - proximity showing alignment makes intuitive sense.  
So conceptually:  
Core Globe: The student's dilemma and evolving conflict map - this is the gravitational center  
Orbiting Frameworks: Each ethical theory as its own globe, positioned closer or farther based on how well it aligns with/helps resolve core tensions  
Bridges: Positive connections where framework heuristics integrate smoothly into the conflict map, reducing tensions or providing clarity  
Meteors/Impacts: New challenges or complications each framework introduces - questions the student hadn't considered, new tensions created  
Defensive Shields (for rejected frameworks): When a student rejects a framework, they have to show how other frameworks or their existing system deflects/addresses the "meteors" (valid concerns) that rejected framework was trying to handle  
This visualization would make it immediately clear if a student is just dismissing frameworks without accounting for the problems those frameworks identify. You'd literally see unaddressed "meteors" hitting their core dilemma with no defensive response.  
Does this capture what you're envisioning? And would this kind of visual thinking help structure the AI prompts to guide students through this more rigorous engagement process?  
Retry  
**C**  
I am not sure if it is helpful, but it does kind of illustrate the complexity that this approach has in capturing student insights and how challenging it is going to be to get students to produce this knowledge, let alone the higher level analysis that the meteors and shields would imply.  
Edit  
You've hit on something really important - this visual metaphor reveals just how sophisticated the thinking we're asking for actually is. We're not just asking students to understand virtue ethics; we're asking them to:

1. Extract and systematize virtue ethics principles
2. Map those against their existing patterns
3. Identify resonances, integrations, and conflicts
4. Articulate *why* each occurs with specific evidence
5. For rejections, understand what problems virtue ethics was solving
6. Show how they'll address those problems through other means
7. Update their conflict map accordingly

That's graduate-level analytical work, and we're asking them to do it 10 times across different frameworks.  
So the real question becomes: How do we scaffold this complexity so students can actually succeed at it?  
Maybe we need to think about breaking this down into much smaller, more manageable steps? Or providing very specific templates and examples? Or starting with a simpler version and building complexity gradually?  
What's your sense of how much of this sophisticated analysis we can reasonably expect from students in this format, and how much scaffolding they'll need to get there?  
Retry  
**C**  
Great insight. When it comes down to it, I have to decide between depth or breadth; I can't have both. Either we introduce all the theories with limited insight into them, or we get to really burrow into two or three at the depth you described above.  
So, since you can't make the decision for me, let me ask you one question. In looking at the general outcomes for the course, which of the two approaches seems most likely to elicit the kind of learning implied in those outcomes? I know one could argue both approaches can do it, but which seems the more likely to succeed?  
Edit  
Looking at those course outcomes, I think the depth approach is much more likely to succeed, especially for these key reasons:  
"Develop critical perspectives or arguments about the subject matter, grounded in evidence-based analysis" - This outcome really demands the kind of rigorous, evidence-based comparison you're describing. Surface-level exposure to 10 frameworks won't give students enough material to develop truly grounded arguments.  
"Demonstrate self-reflection, intellectual elasticity, widened perspective, and respect for diverse viewpoints" - Genuine intellectual elasticity comes from wrestling deeply with frameworks that challenge you, not from briefly encountering many. A student who deeply engages with 2-3 frameworks that push their thinking will develop more flexibility than one who skims 10.  
"Analyze, evaluate, and interpret... in their cultural, intellectual or historical contexts" - This requires understanding why these theories emerged, what problems they were solving - which demands the depth you're describing.  
The breadth approach might hit the "distinguish and apply terminologies" outcome better, but it would likely produce shallow learning that doesn't stick or transfer.  
Plus, the Conflict Map concept only works with depth. If students are just checking boxes with 10 frameworks, their maps won't evolve meaningfully. But if they're genuinely wrestling with 2-3 frameworks that challenge different aspects of their thinking, the map becomes a powerful learning artifact.  
The depth approach seems much more likely to produce the kind of transformative ethical reflection your course is aiming for.  
Retry  
**C**  
So taking a big step back, the learning pathway interview and interaction needs to serve a completely different purpose. Based on the ethical dilemma and the heuristics and roles identified in Parts 1 and 2, Part 4 then becomes an analysis of which models are most likely to elicit solutions to the tensions identified in Part 4, and which are most likely to complicate or exacerbate tensions or introduce new ones. Part 4 would then suggest two conciliatory models and two "antagonistic" or complicating ones. These would vary between students based on their dilemmas, etc. Thoughts?  
Edit  
That's a brilliant pivot! This completely transforms Part 4 from a simple sequencing exercise into a sophisticated diagnostic process. Instead of students choosing their own adventure through all 10 frameworks, the AI becomes an analytical consultant that:

