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# Conversation Truncation Review

Share  
# Dilemma Design Process: Conversation Summary ## Context and Challenge We were developing guidance to help students in an Applied Ethics in Technology course identify authentic ethical dilemmas that could sustain 16 weeks of analysis. The course serves 30 postsecondary CTE students (primarily n  
pasted  
**C**  
I am not sure if we ran into a conversation length limit, but here is a truncated review of the previous conversation...  
Edit  
Thank you for sharing this comprehensive summary of our dilemma design process! This is an excellent distillation of the key insights we developed together. I can see how much the conversation evolved from those initial cybersecurity scenarios to understanding what really creates sustainable ethical complexity for your student population.  
A few things that stand out to me from reviewing this:  
The breakthrough about reframing "dilemma" was crucial - moving from crisis management to "competing goods" opened up so many more authentic scenarios. And recognizing that your non-traditional students actually have *richer* sources of ethical complexity than traditional college students was a game-changer for the whole approach.  
The distinction between emotional difficulty and ethical complexity seems like it will be especially important for your guidance document. Students will likely need concrete examples to see this difference - like your wages example versus the competing family/professional obligations.  
Looking at this summary, I'm curious about a few implementation questions:

1. How are you planning to structure the guidance document? Will you lead with the successful scenarios and then show the refinement process, or walk students through the discovery process we went through?
2. Given that this is asynchronous online, are you thinking about any peer review or discussion components where students can test their dilemma ideas with classmates before committing?
3. The summary mentions that different ethical frameworks should suggest conflicting solutions - will students have been introduced to several frameworks before they select their dilemma, or will this be part of how they test their choice?

This feels like such a solid foundation for helping students find dilemmas that will genuinely sustain their engagement for a full semester. What aspects are you most excited to develop further?  
Retry  
**C**  
And to make this all that much more complex, I want to use UDL principles of multiple ways of engaging and representing, meaning I want to conceptualize and suggest various ways of composing or drafting their thinking to give them approaches that are meaningful and useful to them.  
I, for one, am a very comfortable wordsmith, so I naturally lean towards written expression, either in expository or informative formats, like bulleted lists or narrative descriptions, but I want to open the door for others to explore other meaningful ways of composing this. Infographics, audio recordings/podcasts, video diaries, mosaics or collages of evocative images that express meaning for them...I want to really open this up and figure out how or where they could store whatever medium they use in a shared space so I could see it.  
Edit  
This is a brilliant extension of your already thoughtful design! UDL principles will make the dilemma identification process so much more accessible and authentic for your diverse student population. Let me think through some practical approaches for different modalities:

## **Multimodal Dilemma Exploration Options**

Visual/Spatial Approaches:

* Relationship mapping: Students create visual webs showing their roles, relationships, and competing obligations
* Values collision boards: Collages or mood boards showing images/symbols representing conflicting values or priorities
* Timeline visualizations: Showing how their dilemma has evolved or might unfold over time
* Infographic summaries: Visual representation of stakeholders, competing obligations, and potential outcomes

Auditory/Verbal Approaches:

* Voice memos: Students talk through their thinking process, almost like thinking aloud
* Podcast-style recordings: Students interview themselves or have conversations with family/friends about the dilemma
* Audio journals: Regular voice recordings tracking their evolving understanding

Kinesthetic/Interactive Approaches:

* Photo documentation: Students take pictures that represent different aspects of their dilemma over time
* Video diaries: Short clips explaining their situation and reasoning
* Physical artifacts: Creating or collecting objects that represent different stakeholders or values

## **Storage and Sharing Solutions**

For a shared digital space that accommodates multiple formats, you might consider:  
Platform Options:

* Padlet: Great for mixed media - supports text, images, videos, audio, links all on one collaborative board
* Flipgrid: Excellent for video/audio responses with easy commenting features
* Google Sites: Students could create simple personal sites with multiple media types
* Canvas Discussions with media uploads: If you're already using Canvas
* Wakelet: Combines text, images, videos, links in curated collections

## **UDL Implementation Considerations**

Choice Architecture:

* Provide 3-4 concrete examples of each modality so students can see what success looks like
* Let students combine approaches (maybe they start with voice memos then create a visual map)
* Allow format evolution - they might discover their preferred mode through experimentation

Scaffolding Across Modalities:

* Core questions remain the same regardless of format: "What roles do you occupy? What competing obligations do you face? What values are in tension?"
* Provide modality-specific prompts: "If creating a visual map, consider..." or "If recording audio, you might start by..."

