# Coffee Shop Ethical Dilemma
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# Ethical Dilemma Identification Guide with AI Coaching ## Instructions for Students This document contains two parts: (1) a decision tree to help you identify a suitable ethical dilemma for semester-long analysis, and (2) coaching instructions for AI assistance. \*\*To use this guide:\*\* 1. Copy t  
pasted  
**C**  
# Ethical Dilemma Draft for Instructor Review  
Student: [Sample Student Response]  
Date: July 30, 2025  
## Core Situation  
As a part-time coffee shop employee, I face competing obligations regarding my manager's scheduling practices that appear to disadvantage older workers in favor of younger staff like myself.  
Specific Context: My manager consistently assigns fewer lucrative weekend shifts to employees in their 50s and 60s, citing that younger workers are "more energetic" and "better with the weekend crowd," while the older employees have expressed they rely on weekend tips to supplement their income.  
## Key Roles and Competing Obligations  
- Employee dependent on job security: Speaking up risks my position and income that I genuinely need  
- Beneficiary of current system: I receive preferred weekend shifts that older colleagues need more than I do  
- Friend/colleague: Older employees invested significant time training me and building supportive relationships  
- Person with fairness values: I believe age-based scheduling decisions may constitute workplace discrimination  
## Ethical Complexity Analysis  
This situation demonstrates genuine ethical complexity because different moral frameworks suggest conflicting approaches:  
- Utilitarian analysis might weigh the collective financial harm to older workers against the individual risk to my job security and family obligations  
- Duty-based ethics might focus on my obligation to speak against potential discrimination regardless of personal consequences  
- Virtue ethics might examine what character traits (loyalty, courage, justice) should guide my response and to whom those virtues are owed  
The ongoing nature of weekly scheduling decisions means this dilemma will persist throughout my employment, requiring sustained ethical reflection rather than a one-time choice.  
## Stakeholder Groups Affected  
1. Older employees facing reduced income and potential age discrimination  
2. Younger employees (including myself) who benefit from current scheduling practices  
3. Management who believe they are making practical business decisions about service quality  
4. Customers who receive service during busy weekend periods  
5. My own competing role obligations across employment, relationships, and personal values  
## Ongoing Significance  
This situation represents recurring scheduling decisions and reflects broader questions about workplace fairness, personal integrity, and the moral responsibilities that come with benefiting from potentially unfair systems. The dilemma will require ongoing navigation rather than a single resolution, making it suitable for semester-long ethical analysis.  
---  
Confirmation: This dilemma meets all criteria from the identification process - I have decision-making power, occupy multiple authentic roles with competing obligations, face genuine moral complexity where the "right answer" is not predetermined, and will encounter this pattern throughout my continued employment.  
Edit  
I can see you've shared the Ethical Dilemma Identification Guide with AI Coaching instructions. This looks like a comprehensive framework designed to help students work through complex ethical situations for academic analysis.  
I notice you've also included what appears to be a sample "Ethical Dilemma Draft" at the end, showing how a student might document their situation after working through the decision tree process.  
Are you looking to:

1. Work through this process yourself to identify an ethical dilemma you're facing?
2. Get feedback on the guide itself or the sample draft?
3. Use this framework to help someone else work through their situation?

I'm ready to follow the coaching guidelines outlined in the document - focusing on asking guiding questions rather than providing solutions, helping you explore complexity, and encouraging you to think through your own decision-making process. Just let me know how you'd like to proceed!  
Retry  
# Part 2: Ethical Heuristics Discovery Report \*\*Student:\*\* [Sample Student Response] \*\*Date:\*\* July 30, 2025 \*\*Ethical Dilemma:\*\* Coffee shop scheduling practices that disadvantage older workers --- ## Discovered Heuristics by Role ### \*\*EMPLOYEE\*\* Role \*\*Core Principles:\*\* - Self-preservati  
pasted  
# Ethical Heuristics Discovery & Analysis Guide with AI Interviewing ## For Students: How to Use This Guide You've completed Part 1 and identified your ethical dilemma with multiple roles. Now you need to uncover the implicit and explicit ethical "algorithms" - the heuristics, principles, and deci  
pasted  
**C**  
Edit  
I can see you've shared both the completed Part 2 sample (the Ethical Heuristics Discovery Report) and the guide for conducting the heuristics discovery interview process. This is a fascinating framework for helping students uncover their actual ethical decision-making patterns rather than their aspirational values.  
Looking at these documents, I can see:

1. The completed sample report shows a thorough analysis of how someone navigates competing roles (employee, friend/colleague, person with fairness values, beneficiary of unfair system) with specific heuristics, principles, and if/then rules for each role.
2. The discovery guide provides detailed interviewing instructions for helping students uncover these patterns through probing questions and scenario-based exploration.

Are you:

* Looking to conduct this heuristics discovery process yourself for an ethical dilemma you're facing?
* Wanting feedback on the framework or sample report?
* Ready to begin the interview process using your own Part 1 findings?
* Exploring how this method works before implementing it?

If you're ready to begin the discovery interview, I'll need you to share your Part 1 findings (your identified ethical dilemma and roles) so I can start with some preliminary heuristics extraction as outlined in the guide.  
If you're looking at this for other purposes, let me know how I can best help you explore or refine this framework!  
Retry  
# Part 3: Learning Roadmap AI Prompt ## Role You are an AI Strategic Planning Consultant helping a student design a personalized learning sequence for engaging with \*\*all 10 ethical frameworks\*\*. The student has already completed \*\*Part 1 (Ethical Dilemma)\*\* and \*\*Part 2 (Heuristics Discovery)\*\*  
pasted  
**C**  
# Part 3: Personalized Ethical Frameworks Learning Roadmap  
Student: [Sample Student]  
Date: [Today's Date]  
This roadmap reflects the personalized sequence I developed during my Part 3 planning session. It includes all 10 ethical frameworks from the course, ordered based on my reflections from Parts 1 and 2.  
---  
## Final Sequence Table  
| Priority Order | Framework Title (from Table of Contents) | Why This Framework is in This Spot |  
|----------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|  
| 1 | Marxism — The Class Struggle and Its Ethical Implications | To understand how systemic unfairness shapes workplace structures and my ethical dilemma. |  
| 2 | The Ethics of Simone De Beauvoir — Feminism, Existentialism, and Ambiguity | To explore moral ambiguity and the tension I feel between self-preservation and fairness. |  
| 3 | Breaking the Moral Mold — Nietzsche on Value Creation and Perspectivism | To rethink inherited values and confront the assumptions I make about morality in unfair systems. |  
| 4 | Duty Calls — Exploring Deontological Ethics | To clarify what obligations and responsibilities I might owe even when it feels risky. |  
| 5 | Virtue Ethics — The Role of Character in Moral Philosophy | To strengthen character traits like courage and integrity that I want to embody. |  
| 6 | Balancing the Scales — The Calculus of Utilitarian Ethics | To learn how to weigh outcomes for everyone affected by decisions like the scheduling practices in my dilemma. |  
| 7 | Bound By Agreement — The Principles of Social Contract Theory | To think about the balance between loyalty to coworkers and the broader workplace community. |  
| 8 | Environmental Ethics | To expand my understanding of fairness beyond humans and consider how ethical obligations apply to non-human life and ecosystems. |  
| 9 | Bioethics | To think about how ethical frameworks apply in fast-changing situations like new technologies and scientific advances. |  
| 10 | Universal Order — Unveiling Natural Law Theory | To reflect on enduring moral principles and how they might connect or conflict with what I’ve learned from the other frameworks. |  
---  
### How I Developed This Sequence  
1. Start with systemic perspectives: I wanted to begin with frameworks that help me better understand the unfair systems I’m part of, like Marxism, De Beauvoir, and Nietzsche. These challenge my current patterns and force me to ask harder questions about morality in complex systems.  
2. Move to grounding frameworks: After those, I chose Duty-Based Ethics and Virtue Ethics because they can help me find steady principles and personal qualities I can rely on when facing dilemmas.  
3. Analyze outcomes and social obligations: Utilitarianism and Social Contract Theory follow because they teach me to consider broader impacts and the mutual obligations I have to others.  
4. End with broadening perspectives: Environmental Ethics and Bioethics allow me to consider ethical responsibility beyond my immediate context. Finally, I finish with Natural Law Theory to reflect on how universal moral principles align or conflict with everything I’ve learned.  
---  
### How I Will Use This Roadmap  
- This sequence will guide my Part 4 engagement with the ethical frameworks.  
- I will follow this order but remain flexible if my priorities shift.  
- I will revisit the "why" column as I study each framework to stay focused on my learning goals.  
Edit  
I can see you've shared the Part 3 guide for creating a personalized learning roadmap, along with what appears to be a sample completed roadmap showing how a student might sequence all 10 ethical frameworks based on their Parts 1 and 2 discoveries.  
The guide is designed to help students strategically order their engagement with ethical frameworks - starting with those that address tensions and discomfort, then progressing toward frameworks that build confidence and reinforce strengths.  
Are you looking to:

1. Work through the Part 3 process yourself using your own Parts 1 and 2 findings to create your personalized learning sequence?
2. Get feedback on the Part 3 guide or the sample roadmap?
3. Begin the strategic planning conversation where I act as the AI Strategic Planning Consultant to help you sequence the frameworks?

If you're ready to begin Part 3, I'm prepared to follow the conversation flow outlined in the guide:

* Review your Parts 1 & 2 findings
* Guide you through reflective processing of your heuristics discoveries
* Help you identify your focus direction
* Present the reordered framework list
* Guide your sequencing decisions
* Confirm your final personalized roadmap

Just share your Parts 1 and 2 materials when you're ready, and I'll begin with acknowledging your work and asking one focused question at a time as outlined in the guide!  
Retry  
# Part 4: AI Strategic Planning Consultant Guide ## Role You are an AI Strategic Planning Consultant helping a student create a \*\*Learning Production Strategic Plan\*\* for how they will produce artifacts and engage with the ethical frameworks across the semester. The student has completed \*\*Part  
pasted  
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Edit  
I can see you've shared the Part 4 guide for creating a Learning Production Strategic Plan. This is the final planning stage where students design how they'll actually engage with and create artifacts for all 10 ethical frameworks throughout the semester, based on their previous work in Parts 1-3.  
The guide is structured to help students think through:

* What types of artifacts will best demonstrate their learning
* How to pace their work across ~15 weeks
* Framework-by-framework planning for engagement and artifact creation
* A flexible but structured approach that prioritizes thoughtfulness over complexity

Are you ready to:

1. Begin the Part 4 strategic planning process where I act as your AI Strategic Planning Consultant to help you create your Learning Production Strategic Plan?
2. Get feedback on the Part 4 guide itself?
3. See how this fits with the overall framework you've been developing?

If you're ready to begin Part 4, I'll need you to share your completed Parts 1, 2, and 3 so I can:

* Review and acknowledge your work
* Help you brainstorm artifact types that fit your learning style
* Guide you through semester pacing decisions
* Walk through framework-by-framework planning
* Confirm your final strategic plan

Just share your materials when you're ready, and I'll start with a focused review and ask one question at a time as outlined in the guide!  
Retry  
# Part 4: Learning Production Strategic Plan \*\*Student:\*\* [Sample Student] \*\*Date:\*\* [Today's Date] This plan is based on my Part 3 Learning Roadmap. It’s basically my game plan for how I’m going to work through all 10 frameworks and show what I’ve learned. I know I might adjust things as  
pasted  
**C**  
Edit  
I can see you've shared a sample completed Part 4: Learning Production Strategic Plan. This shows how a student might translate their earlier work (Parts 1-3) into a concrete, semester-long plan for engaging with all 10 ethical frameworks through practical artifacts.  
The sample plan demonstrates several strong elements:

* Realistic artifact types (journal entries, memos, simple charts, thought experiments)
* Clear connections between each framework and the student's coffee shop scheduling dilemma
* Flexible pacing strategy that accounts for varying difficulty levels
* Personal, authentic tone that shows genuine engagement rather than just academic compliance
* Focus on reflection and application rather than complexity

This appears to be the final piece of the four-part framework you've been developing. The complete sequence seems to be:

1. Part 1: Identify a complex ethical dilemma with multiple roles
2. Part 2: Discover personal ethical heuristics through guided interview
3. Part 3: Create a personalized learning sequence for all 10 frameworks
4. Part 4: Design a strategic plan for artifact creation and engagement

Are you:

* Looking for feedback on this sample Part 4 or the overall four-part framework?
* Ready to create your own Part 4 plan using your personal Parts 1-3 materials?
* Exploring how this framework works before implementing it with students?
* Wanting to discuss how these parts work together as a complete system?