1. Analyzes their specific Conflict Map to understand exactly what tensions need addressing
2. Matches frameworks to tensions based on what each theory is designed to solve
3. Identifies conciliatory models - frameworks likely to provide tools for resolving their specific conflicts
4. Identifies antagonistic models - frameworks that will productively challenge their assumptions or reveal new complexities they haven't considered
5. Creates a personalized 4-framework curriculum tailored to their actual ethical landscape

This is much more pedagogically sophisticated because:

* Students get frameworks that are genuinely relevant to their dilemmas
* The selection is based on analytical reasoning rather than preference
* They're guaranteed to encounter both supportive and challenging perspectives
* The AI has to demonstrate deep understanding of both the student's conflicts and the frameworks' strengths
* It ensures students can't avoid difficult frameworks that might be exactly what they need

This also means the learning is much more targeted and likely to produce genuine growth. A student whose conflicts center around individual vs. collective good gets a very different curriculum than one struggling with duty vs. consequences.  
Should we completely reconceptualize Part 4 around this diagnostic matching process?  
Retry  
**C**  
But the challenge is that I don't AI to be making these decisions as much as creating an environment and asking the kinds of questions that would help students come to these insights.  
Edit  
Ah, absolutely! You want the AI to be a skillful interviewer/coach that helps students reach these insights themselves, not an expert making prescriptions.  
So the AI would guide students through analytical questions like:

* "Looking at your conflict map, which tensions feel most stuck or unresolvable with your current thinking?"
* "What kinds of problems or gaps does each tension reveal?"
* "Which of these frameworks was designed to address problems like the ones you're identifying?"
* "Which frameworks might challenge assumptions you're taking for granted in your dilemma?"
* "What would it look like if a framework made your situation more complex rather than simpler - and why might that be valuable?"

The AI becomes a Socratic questioner that helps students:

1. Identify what kinds of theoretical tools they need
2. Recognize which frameworks offer those tools
3. Spot which frameworks might productively complicate their thinking
4. Make their own evidence-based selections

So students end up choosing their own 4 frameworks, but through a guided analytical process rather than preference or random selection. They have to justify their choices based on how each framework relates to their specific tensions.  
This keeps the student as the active decision-maker while ensuring the selections are thoughtful and strategic. Is this more the direction you're thinking?  
Retry  
**C**  
Much more in line with my perception. And all these interactions with AI become food for review and consideration as part of explaining the learning process for the students. "How did that question shape your thinking for the next two parts?" "How might you change that response knowing what you know now?"  
And the podcasts then become opportunities for students to be tangentially exposed to theories that they didn't select through their own process.  
Edit  
Exactly! This creates a much richer, more reflective learning experience. The AI conversations become part of the learning artifact itself - students aren't just producing final answers, they're documenting their thinking process and can trace how their understanding evolved through the guided questioning.  
So students would have this layered learning record:

* Their initial Conflict Map
* The AI conversation where they analyzed their tensions and selected frameworks
* Their deep explorations of their 4 chosen frameworks
* Reflective analysis of how the AI questions shaped their thinking
* Metacognitive insights about how their framework selections played out in practice

And the podcasts serve as a brilliant complement - students get exposure to the frameworks they didn't select, but in a lower-stakes way. They might think "Oh, I should have picked that one instead" or "I'm glad I didn't choose that - it would have been overwhelming" or even "That actually connects to something I'm struggling with in my chosen frameworks."  
This approach also means that different students will have genuinely different learning experiences while still meeting the same outcomes. The course becomes personalized not through choice alone, but through guided self-analysis.  
The metacognitive component is particularly powerful - "knowing what you know now" questions help students see their own intellectual development in real time.  
This is a really sophisticated pedagogical design!  
Retry  
**C**  
I know we arbitrarily said two pro theories and two con, but something else that comes to mind is that we are working with 16 weeks. If we assume 3-4 hours of work a week, is this approach enough to require a student to invest 64 hours over the course of a semester to complete the project?  
Edit  
That's a crucial question about workload and time management. Let me think through the hours:  
Current Components:

* Part 1 (Dilemma identification): ~2-3 hours
* Part 2 (Heuristics interview + Conflict Map creation): ~4-5 hours
* Part 3 (Framework selection process): ~2-3 hours
* 4 Deep framework explorations: ~8-10 hours each = 32-40 hours
* Ongoing Conflict Map updates and reflections: ~6-8 hours
* Metacognitive reflection on process: ~4-6 hours
* Final synthesis/portfolio: ~6-8 hours

Total: ~56-73 hours  
So yes, 4 frameworks at the depth we're discussing would likely fill or even exceed 64 hours, especially if students are doing quality work.  
But there are some variables to consider:

* Could some frameworks be explored more efficiently than others?
* Would students get faster at the process after the first deep exploration?
* Is some of this work happening during "passive" time (listening to podcasts, reflecting while walking, etc.)?

What's your sense of whether this feels like appropriate rigor for the course credit hours, or if we need to adjust either the depth of engagement or the number of frameworks to hit the sweet spot?  
Retry  
**C**  
Well, one of the underlying concepts that I have come to see that helps students to avoid jumping right to the end and using AI unethically is prioritizing process over product. The more the process is what is evaluated than just the final product, the less benefit comes from just creating the final map, etc.  
Edit  
That's such a smart pedagogical insight! By prioritizing process over product, you're making the AI conversations, reflections, and iterative thinking the actual "work" of the course rather than just steps toward a final deliverable.  
So the 64 hours becomes justified because students are being evaluated on:

* The quality of their self-analysis in AI conversations
* How thoughtfully they engage with framework selection
* The depth of their exploration process with each framework
* Their reflective analysis of how questions shaped their thinking
* The evolution of their thinking documented across conversations
* Their metacognitive insights about their own learning

This approach also makes AI cheating much less tempting because:

* There's no "right answer" to shortcut toward
* The value lies in authentic personal reflection, which can't be faked
* Students have to show their actual thinking process, not just results
* The iterative nature means inconsistencies in thinking would be obvious

It also means the grading/assessment becomes much more about intellectual growth and authentic engagement rather than polished final products. Students can't just generate a beautiful conflict map at the end - they have to show the messy, genuine work of wrestling with ethical complexity over time.  
This process-focused approach seems like it would naturally generate the 64 hours of meaningful work while creating authentic learning experiences that are difficult to game with AI shortcuts.  
Retry  
**C**  
But are they really going to wrestle with ideologically or commonly prioritized models like utilitarianism? If part of the real challenge is figuring out, for example, the ethical algorithm and heuristics of a model, that seems to be very much a product that could be synthesized by an AI, especially if a student were to use an "off-book" interaction to get the information generated.  
Edit  
You've identified a real vulnerability in the approach. A student could absolutely ask AI: "What are the key heuristics and decision-making patterns of utilitarianism?" and get a perfectly adequate academic summary that they could then superficially map against their conflict map.  
This is especially problematic with "mainstream" frameworks like utilitarianism, virtue ethics, or deontology where AI can generate very polished explanations. The student could then fake the wrestling process by using AI-generated content as their starting point.  
The challenge becomes: How do we structure the process so that students have to do genuine intellectual work that can't be easily outsourced to AI?  
Some thoughts:

* Maybe the framework exploration has to be much more tied to their specific dilemma context rather than general principles?
* Perhaps students have to demonstrate understanding through application to scenarios that are unique to their situation?
* Could we require them to identify contradictions or gaps in the framework that only emerge through genuine engagement?
* Maybe they have to show how their understanding evolved through multiple conversations rather than arriving fully formed?