Assessment Considerations:

* Focus on evidence of ethical complexity rather than production quality
* Clear rubrics that work across different media types
* Self-reflection component where students explain their choice of modality and what it revealed

## **Practical Questions to Consider:**

1. Technical comfort levels: How will you support students who are less comfortable with digital media creation?
2. Privacy concerns: Some students might hesitate to share deeply personal dilemmas in visual or audio formats - how will you handle varying comfort levels?
3. Feedback mechanisms: How will you and peers provide meaningful feedback across different formats?
4. Time investment: Some modalities (like video creation) might require more time - how will you ensure equity?

Would you like to dive deeper into any of these approaches? I'm particularly curious about how you're envisioning the peer interaction component - will students be responding to each other's work across different modalities?  
Retry  
**C**  
Great question. When I first read that question, I immediately assume we are talking about grading, but that isn't what we are talking about. In this case, the assessment lies in the student's perception of the impact of this process on their own thinking and behavior - how did this analysis give you new perspectives or pathways for your own growth as an ethically aware adult, reinforce or supplement your existing models, provide you new insights into others' and their motivations or tensions, and help you to anticipate possible ethical dilemmas that might come to you in the future and how you might deal with them.  
Those aren't questions I can or want to answer; I want them to assess those things for themselves and report to me about the nature and extent to which they wrestled with these ideas within the context of the course and evaluate for themselves the impact it had on them. It isn't about coming up with the answer to what the councilman should do, for instance, but rather seeking to better understand the tensions within the various roles and what solutions might look like, or how to live with the ambiguity of not having a fixed or immediate resolution - how to live in the discomfort of reality.  
To use a metaphor by Schon, we are moving from the relatively dry and clean, but barren hilltop of academic thought or abstract consideration, to the dirty, messy, but incredibly vibrant and diverse life of the swamp of real life. It's not clean, but it is alive and to pull in a Cohen Bros reference from O Brother Where Art Thou?, "Come on in, boys, the water's fine."  
Edit  
Ah, what a beautiful reframe! You're absolutely right - this isn't about grading their "right answers" but about their capacity for ethical self-awareness and growth. And I love that Schön metaphor - moving from the clean hilltop to the vibrant swamp where actual human life happens.  
This shifts everything about how the multimodal approaches could work. Instead of producing artifacts for evaluation, students are using different modalities as tools for their own deeper engagement and reflection. The "assessment" becomes their metacognitive awareness of how the process affected their thinking.

## **Multimodal Self-Assessment Implications**

The Real Questions Become:

* "How did creating this visual map help me see connections I hadn't noticed before?"
* "What did I discover about my own values when I tried to explain this dilemma out loud?"
* "Which stakeholders became more real to me through this process?"
* "Where am I more comfortable with ambiguity now than I was 16 weeks ago?"

Different Modalities as Different Lenses:

* Visual mapping might reveal relationship complexities they couldn't articulate in words
* Audio reflection might help them hear their own assumptions or contradictions
* Photo documentation over time might show them how their understanding shifted
* Collaborative formats might illuminate how others' perspectives changed their own thinking

## **The "Living in the Swamp" Dimension**

This connects beautifully to your UDL approach because different students will need different ways to:

* Sit with discomfort (some through writing, others through visual processing, others through talking it out)
* Track their evolving thinking over 16 weeks
* Recognize their growth in ethical sophistication
* Develop comfort with ongoing ambiguity

The shared digital space becomes less about showcasing final products and more about documenting the journey - showing how their thinking evolved, what surprised them, where they got stuck, what helped them push through.

## **Self-Assessment Across Modalities**

Students could reflect on questions like:

* "What did I learn about my own ethical reasoning process?"
* "How has my tolerance for ethical complexity changed?"
* "What assumptions did I discover I was making?"
* "How do I now approach similar situations differently?"
* "What ethical 'muscles' did I develop that I didn't know I needed?"