Let me know how I can best help you with this comprehensive ethical learning framework!  
Retry  
**C**  
Do you see gaps or omissions in the structure and sequencing of Parts 1 -4 as they currently stand?  
Edit  
Looking at the four-part framework as a complete system, I see several potential gaps and areas for strengthening:

## **Structural Gaps**

Assessment and Feedback Integration

* No clear mechanism for instructor feedback between parts (especially after Parts 1-2)
* Missing self-assessment checkpoints to verify quality before moving forward
* No peer review or collaborative elements that could enrich the discovery process

Emotional Processing Support

* Part 2 acknowledges the process can be "emotionally intensive" but doesn't provide structured support
* No guidance for students who discover deeply uncomfortable patterns about themselves
* Missing strategies for when students hit genuine ethical paralysis or despair

Connection to Broader Learning

* Limited integration with other coursework, readings, or external ethical resources
* No mechanism for connecting with current events or real-world applications beyond the personal dilemma
* Missing opportunities to engage with diverse cultural or philosophical perspectives

## **Sequencing Issues**

Pacing Reality Check

* 15 weeks for 10 frameworks feels rushed, especially after the intensive self-discovery in Parts 1-2
* No buffer time for deeper engagement with frameworks that prove particularly challenging or revelatory
* Risk of superficial coverage in later frameworks due to semester fatigue

Iterative Development

* The linear progression doesn't allow for revisiting earlier insights with new framework knowledge
* Students might discover their Part 1 dilemma was too narrow/broad only after engaging with frameworks
* No mechanism for refining heuristics as ethical understanding deepens

## **Methodological Concerns**

Artifact Quality Control

* Part 4 emphasizes "simple" artifacts but provides limited guidance on depth vs. superficiality
* No examples of what constitutes meaningful engagement vs. checkbox completion
* Missing scaffolding for students who struggle with reflective writing

Framework Integration

* Each framework treated somewhat in isolation rather than building cumulative understanding
* No synthesis mechanism that brings frameworks into dialogue with each other
* Missing capstone experience that integrates all learning

## **Potential Enhancements**

Mid-Point Recalibration (around Week 7-8)

* Formal checkpoint to reassess the dilemma, refine heuristics, and adjust the learning plan
* Opportunity for instructor conferences or peer consultation

Collaborative Elements

* Structured peer sharing of dilemmas (anonymized if needed)
* Small group discussions about framework applications
* Cross-pollination of insights between different types of ethical dilemmas

Synthesis and Application

* Capstone project that demonstrates integrated learning across multiple frameworks
* Real-world application component (action plan, community engagement, etc.)
* Reflection on how ethical reasoning has evolved throughout the process

What aspects of these gaps resonate most with your experience or concerns about the framework?  
Retry  
**C**  
Wow, don't hold back...*grin* No, seriously, thank you. Let's take a look at these concerns and determine where we can edit or adapt to resolve what you mention.  
Edit  
Ha! You asked for gaps, I delivered gaps! *grin back*  
Let's tackle these systematically. I think some of these concerns are more critical than others, and some might be easier fixes than complete overhauls.  
Where should we start? I'm thinking we could prioritize based on:

1. Impact on student success - What gaps are most likely to derail a student's learning?
2. Feasibility of fixes - What can we address with tweaks vs. major restructuring?
3. Your implementation context - What constraints are you working within?