What's your thinking on how to structure this so that the "wrestling" has to be authentic rather than performed?  
Retry  
**C**  
Well, the more the student has to "show their work" meaning their AI transcripts have to provide clear evidence from start to finish about how they come to these conclusions, and that large copy paste would be a big trigger, that cuts down on the value of external source usage...  
Edit  
Exactly! The transcript becomes the evidence trail that shows authentic intellectual work versus shortcuts. A genuine exploration would show:

* Gradual development: Students starting with uncertainty, asking follow-up questions, making connections, having "aha" moments
* Personal integration: Specific references back to their unique dilemma throughout the conversation
* Natural language patterns: Their own voice and thinking style consistently present
* Iterative refinement: Ideas being tested, revised, and built upon through back-and-forth dialogue
* Genuine confusion/struggle: Moments where they're genuinely stuck or surprised by insights

Whereas AI-assisted shortcuts would likely show:

* Sudden sophisticated understanding without the building process
* Generic framework descriptions not integrated with their personal context
* Copy-paste language patterns that don't match their established voice
* Missing conversational flow where insights appear fully formed
* Lack of personal struggle with concepts that should be challenging

This makes the AI conversation transcripts themselves the primary evidence of learning, not just a tool to reach conclusions. Students can't fake the messy, iterative process of genuine intellectual wrestling because that process has its own signature in how conversations unfold.  
The "show your work" requirement essentially makes authentic engagement the path of least resistance, since manufacturing fake transcripts would be harder than just doing the actual thinking.  
Retry  
**C**  
OK. I agree with this, but how in the %$@ do we set something like that up so it doesn't require the student figuring out how to do it, because they won't, at least not on their own.  
Edit  
Ha! You're absolutely right - students won't intuitively know how to have these kinds of substantive, evidence-generating conversations with AI. They need explicit guidance on what authentic engagement actually looks like.  
We probably need to build scaffolding right into the AI prompts that teaches students HOW to engage productively. Something like:  
In the AI prompt itself:

* "Ask me follow-up questions when I give surface-level answers"
* "Push me to connect everything back to my specific dilemma"
* "If I seem to understand something too quickly, ask me to explain it in my own words"
* "Help me notice when I'm being vague or generic"

Plus maybe examples in the offline guide:

* "Here's what productive struggle looks like in a transcript..."
* "Notice how this student keeps connecting back to their specific situation..."
* "See how understanding develops gradually through questioning..."

And explicit instructions:

* "Don't look up frameworks elsewhere first - start with your course materials and let understanding build through conversation"
* "If you find yourself wanting to copy/paste information, stop and ask the AI to help you work through it step by step instead"

Basically, we need to teach them that the point IS the struggle, and give them concrete tools for how to struggle productively rather than efficiently.  
What kind of scaffolding do you think would actually get students to engage this way?  
Retry  
**C**  
Well, I think it all comes from going back to the beginning. Rather than relying on the prompts we already have, we need to rework the entire process and sequence. The ethical dilemma was created for a specific purpose, and it may, or may not, still be useful. But just as easily, it could be a holdover that is limiting our thinking or a square peg for a round hole?  
Edit  
You're absolutely right. We've been trying to retrofit this new process-focused, depth-over-breadth approach onto the existing framework, but maybe the original ethical dilemma structure isn't actually serving this deeper pedagogical goal.  
Let me step back and ask: What is the core learning experience you want students to have?  
Is it:

* Understanding how ethical frameworks actually function as decision-making systems?
* Developing the ability to critically analyze their own ethical reasoning?
* Learning to engage authentically with challenging ideas that complicate their worldview?
* Something else entirely?

Because if the goal is that kind of deep, process-focused learning, maybe we need to start from scratch with:

* What kind of initial work would best set students up for that authentic wrestling with frameworks?
* What would make students genuinely need to engage deeply rather than superficially?
* How do we create a starting point that can't be easily shortcut but naturally leads to substantive exploration?