The beauty is that a student who processes through visual collages might discover different insights about their ethical development than one who processes through recorded conversations - and both paths are equally valid routes to ethical sophistication.  
How are you thinking about helping students recognize and articulate these deeper metacognitive insights about their own ethical growth?  
Retry  
**C**  
Since this is an online asynchronous course, most of the work, if not almost all of it, will happen privately and independently. I absolutely hate discussion forum type work in academic settings; it is mind-numbing and rarely anything but superficial and performative. My plan is to ask students to self-select into groups that will participate in a weekly podcast that I host. The topic of each week's conversation will be self-reports about what students are working on, where they stand, and what they are learning. Rather than using a standardized approach, where everyone studies the same thing at the same time, students will self-select their own pathways and which of 10 ethical models they will study at any given time. Their final project should demonstrate evidence of their consideration of all models, along with some kind of evidence of assessment and evaluation that determines if elements for any given model fit into their perception of the issue and the ethical algorithm they already possess or are trying to refine. If they reject a model, that is perfectly acceptable, but in most cases, those models exist as a means of answering or addressing ethical questions that the creators did not feel were adequately resolved under existing thought - students will have to show how they can answer those questions within the framework of the ethical alogrithm they are designing or defending. That all will happen on an ongoing basis, with each student participating in at least 2 or 3 podcast episodes as an invited guest. Students will also report using a kanban board their individual progression along the path and highlight items for me to review or address on an ongoing basis to make sure they are successfully progressing toward that final self-assessment. It is very possible that some students might select ethical dilemmas that have deeply personal or private elements, so I am reluctant to ask students to have to share everything they are doing publically, but if they want to include interactions as part of their development process, I am completely open to it.  
Edit  
This is such a sophisticated and humane design! You've created a structure that honors both the deeply personal nature of authentic ethical work and the collaborative learning that can emerge when students choose to share. The podcast format is brilliant - it transforms what could be performative discussion posts into genuine, dynamic conversations about real intellectual and personal growth.

## **The Self-Directed Learning Architecture**

What strikes me most is how you've built authentic choice at multiple levels:

* Choice of dilemma (personally meaningful)
* Choice of ethical frameworks to explore and when
* Choice of modality for processing/documenting
* Choice of how much to share publicly
* Choice of their own ethical algorithm development

This creates conditions where students can do genuinely deep work rather than jumping through academic hoops.

## **Podcast as Learning Community**

The weekly podcast serves multiple functions:

* Accountability without surveillance
* Intellectual community without forced collaboration
* Modeling as students hear others' thinking processes
* Normalization of struggle, confusion, and breakthrough moments
* Celebration of different approaches and insights

Students self-selecting into podcast groups means they're choosing their level of public engagement, which respects the privacy concerns around personal dilemmas.

## **Kanban Board for Individual Progress**

This is perfect for asynchronous self-paced work - students can signal where they need support without having to expose their dilemma content. Categories might be something like:

* "Exploring this framework"
* "Struggling with this concept"
* "Ready for feedback on..."
* "Breakthrough to share"

## **Questions for Implementation**

Podcast Logistics:

* How long are you envisioning episodes?
* Will you have structured prompts or let conversations flow more organically?
* Are you thinking live recordings or asynchronous submissions that you edit together?

Framework Integration:

* Will you provide brief introductions to all 10 ethical models upfront, or release them as resources students can access when ready?
* How will you help students recognize when they might benefit from exploring a particular framework?

Final Self-Assessment:

* Are you envisioning this as a reflective portfolio, a presentation, a written narrative, or open to student choice of format?
* Will students be demonstrating their "ethical algorithm" through application to their original dilemma, or through some other means?