My gut says the most critical issues are probably:

* The emotional processing support (Part 2 can genuinely blindside students)
* The pacing reality (15 weeks for 10 frameworks after intensive self-discovery)
* Some kind of mid-point recalibration (linear progression without iteration feels risky)

But I'm curious about your perspective. Looking at your framework:  
Which of these gaps have you already been thinking about?  
Are there specific constraints I should know about (semester length, class size, institutional requirements) that would shape which solutions are viable?  
What's your sense of the biggest risk points where students are most likely to get stuck or give up?  
Let's pick 2-3 high-priority areas and brainstorm some concrete adaptations rather than trying to solve everything at once. What feels most pressing to you?  
Retry  
**C**  
I would agree with your identification of critical issues, especially looking at my own experience working on Part 2 with you earlier. I am pleased to report that we have an "in-house" counseling center for our college that offers tele-health counseling services free of charge for students that I can offer to students in need. Since this is not necessarily a complete or perfect fix, it does give me an avenue to really address this concern without requiring major changes in our approach. We can circle back to creating information resources about that later.  
Edit  
Excellent - that's a huge asset to have available, and you're right that it addresses the emotional processing concern without requiring structural changes to the framework itself. Smart institutional resource leveraging.  
So that leaves us with the pacing reality and mid-point recalibration as the two most critical structural issues to tackle.  
Let me focus there:  
On Pacing: Looking at your framework, students are doing intensive self-discovery work in Parts 1-2, then immediately jumping into 10 frameworks. That's a lot. A few potential approaches:

1. Extend timeline - Maybe 18-20 weeks instead of 15?
2. Strategic grouping - Cluster related frameworks (like the "challenging assumptions" group in Part 3) for deeper engagement
3. Tiered engagement - Some frameworks get full treatment, others get lighter touch based on student's Part 3 priorities

On Mid-Point Recalibration: The linear progression does feel risky. Students will inevitably discover their initial dilemma framing was off, or their heuristics were incomplete, after engaging with frameworks.  
What's your sense of which pacing approach might work best in your context? And are you thinking semester-long course, or is this spread across multiple terms?  
Also - curious about your Part 2 experience - did you hit any of those emotional intensity moments I flagged, or discover patterns that surprised you? That might inform how we think about supporting other students through that process.  
Retry  
**C**  
I am open to the idea of allowing students to prioritize some frameworks over others, but I worry about their likelihood to dismiss those frameworks that are politically, religiously, or ideological opposed to their pre-established perspectives out of hand, so I don't want to give them an "easy out." But you are right, trying to cover everything really invites superficial consideration, which, if we are putting all that effort into authenticity and deep thinking, really undermines the entire operation.  
Edit  
Ah, that's the classic dilemma of deep learning vs. comprehensive coverage! And you're absolutely right - students will absolutely gravitationally avoid frameworks that challenge their existing worldview, which defeats the whole purpose of the authentic self-discovery work.  
What if we think about this differently? Instead of optional frameworks, what about differentiated engagement levels where all frameworks are still required, but the depth varies strategically?  
For example:

* Deep Dive Frameworks (4-5): Full artifact creation as currently planned
* Exploration Frameworks (3-4): Shorter engagement, maybe a structured reflection or comparative analysis
* Integration Frameworks (2-3): Explicitly connected to earlier deep dives, showing how they complement/challenge previous insights

The key would be ensuring that students can't just put all the "uncomfortable" frameworks in the shallow category. Maybe:

* Part 3 requires at least 2 frameworks that directly challenge their Part 2 heuristics to be in the "Deep Dive" category
* Or students must justify their categorization based on learning goals, not comfort level
* Or you assign some frameworks to categories based on what you see in their Parts 1-2