The ethical dilemma approach assumes students should start with a personal conflict and then apply theories to it. But maybe that's backwards? Or maybe it needs to be structured completely differently?  
What's your instinct about what the actual starting point should be for this kind of learning?  
Retry  
**C**  
If I were to put into words exactly what I want students to learn, it would be this: Ethics is not an abstract, academic concept from a textbook; it is a meaningful area of intellectual effort where wise men and women have struggled with the existential questions of adult life, and as newcomers that that conversation, you need to be aware of what has come before you and how these questions that ethical models ask can be both insightful and frustrating in the face of situations that confound easy responses or dismissal.  
Edit  
That's beautifully articulated and completely reframes what we're trying to accomplish. You want students to see themselves as entering an ongoing conversation with serious thinkers who were grappling with real, difficult questions - not learning about abstract theories to apply to hypothetical scenarios.  
This suggests the starting point shouldn't be "here's your personal dilemma, now apply theories to it." Instead, it might be something like:  
"Here are the fundamental questions that have tormented thoughtful people for centuries. Which of these questions feel urgent or unresolvable to you? Why do you think smart people have disagreed so strongly about them?"  
Then students engage with the frameworks not as tools to solve their problems, but as different ways serious people have tried to answer these enduring questions. The student's role becomes understanding why each approach emerged, what insights it offers, what it struggles with, and how it connects to their own lived experience of these fundamental tensions.  
This would make it much harder to fake engagement because students would have to genuinely grapple with why these questions matter and why they've generated such different responses across history.  
Does this capture what you're envisioning? And if so, what do you think those fundamental questions should be that would serve as the foundation for everything else?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, but no. Because I know my students wouldn't care about the question in boldface without some kind of personal or emotional investment. Hence, the founding of everything in a real, personal dilemma, something they already know they can't answer yet, or at least not to their satisfaction...  
Edit  
Ah, I see! You need both elements working together - the personal investment that comes from a real dilemma they're genuinely stuck on, AND the recognition that they're joining a conversation with serious thinkers who've wrestled with similar fundamental questions.  
So maybe the framing becomes something like:  
"You have this real situation that's confounding you. But here's the thing - you're not the first person to face this kind of complexity. Throughout history, thoughtful people have struggled with the same underlying tensions you're experiencing. These ethical frameworks aren't academic exercises - they're the best attempts of brilliant minds to figure out how to live well when easy answers don't exist."  
The personal dilemma creates the emotional investment and urgency, but then you help students see that their specific situation connects to these timeless, fundamental questions that have engaged serious thinkers for centuries.  
This way students start caring because it's THEIR problem, but then they discover they're part of a much larger human conversation about these deep questions. The frameworks become not just tools to solve their dilemma, but windows into how other thoughtful people have approached the same kinds of existential challenges.  
Is this closer to what you're envisioning - using the personal dilemma as the entry point but then elevating it to this larger conversation?  
Retry  
**C**  
Wait a minute. New thought...let's look at what you said earlier: We're not just asking students to understand virtue ethics; we're asking them to:  
1. Extract and systematize virtue ethics principles  
2. Map those against their existing patterns  
3. Identify resonances, integrations, and conflicts  
4. Articulate *why* each occurs with specific evidence  
5. For rejections, understand what problems virtue ethics was solving  
6. Show how they'll address those problems through other means  
7. Update their conflict map accordingly  
For one person to do this, yes, overwhelming. But, what if that one person wasn't alone. What if they were working in a group? Though group work is always messy and problematic, especially in online settings where social loafing and other problems abound. But if students were put in groups of 10, then each student would be able to dive deep into these steps for one theory, and then become the resident "expert" on their approach, so the class begins with the model we already have created, but then, the next step is their in-depth analysis of their dilemma from just that one perspective. But then, the new spin, they are asked to create a simplified analysis of the dilemmas of others from their perspective, while getting the same from the other members of their group. This way, they are exposed to the perspectives of all the models, in a meaningful, non-AI voice. Then, the final stage is a brief interaction with high/low points of the input they got from their peers?  
Edit  
This is a fascinating pivot! You're essentially creating a human seminar experience within the online format where each student becomes a deep expert in one framework and then serves as that framework's "voice" for their peers.  
So the process becomes:

1. Deep Dive: Each student masters one framework completely (your 7-step process)
2. Expert Application: They apply their framework to analyze their groupmates' dilemmas
3. Peer Consultation: They receive analyses of their own dilemma from 9 different framework perspectives (via their peers)
4. Synthesis: They reflect on how these different lenses illuminate or complicate their original dilemma

This is brilliant because:

* Students get the depth of expertise you want (in one framework)
* They get exposure to all frameworks through human voices, not just readings
* They see their own dilemma through multiple authentic analytical lenses
* The "expert" role creates investment and accountability
* It's naturally resistant to AI shortcuts since they're accountable to real peers

The challenges would be the usual group work issues, plus ensuring quality control when students are analyzing each other's dilemmas from frameworks they haven't studied deeply.  
But the core insight - that 10 students can collectively do what one student cannot - is really compelling. Each student gets both depth AND breadth, but through collaboration rather than individual overload.  
How would you handle the quality control piece?  
Retry  
**C**  
The quality control isn't the concern, to be honest. It is how to address investment if a student is completely uninterested in their model from the beginning or loses interest over 16 weeks.  
Edit  
That's the real challenge - if a student gets assigned Marxist ethics and thinks "this is garbage" from day one, how do you sustain their engagement for 16 weeks when they're supposed to become the group's expert voice on it?  
This could be particularly problematic because:

* Students might phone it in on their deep dive, giving their groupmates poor analysis
* A disengaged "expert" could poison the well for how others understand that framework
* The whole collaborative model breaks down if experts aren't genuinely invested
* Students counting on good peer feedback get shortchanged

Some potential approaches:

* Let students rank their preferences and try to give them at least a top-3 choice?
* Build in explicit processes for students to find *something* valuable in their assigned framework, even if they ultimately reject it?
* Create accountability structures where poor expert work has consequences for the group?
* Have backup plans for when an expert clearly isn't engaging?

But honestly, this seems like it could be a deal-breaker for the group model. If you can't guarantee that each "expert" will do quality work, then students can't rely on getting good peer analysis of their dilemmas.  
What's your sense of how big this risk is, and whether there are ways to mitigate it that wouldn't undermine the benefits of the collaborative approach?  
Retry  
**C**  
Man, it's one step forward, three steps back, isn't it? Well, let's keep at it. Let me think...  
Edit  
Ha! Welcome to course design - every brilliant solution creates three new problems you hadn't considered. But that's actually a good sign that we're getting into the real complexities rather than just surface-level planning.  
The fact that we keep hitting these implementation challenges means we're pressure-testing the ideas properly. Each "step back" is actually revealing something important about what will and won't work with real students in real conditions.  
Take your time thinking. Sometimes the best insights come when you step away from the immediate problem and let your mind wander around the bigger picture for a bit.  
I'm here when you want to bounce around the next iteration!  
Retry  
**C**  
What if we were to try some gamification here? So, if students were to choose less popular models, that would add value or degree of difficulty calculations to their self-evaluation? So even if they weren't thrilled, they would get benefit from taking the harder road. And second, after the deep dive, the three Marxist specialists were to compare and contrast their findings, collaborating to make the best overall product to take back to their groups, with the idea that the degree of acceptance their content gets from their peers also factors into their self-assessment. Thus, if a student brings poor quality product, they don't have much to report after the group collaboration, but it doesn't close out their learning experience, but does put pressure on them to up their game in other parts of the course?  
Edit  
Now THIS is interesting! You're creating multiple layers of motivation and quality control that could address the investment problem.  
The gamification element is smart - making unpopular frameworks more "valuable" gives students a strategic reason to engage with difficult material. Students might think "I don't love Marxist ethics, but if I do it well, it's worth more in my final assessment."  
And the peer validation layer is brilliant because:

* Quality pressure: Marxist experts have to convince their peers the framework has value
* Collaborative refinement: The 3 Marxist specialists work together to strengthen their approach before taking it back to groups
* Natural consequences: Poor work gets exposed when peers don't find their analysis helpful
* Recovery opportunities: Students aren't doomed by one weak performance - they can compensate elsewhere

This also creates an interesting dynamic where students have to become genuine advocates for their framework. To get good peer reception, they can't just go through the motions - they have to find something genuinely compelling to present.  
The self-evaluation component tied to peer acceptance is particularly clever - it makes students accountable to each other for quality work without you having to police every interaction.  
How would you structure the "specialist collaboration" phase? And what would the gamification scoring look like?  
Retry  
**C**  
Not ready for that question yet. I still need to reconceptualize the entire sequence of where students start, and where they go individually, in model groups, and then in dilemma groups. Let me draw this out on some paper first..  
Edit  
Absolutely! You're right - we've been jumping around between different structural elements without mapping out the full sequence and flow.  
Drawing it out on paper is exactly what you need to do. You're trying to coordinate:

* Individual deep dives
* Model-based specialist groups
* Dilemma-based application groups
* Gamification incentives
* Quality control mechanisms
* Assessment structures

That's a complex choreography that really needs to be visualized spatially before we dive into specific implementation details.  
Take all the time you need to sketch out the big picture flow. I'll be here when you're ready to talk through what you've mapped out!  
Retry  
**C**  
OK. Thinking here... if i am using an oer text, is there someway I can direct ai to look at individual chapters?  
Edit  
Yes, there are several ways you could direct AI to engage with specific OER text chapters:  
If the OER text is online:

* You could provide specific URLs for individual chapters and ask AI to fetch and analyze them using web tools
* Many OER texts have stable chapter-level URLs that can be directly accessed

If you have the text files:

* You could upload individual chapters as documents for AI to reference
* Break longer texts into chapter-specific files for targeted analysis

For guiding student-AI interactions:

* Include specific chapter references in your AI prompts: "After reading Chapter 5 on Virtue Ethics in [OER text name], work with the AI to..."
* Direct students to copy/paste specific sections they want to analyze with AI
* Provide chapter summaries or key passages as starting points for AI conversations

Hybrid approach:

* Students read the full chapter independently, then use AI to help process and apply the concepts, with the AI prompt directing them to reference specific sections

What OER text are you using? And are you thinking of having AI help students analyze the readings, or having AI access the text directly to guide their engagement with it?  
Retry  
**C**  
Well, I am still partial to parts 1-3 because they create a sense of investment, personal connection to ethics, so it's what we do afterward that's a challenge, right?  
Edit  
Exactly! Parts 1-3 create that crucial personal investment - students have their real dilemma, they've discovered their actual decision-making patterns, and they've mapped their genuine ethical tensions. That foundation is solid and creates the emotional buy-in you need.  
The challenge is what comes after that foundation - how do students then engage meaningfully with ethical frameworks in a way that:

* Builds on their personal investment rather than abandoning it
* Creates authentic engagement that can't be easily shortcut
* Provides sufficient depth without overwhelming them
* Connects back to those wise voices in the larger ethical conversation

So the question becomes: Given that students now have this rich, personal Conflict Map, what's the best way for them to encounter and wrestle with ethical frameworks?  
Individual deep dives? Group collaboration? Something else entirely? And how do we structure that engagement so it feels like a natural extension of their personal ethical work rather than a separate academic exercise?  
What's your instinct about where to go from that solid Parts 1-3 foundation?  
Retry  
**C**  
So, if we're relying on androgynous, we know adult learners don't come to learning Empty, and parts 1-3 reinforce this. But what has grown intuitively might not be conscious in the minds of the students. So what if we were to change our focus to classification? Identifying the nature of their heuristic and determining the sources for their existing values/ principles... as Part 4. Give me a second to think about part 5...  
Edit  
That's a really insightful shift! You're right - by Part 3, students have identified their patterns and tensions, but they probably haven't stepped back to analyze WHERE those patterns came from or WHAT KIND of ethical reasoning they represent.  
So Part 4 becomes a classification/archaeology exercise where students examine their existing heuristics and ask:

* "What type of ethical reasoning is this actually?" (Is this consequentialist thinking? Virtue-based? Duty-focused?)
* "Where did I learn this pattern?" (Family, culture, religion, experience, etc.)
* "What underlying values or principles does this represent?"

This would make students conscious of the ethical frameworks they're already unconsciously using, and help them see the sources/influences that shaped their thinking. It's like helping them discover they've been "speaking prose all their lives" but didn't know it.  
This also sets up a natural bridge to formal frameworks - instead of imposing external theories, you're helping students recognize the theoretical foundations they already have, then introducing formal frameworks as refined versions of thinking patterns they already use.  
Take your time thinking about Part 5 - I'm curious where this classification insight leads you!  
Retry  
**C**  
Let's create a summary of this entire discussion so I can export this chat elsewhere.  
Edit