The respect for privacy while still building learning community is really thoughtful. Students with highly personal dilemmas can still participate fully while maintaining appropriate boundaries.  
Retry  
**C**  
Logistics: I envision episodes to be 20-30 minutes in length; anything longer and non-participants are likely to drift. I expect to have a skeletal outline of possible questions to initiate conversation, but the hope is the flow emerges organically from there. The podcast recording will be live via a Zoom conference. This is a tricky element in that students don't have an established required availability time frame, so I am selecting to host podcast sessions at pre-established times that vary week to week (7:00 am, 7:00 pm, 4 pm) and on different days to try and accommodate student schedules as much as possible. The fact they only have to find 2 or 3 times over the course of the entire semester should minimize the "discomfort." While participation isn't graded per se, students will be asked to justify their grade in terms of participation and interaction as part of the overall course outcome.  
Edit  
The varied timing strategy is really smart - rotating between morning, evening, and afternoon slots across different days gives students the best chance of finding times that work with their full-time work and family schedules. And you're right that 2-3 appearances over 16 weeks is much more manageable than weekly required participation.  
The self-justification of participation grade is particularly elegant because it aligns with your overall philosophy of student self-assessment. They have to reflect on and articulate their own engagement rather than having you monitor and measure it externally.

## **Practical Considerations for the Podcast Format**

Creating Safety for Authentic Sharing:

* Will you establish some ground rules about confidentiality - what's shared in podcast stays in podcast?
* How will you handle moments when students might overshare personal details that could make others uncomfortable?
* Any thoughts on how to balance the "organic flow" with keeping conversations focused enough to be valuable for listeners?

Managing the Self-Selection Process:

* How will students sign up for episodes? First-come-first-served, or will you help coordinate to ensure good mix/timing?
* Will you limit the number of participants per episode to ensure everyone gets adequate speaking time?

Supporting Non-Participants:

* Will podcast episodes be available for students to listen to later? This could be valuable modeling for students working on similar challenges
* Any concern about students feeling pressured to participate more than they're comfortable with, or conversely, about some students never participating?

Framework Integration During Conversations:

* Since students will be at different points in exploring the 10 ethical models, how will you handle moments when someone references a framework others haven't encountered yet?
* Will you weave in brief explanations during the conversation, or let those moments spark curiosity for later exploration?

The live Zoom format preserves the authenticity and spontaneity that makes real conversation valuable, while the recording creates a resource for the broader learning community. It's a nice balance between intimacy and accessibility.  
Retry  
**C**  
The podcasts are intended to be public, so there will be no expectation of privacy other than that the podcast will be limited access only within the course shell. Since students are sharing their work with me on an ongoing basis, I would hope to be aware of potentially sensitive subjects and have feedback conversations about how to deal with these individually before podcast episodes begin - hey, this is clearly a personal and important issue for you, but could be triggering for others. How might we navigate this so that when we talk about it next week, we can have a helpful and meaningful conversation about this without harming or upsetting you or others? In terms of making things meaningful, one of my hopes is that since students are likely to head in very different directions, even if they are talking about the same models, the diversity of approaches, of insights, and growth will have a mutually beneficial impact of students helping each other organically. I am not exactly clear on how it will work just yet - but on my development roadmap, that's a bit down the stretch from where I am right now. Definitely first come, first served, though since this is a pilot, I will obviously take notes for future sessions and even other podcasts within the same semester as new elements emerge from our experiences. Each session only has 5 openings, so I anticipate being able to handle the conversation flow to insure wholesale participation. Podcasts will be uploaded for students to listen to and annotate using social collaboration software (Perusall) which opens up the possibility of side conversations and extended discussion taking place beyond the immediate timeframe of the podcast or its participants. If students select models that others aren't familiar with, that shouldn't be a problem. It's like mentioning a book, movie, or show at a party that you recommend or pan for your friends to consider. It helps to provide recommendations for others, along with your impressions. Word of mouth is always a powerful tool for motivation.  
Edit  
This is such a thoughtful ecosystem! The way you've designed the interconnected elements - individual work, podcast conversations, and then extended discussion through Perusall annotations - creates multiple layers of engagement that can accommodate different learning styles and comfort levels.

## **The Organic Recommendation Dynamic**

I love the party conversation analogy - students naturally becoming resources for each other about different ethical frameworks. "I tried virtue ethics with my dilemma and here's what I discovered..." or "Utilitarian calculus really helped me see the stakeholders I was missing..." This kind of peer-to-peer sharing is so much more motivating than assigned readings.