Another thought: What if the mid-point recalibration actually serves this purpose? Around week 7-8, students revisit their Part 3 priorities based on what they've learned, and might be required to "promote" a framework they initially planned to treat lightly?  
Does this differentiated approach feel like it could work while still maintaining the integrity challenge you're after?  
Retry  
**C**  
Actually, if the metacognitive goal of the course is to help students develop executive thinking behaviors, putting this into their hands is an excellent way of dividing the sheep from the goats. One of the preferred self-assessment elements (the ones that help distinguish A and B level students from C/D) will be, "How did you demonstrate a willingness to engage in critical evaluation of your algorithms from opposing or challenging perspectives?" Those who really choose to engage in the process can easily demonstrate that in their arguments. And it puts the decision-making power in their hands as to what they want to invest in their learning decisions and time allocation.  
Edit  
Brilliant! That completely reframes the concern. You're not trying to force deep engagement - you're creating a system where the depth of engagement becomes the evidence of learning sophistication. The framework itself becomes a metacognitive assessment tool.  
Students who game the system by avoiding challenging frameworks will produce thin, unconvincing self-assessments. Students who genuinely engage with perspectives that challenge their heuristics will have rich, complex evidence of growth to point to.  
This actually makes the differentiated engagement levels even more powerful because:

1. Self-selection becomes self-assessment - Students reveal their learning priorities through their choices
2. The artifacts tell the story - You can see immediately who took intellectual risks vs. who played it safe
3. Metacognitive reflection is built in - They have to justify and defend their engagement decisions
4. No gaming possible - You can't fake having wrestled with a challenging perspective

So the mid-point recalibration could include questions like:

* "Which frameworks have you avoided and why?"
* "What would it look like to engage seriously with a perspective that challenges your core heuristics?"
* "How might your artifact plan need to change to demonstrate intellectual courage?"

This also means Part 4 could include explicit planning around: "Which frameworks will challenge me most, and how will I document that challenge?"  
Does this shift your thinking about the pacing issue too? If students are self-selecting their depth levels, maybe 15 weeks becomes more manageable?  
Retry  
**C**  
Well, the timeframe for the course is not open to alteration or change, so that's completely off the table, so whatever solution will have to work within that timeframe.  
Edit  
Got it - 15 weeks is fixed. That's actually helpful to know the constraint clearly.  
So we're working with differentiated engagement within that timeframe, where the metacognitive self-assessment does the heavy lifting on distinguishing quality engagement.  
Looking at the sample Part 4, the student planned "one framework per week for the first six weeks since those feel like the hardest ones, then might double up when I can, keeping two catch-up weeks at the end."  
That seems like a reasonable approach that could accommodate the differentiated engagement model. Students could:

* Weeks 1-6: Deep dive frameworks (the challenging ones they identified in Part 3)
* Weeks 7-10: Mixed engagement levels based on their learning priorities
* Weeks 11-13: Integration and lighter-touch frameworks
* Weeks 14-15: Synthesis/catch-up

The mid-point recalibration around week 7-8 becomes even more crucial in this compressed timeline - it's the moment where students assess how their deep engagement is going and adjust their strategy for the remaining frameworks.  
Question: Are you thinking the mid-point recalibration happens in class, as individual conferences, or as a structured self-reflection assignment? That might affect how we design it to support both the pacing and the metacognitive assessment goals.  
And does this differentiated approach within the fixed timeline feel workable for your context?  
Retry  
**C**  
Good question - this is right around the traditional midterm point, so it could come as an ungraded "exam" where students can simply address these in the form of short-answer essay questions, since the class doesn't meet in person or online and trying to create appointment slots for all the students is a heavy lift with my overall workload?  
Edit  
Perfect! A midterm self-assessment "exam" is elegant - it leverages the natural semester rhythm, keeps your workload manageable, and puts the metacognitive work squarely in the students' hands where it belongs.  
Short-answer essay format works well because it requires them to articulate their thinking but isn't overwhelming. Plus, being ungraded removes the anxiety while still creating accountability.  
Potential midterm questions might look like:

* "Review your Part 2 heuristics. Which frameworks so far have most directly challenged these patterns, and what have you discovered?"
* "Assess your engagement strategy from Part 4. What's working? What needs adjustment for the remaining frameworks?"
* "Which framework(s) have you been avoiding or treating lightly? What would serious engagement look like?"
* "How are you demonstrating intellectual courage in this process?"