## **Perusall for Extended Engagement**

Using Perusall for podcast annotations is brilliant because:

* Students who aren't comfortable speaking live can still contribute meaningfully
* Conversations can develop over time as students reflect further
* It captures those "aha moments" that happen after the live conversation
* Creates searchable wisdom for future students facing similar challenges

## **The Protective Coaching Approach**

Your plan for individual feedback conversations about sensitive content shows real wisdom about balancing authentic engagement with community care. That kind of coaching - "How might we talk about this in a way that serves your learning and others' comfort?" - models exactly the kind of ethical reasoning you want students to develop.

## **Implementation Notes for Your Development**

Since this is pilot territory, a few things you might want to track:

* Which types of dilemmas generate the most engaging podcast conversations
* How students use the Perusall annotations - are they asking questions, making connections, sharing additional insights?
* Whether the 5-person limit feels right for conversation flow
* How the varied scheduling works in practice - do certain times consistently fill up faster?

The first-come-first-served approach also builds in natural accountability - students have to be actively engaged with the course timeline to secure their spots.  
This whole design honors adult learners' autonomy while creating genuine intellectual community. The students are essentially co-creating the learning experience through their diverse pathways and shared reflections.  
Retry  
**C**  
And, like you said, there are those who might be very uncomfortable with verbal or in-the-moment participation, so the idea of annotations might be a helpful way for students to represent their insights and participation in alternative ways. It also makes it possible for a student to miss their scheduled window for a podcast and not be permanently affected outcomes-wise. Again, I'll keep thinking about that, but that's for another time.  
Edit  
Exactly! The annotation layer creates multiple pathways for meaningful participation, which is so aligned with your UDL principles. A student who freezes up in live conversation might offer profound insights through thoughtful written annotations, or someone who missed their podcast slot due to a work emergency can still demonstrate deep engagement with others' conversations.  
It's really elegant how all these pieces work together - the multimodal dilemma exploration, the organic podcast conversations, the extended reflection through annotations, the self-paced framework exploration, and ultimately the self-assessment of growth. Each element supports the others while giving students genuine choice in how they engage.  
The whole design feels like it honors the reality of your students' complex lives while creating rich opportunities for the kind of ethical thinking that actually matters - the messy, ongoing, personally meaningful work of figuring out how to live well in relationship with others.  
I'm curious to see how this pilot unfolds! The iterative approach you're taking - noting what emerges and adapting as you go - seems perfect for this kind of innovative course design. Students are going to be part of creating something genuinely new in ethics education.  
Is there a particular aspect of the design you're most excited about, or one that feels like the biggest unknown as you head into implementation?  
Retry  
**C**  
I am not sure if my overview included the sample scenario of the city councilman, but I was thinking of using that as a test case to help illustrate to students how to create the initial dilemma and role identification elements that are at the core of the first weeks of the course. Since my plan is to allow students to interact with this assignment in a wide variety of ways and modes, I need to create a guidance element that can support all of these different approaches without it becoming bloated or attempting to address every possible variation. Additionally, as I experienced yesterday in trying to brainstorm possible scenarios, it is a heavy lift metaphorically speaking. Lots of intellectual reflection and revision, and that was with my experience in the field. Students coming into the class with little to no experience in articulating these things are sure to have serious struggles, so I want to anticipate and assist in easing their passage however possible.  
Edit  
You're absolutely right about the cognitive load - and that's with your expertise! For students new to this kind of ethical analysis, the task of identifying authentic complexity while distinguishing it from emotional difficulty or clear-cut violations is genuinely challenging intellectual work.

## **Using the City Councilman as a Teaching Case**

The councilman scenario is perfect for demonstration because it shows:

* Multiple authentic roles: Community activist → elected official → family member
* Competing goods: Advocacy ideals vs. governing pragmatism vs. personal relationships
* Sustained complexity: Different ethical frameworks will genuinely suggest different approaches
* Real stakes: Affects constituents, political relationships, personal integrity

## **Multimodal Guidance Strategy**

Instead of trying to create one bloated guide, what if you created modality-specific worked examples all using the same councilman scenario? Students could see:  
Visual Approach Example:

* Role mapping diagram showing councilman's competing obligations
* Stakeholder visualization with arrows showing conflicting interests
* Values tension chart showing where ideals clash with practical governance

Narrative Approach Example:

* Written exploration of the councilman's internal dialogue
* Bullet-pointed analysis of competing obligations
* Paragraph describing why this sustains 16-week analysis

Audio Approach Example:

* You thinking aloud through the councilman's dilemma identification process
* Modeling the internal questions: "Wait, is this just about being disappointed in politics, or are there genuine competing ethical obligations here?"

## **Scaffolding the Heavy Lifting**

Common Pitfalls Preemption:

* Show refined versions alongside initial attempts
* "Here's what I first thought this dilemma was about... but then I realized..."
* Demonstrate the revision process rather than just showing polished results

Guided Self-Assessment Questions:

* "Can different ethical frameworks suggest genuinely different solutions to your situation?"
* "Do you have actual decision-making power here, or are you mainly reacting to others' choices?"
* "Would this dilemma disappear if you just had more time/money/information?"

Would it help to create the councilman example in 2-3 different modalities to show students how the same analytical process can take different forms?  
Retry  
**C**  
That is what I am thinking...two or three widely variant modal versions of the same approach help to suggest possible avenues without having to cover every possibility, but opening up the potential for self-expression. But, as you mentioned before, there might be a temptation for some students to select development models that require far more effort or expertise than is warranted for the assignment, or where the technical requirements are much more complex than they anticipate, resulting in massive extraneous effort for the class. So I need to keep an eye on that, but that isn't necessarily something that needs to go into the guidance document, other than recommending minimum and maximum time constraints for weekly work.  
Edit  
Exactly - showing 2-3 very different modalities demonstrates the range of possibilities without creating an overwhelming menu of options. Students can see the analytical thinking process translated into different forms and then innovate from there.

## **Strategic Modality Selection for Examples**

You might choose modalities that vary significantly in:

* Production complexity: Simple voice memo vs. visual mapping vs. written analysis
* Time investment: Quick sketch vs. detailed infographic
* Technical skill required: Basic audio recording vs. video editing vs. graphic design

This way students can see that sophisticated ethical thinking doesn't require sophisticated production values.

## **Gentle Guardrails in Guidance**

For the time management piece, you could frame it positively:

* "Aim for 2-3 hours per week on your dilemma exploration"
* "Remember, the goal is deepening your ethical thinking, not mastering new software"
* "If you find yourself spending more time on technical aspects than ethical analysis, consider simplifying your approach"

## **The Learning Curve Reality**

Students will inevitably misjudge effort required - that's part of learning. But having the Kanban board where they can signal "this is taking longer than expected" gives you early warning systems to coach them toward more sustainable approaches.  
The beauty of your design is that a student who starts with an overly complex video project can pivot to voice memos without losing their ethical analysis work. The thinking transfers even when the modality changes.  
You're creating space for authentic self-expression while protecting students from getting lost in production complexity that doesn't serve their learning goals.  
Retry  
**C**  
But it does mean that I have to get the models done in a very tight window, and even with your help, some of that creative work can't be offloaded, especially in terms of audio or video representations.  
Edit  
Absolutely - the creative and personal elements, especially for audio/video, have to come from you. No one else can model your thinking process or demonstrate your authentic approach to ethical analysis. That's both the strength and the time crunch of this design.

## **Realistic Development Strategy**

Given the tight window, you might consider:

* Start with the modality you're most comfortable with (likely written, given your wordsmith nature)
* Choose one low-tech modality for the second example (voice memo or simple visual mapping)
* Save the most production-intensive option for last, or potentially for a future iteration

## **Time-Saving Approaches**

For Audio:

* Unscripted "thinking aloud" recording - less polished but more authentic to actual thought processes
* Use phone voice memo app rather than professional recording setup

For Visual:

* Hand-drawn mapping on paper, then photographed
* Simple digital tools like basic mind mapping software rather than graphic design programs

Documentation:

* Record your own process as you create these - that meta-reflection could become valuable guidance content too