The beauty is this also creates a natural checkpoint for students who are struggling - they'll reveal it in their responses, and you can reach out individually to those who need support (including potential counseling referrals).  
Does this format give you what you need for identifying students who are gaming the system vs. genuinely engaging? And does it feel manageable to review/respond to these midterm reflections within your workload?  
We could also think about whether any of these responses should inform their Part 4 adjustments going forward - like requiring them to submit a brief "revised strategy" based on their midterm insights.  
Retry  
**C**  
One more meta-level question. I am really happy with the guideline documents that students can simply paste into an AI interface that creates the right environment for AI to do what it does best: helpful, supportive and immediate feedback that allows the student to do what he/she should be doing, without offloading cognitive work or effort onto the system. It also provides a lot of contextual support and assistance in the most formative timeframes of the class and seemingly will help them get off on the right foot as efficiently as possible, since time frames become an issue, as you mentioned. But in thinking about this, I believe there needs to be a Part 5 - we have the dilemma, the alogrithms, the learning sequence, and the broad strokes of the learning demonstrations penciled in, but I think we need to create a scaffolded guide to their first learning experience, so they have a guided process for how to review one of the frameworks. If we do this, I can confidently then ask them to repeat the process, or to alter it using simple documentation rather than the intensive AI prompt guides we created for Parts 1 - 4, that really needed more rigor and substance. Thoughts?  
Edit  
Absolutely brilliant insight! You've identified exactly what's missing - the bridge between planning and execution.  
Parts 1-4 are all *preparation* for learning, but then students are supposed to magically know how to engage meaningfully with complex ethical frameworks? That's a huge gap.  
A Part 5: Guided Framework Engagement makes perfect sense because:

1. It models the depth you want - Students see what "serious engagement" actually looks like in practice
2. It's transferable - Once they've done it guided, they can replicate/adapt the process independently
3. It frontloads the methodology - They learn *how* to engage before getting into their trickier frameworks
4. It maintains efficiency - One intensive guided experience vs. 10 AI prompt sessions

Strategic question: Should Part 5 use their first framework from Part 3 (which might be challenging), or should it use a neutral "practice" framework that lets them learn the methodology without the emotional stakes?  
I'm leaning toward using their actual first framework because:

* It maintains the authentic connection to their dilemma
* It gets them started on their real work
* The AI guidance can help them navigate any discomfort

Structure-wise, are you thinking Part 5 would be another AI prompt guide (like Parts 1-4) that walks them through framework analysis step-by-step? And then subsequent frameworks just get a simple checklist or template they can follow independently?  
This feels like the missing piece that makes the whole system work smoothly.  
Retry  
**C**  
Part 5, by its title, implies AI guide, from my thinking. And if we can help walk them through one of the harder frameworks, by their selection, then it would stand to reason the other steps would get progressively easier. But this does make me think back to one of the elements in Part 3, which asked them about their preferences for sequencing, which allowed them to select easier before harder. That would have to go, if we use this approach, and that imposes a requisite structure that could be problematic if we immediately jump into the "deep end" of the course right off the bat. Students may already be skeptical, and pushing them immediately into oppositional perspectives might just cause them to shut down. Hmmm... not sure how to address this. Thoughts?  
Edit  
Great catch! This creates a real tension between pedagogical effectiveness and student buy-in.  
The dilemma:

* Part 5 works best with a challenging framework (builds confidence for harder ones later)
* But forcing students into oppositional perspectives immediately might cause shutdown
* Yet we can't let them sequence easy-to-hard because that defeats Part 5's purpose

Potential solution: What if we keep the sequencing choice in Part 3, but Part 5 uses their second or third framework instead of their first?  
This way:

* Students can still choose to start with a "confidence builder" framework in their independent work
* Part 5 tackles something more challenging, but after they've had one successful engagement
* The guided experience prepares them for the really difficult frameworks later

Alternative approach: What if Part 5 uses a designated practice framework that's moderately challenging but not ideologically loaded? Something like Virtue Ethics or Social Contract Theory - substantive enough to model deep engagement, but not typically as triggering as Marxism or Nietzsche?  
Then their Part 3 sequence remains intact for their independent work.  
Or third option: Keep Part 5 as their first framework, but modify Part 3 to require their first choice to be "moderately challenging" rather than allowing full easy-to-hard sequencing. Force some intellectual stretch, but not immediate deep-end immersion.  
Which of these feels most workable for maintaining both rigor and student engagement?  
Retry  
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