The pressure is real, but remember that "good enough to demonstrate the concept" is probably more valuable to students than highly polished examples. They need to see that the thinking matters more than the production values.  
Would it help to prioritize which modality examples would be most useful for your specific student population based on what you know about their comfort levels and available tools?  
Retry  
**C**  
I think what we need to do is come up with 3 likely approaches that accomplish 4 core outcomes for this activity: 1) reflect the challenging mental work of articulating a clear and personally compelling scenario that captures a nuanced and authentic ethical dilemma, 2) creates a starting point for drafting and revising the ethical algorithms of related roles of the individual author as stakeholder in that situation (I don't want them trying to offload work or accountability onto 3rd persons), and 3) sets them up for exploring the questions, answers, and priorities of various ethical models and how these might be introduced, adapted, or rejected for inclusion in that editing and revising process, and 4) focus on the intellectual work of the assignment over the production quality or complexity - authentic work that uses low tech is much more preferrable to high-quality drek that comes from asking a gen AI to do the work for you. No offense intended.  
Edit  
None taken on the AI comment - you're absolutely right that authentic intellectual struggle beats polished but superficial work every time!  
Let me suggest three approaches that hit all four outcomes while staying accessible:

## **Approach 1: Reflective Audio Journal**

Format: Series of 5-7 minute voice memos recorded on phone Process: Student talks through their dilemma identification, almost like thinking aloud to a friend Core Elements:

* Initial dilemma description and why it matters to them personally
* Mapping their own roles and competing obligations (not analyzing others)
* Wrestling with why different ethical frameworks might clash
* Ongoing revisions: "I thought this was about X, but now I see it's really about Y"

Why it works: Forces articulation without hiding behind polished writing; captures authentic thinking process; low-tech; hard to outsource to AI.

## **Approach 2: Visual Role-Mapping with Reflection**

Format: Hand-drawn or simple digital diagram + written reflection Process: Student creates visual map of their roles, relationships, and tensions, then writes about what the mapping revealed Core Elements:

* Visual representation of their competing roles/obligations
* Written analysis of where their ethical "algorithms" conflict
* Documentation of how mapping changed their understanding
* Framework exploration notes directly on or around the visual

Why it works: Combines spatial and verbal processing; makes abstract relationships concrete; personal and hard to fake; accessible tools.

## **Approach 3: Structured Written Dialogue**

Format: Students write internal conversations between their different "selves" Process: Literally writing dialogue between themselves as parent, employee, student, community member, etc. Core Elements:

* Conversations between their conflicting roles
* Each "voice" advocating for different ethical priorities
* Exploration of how different frameworks speak through different roles
* Evolution of the conversation as they learn new ethical models

Why it works: Forces them to inhabit their different stakeholder positions; makes competing obligations explicit; shows ethical reasoning development; naturally iterative.  
Which of these resonates most with your vision?  
Retry  
**C**  
I think all three of these would work well as the samples to be included in the guidance resource - it really doesn't lend itself to the categorization of a "document." Students should be spending as much time reviewing the resources as they do in creating their own to make sure they start off correctly. The audio shouldn't be too hard to create if we can draft a reasonable outline or script to help me conceptualize what it is I am trying to portray to them.  
Edit  
Perfect! You're right - this is much more of a "resource collection" than a traditional document. And having students spend significant time with the examples before diving into creation is smart pedagogy - they need to internalize what authentic ethical complexity looks like.

## **Audio Example Script Outline**

Let me draft a framework for your councilman audio thinking-aloud:  
Opening (30-45 seconds): "So I'm trying to figure out this ethical dilemma for my project, and I keep coming back to this situation I'm in as a new city council member..."  
Initial Dilemma Articulation (2-3 minutes):

* "I ran on this platform of environmental justice, really passionate about it..."
* "But now I'm in these budget meetings and I'm seeing how the city actually works..."
* "There's this vote coming up about the new industrial development..."
* [Pause] "Wait, let me think about what my actual roles are here..."

Role Mapping Out Loud (2-3 minutes):

* "I'm an elected official - I took an oath to serve all constituents..."
* "But I'm also still an activist at heart - those values didn't disappear..."
* "And I'm a parent - my kids live in this community too..."
* "Oh, and I'm a party member - there are political relationships to consider..."

Wrestling with Complexity (2-3 minutes):

* "So if I vote against this development, I'm being true to my environmental values..."
* "But I'm also potentially blocking jobs that some of my constituents really need..."
* "This isn't just about what I personally believe is right - I have responsibilities to people who disagree with me..."
* [Pause] "Actually, this is way more complicated than I first thought..."

Why This Sustains Analysis (1-2 minutes):

* "I can see how different ethical frameworks would give me totally different answers here..."
* "And this isn't going away - I'll face votes like this for my whole term..."

Would this kind of structure work for you to record from?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, and no. I think that the guidance needs to be broken up into 2 parts - the conceptual process (how to come up with a working dilemma and roles) and then the applicative element (how do I represent or create documentation of what I came up with in the conceptual part. For example, giving them instructions on how to come up with a dilemma and then trying to portray that part of the process in audio files doesn't seem very helpful. Giving them an infographic guide to the first steps of the process or an annotated version of the sample scenario with embedded comments about common pitfalls or mistakes that can pop up makes more sense...  
Edit  
Ah, that's a much cleaner separation! You're absolutely right - the conceptual process (how to identify and develop a workable dilemma) needs different treatment than the representation methods (how to document and explore what you've identified).

## **Part 1: Conceptual Process Resources**

Best delivered through:

* Annotated councilman scenario with embedded comments like "Notice how this isn't just about personal preference - there are genuine competing obligations here"
* Infographic guide showing the decision tree: "Is this emotionally difficult? Yes. But does it also involve competing ethical frameworks? If no, keep looking..."
* Common pitfalls chart with examples: "Feels like a dilemma but is actually..." vs. "Genuine ethical complexity looks like..."

## **Part 2: Representation/Documentation Methods**

This is where your three modalities shine:

* Audio example: Councilman scenario explored through thinking-aloud process
* Visual mapping example: Same councilman scenario as role/tension diagram with reflection
* Written dialogue example: Councilman's different "selves" in conversation

Students would work through Part 1 to develop their dilemma, then choose from Part 2 approaches to document and explore it.  
This makes so much more sense pedagogically - they need to understand what they're looking for before they can effectively use tools to explore it. And it prevents the audio from trying to do double duty as both instruction and demonstration.  
Would the annotated councilman scenario work well as the centerpiece of Part 1, with the infographic and pitfalls chart as supporting materials?  
Retry  
**C**  
I think an annotated flowchart of the decision-making process for coming up with a dilemma seems like it would be the most helpful (where the annotations explain the decision forks in the flow...)  
Edit  
Ethical Dilemma Identification Flowchart  
Document  
# Ethical Dilemma Identification Flowchart

## START: Think of a situation in your life that feels challenging or difficult

\*\*↓\*\*

### Decision Point 1: Do you have actual decision-making power in this situation?

\*\*Annotation:\*\* \*You need to be a s  
Brilliant idea! An annotated flowchart makes the decision-making process explicit and helps students self-diagnose where their potential dilemmas might be falling short. The flowchart format naturally guides them through the logical sequence while the annotations explain the "why" behind each decision point.  
This approach should help students avoid the common pitfalls we identified (like the cybersecurity scenarios that felt too dramatic, or the observer positions where they lack agency) by building in self-check mechanisms at each stage.  
The flowchart also reinforces that this is iterative work - they might need to loop back and reframe their situation multiple times before finding something that works, and that's completely normal and expected.  
Would you want to adjust any of the decision points or annotations based on your experience with the scenario development process we went through?  
Retry  
**C**  
Please create a markdown summary of this conversation  
Edit  
UDL-Based Dilemma Identification Design: Conversation Summary  
Document  
# UDL-Based Dilemma Identification Design: Conversation Summary

## Context and Challenge Extension  
Building on previous dilemma design work for an Applied Ethics in Technology course serving 30 non-traditional postsecondary CTE students in an online  
This summary captures the evolution of your course design from dilemma identification to a comprehensive UDL-based learning experience. The integration of multimodal approaches with your existing podcast and self-assessment structure creates a really sophisticated learning environment that honors both the complexity of ethical reasoning and the diverse needs of your student population.  
The two-part guidance structure (conceptual process vs. representation methods) and the flowchart approach should make the heavy intellectual work much more manageable for students while preserving the authentic complexity that makes the course meaningful.  
Retry  
[Claude can make mistakes. Please double-check responses.](https://support.anthropic.com/en/articles/8525154-claude-is-providing-incorrect-or-misleading-responses-what-s-going-on)  
Sonnet 4  
Claude

**C**  
Clayn  
Free plan