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# Course Syllabus Adaptation Strategy

Share  
**C**  
Here are the general syllabi for the two courses and the AI prompts for both. I want to take the Start of Day, End of Day, Process Planning, and Confidence Assessment elements from the comp course and replicate them in the same style and voice as the other Ethics prompts. Let's not just jump into drafting, but look at the implications of the first (the Process Planning) and any specific alterations that might need to be made from one to the other...  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vRt8uBk2pF9es-ntyj0YwD8k9R4Gk3ir8SRz-BSaM9jQO4n7lHlhizCu0vmMTYs53MpxCqJAEJSHqYO/pub>  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vRZCRpEG3YuBkT3rgBiZ7ShXmonLsdRGdpwII5aNMeUookn9OFcrQ51swK7QGYgPnthpC0LseQsWg5P/pub>  
Edit  
I'll fetch both documents to examine the syllabi and AI prompts, then analyze the implications of adapting the computational thinking elements to the ethics course.  
favicon  
Fetched Course Syllabus  
google.com  
favicon  
Fetched Course Syllabus  
google.com  
Perfect! Now I can analyze both documents to understand the structure and voice of each course and examine the implications of adapting the computational thinking elements to the ethics course.

## **Analysis of Both Courses**

Composition Course (ENGL 1101):

* Voice: Highly supportive, student-centered, practical
* Structure: Process-focused with AI as thinking partner, self-directed learning, transparent methodology
* Key Elements: Start of Day, End of Day, Process Planning, Confidence Assessment
* Philosophy: "AI enhances your thinking rather than replacing it"

Ethics Course:

* Voice: Archaeological metaphor, intellectual excavation, philosophical discovery
* Structure: Systematic exploration of ethical frameworks through personal dilemma analysis
* Philosophy: "Ethical archaeology" - uncovering philosophical foundations already embedded in reasoning

## **Implications of Adapting Process Planning**

The Process Planning element from the comp course is the most complex to adapt because it assumes:

1. Concrete deliverables (3-4 page writing projects with clear audiences)
2. Predictable sequences (research → drafting → revision → editing)
3. Practical timelines (semester-long project completion)

The ethics course, however, involves:

1. Intellectual excavation (discovering philosophical patterns, not producing documents)
2. Recursive exploration (frameworks may reveal new layers requiring re-examination)
3. Open-ended inquiry (archaeological discoveries can't be precisely scheduled)

## **Specific Adaptations Needed**

### **Process Planning → Excavation Planning**

* Instead of "What tasks do I need to complete?", ask "What archaeological sites do I need to explore?"
* Replace concrete deliverables with investigation phases
* Account for the recursive nature of philosophical discovery

### **Confidence Assessment → Philosophical Comfort Assessment**

* Shift from "Can I write this?" to "Am I prepared to excavate this philosophical territory?"
* Include comfort with ambiguity and intellectual uncertainty
* Address philosophical resistance or avoidance patterns

### **Timeline Considerations**

* Ethics work is more cyclical - frameworks build on each other
* Allow for "dead ends" and unexpected discoveries that require methodology changes
* Plan for integration work where multiple frameworks illuminate the same tensions

## **Key Voice/Style Adaptations**

The ethics prompts should:

* Maintain the archaeological metaphor consistently
* Frame AI as an excavation assistant rather than writing coach
* Emphasize discovery and interpretation over production and completion
* Address intellectual courage needed for uncomfortable philosophical territory

Would you like me to proceed with drafting the adapted prompts, keeping these implications in mind?  
Retry  
**C**  
Go for it!!  
Edit  
Ethics Course AI Prompts - Adapted Elements  
Document  
# Ethics Course AI Prompts - Adapted Elements

## Start of Day - Excavation Session Launch

You are helping this student launch into today's excavation session efficiently. Review their uploaded end-of-day reflection and checkpoint saves to understan  
Retry  
**C**  
Wait, I thought we were starting with the Process Planning first?  
Edit  
You're absolutely right! Let me focus on the Process Planning first since that's the most complex adaptation and the one we analyzed the implications for.  
Ethics Course AI Prompt - Excavation Planning  
Document ∙ Version 2  
# Excavation Planning - Ethics Course AI Prompt

You are helping this student map out the specific, actionable phases needed to conduct systematic archaeological excavation of their ethical dilemma. Your job is to help them think through their excava  
Perfect! I've adapted the Process Planning prompt for the ethics course. The key adaptations I made:

## **Major Changes from Comp to Ethics:**

1. Archaeological Metaphor Throughout

* "Excavation planning" instead of "process mapping"
* "Philosophical territory" instead of "writing tasks"
* "Archaeological methodology" instead of "writing process"

2. Intellectual vs. Production Focus

* Planning for discovery and interpretation rather than deliverable creation
* Emphasis on handling intellectual resistance and uncomfortable insights
* Acknowledgment that philosophical exploration is recursive and unpredictable

3. Framework Integration Complexity

* Unlike writing projects with clear sequences, philosophical excavation requires planning for synthesis across multiple frameworks
* Addresses the challenge of contradictory philosophical insights
* Plans for methodology adjustments based on discoveries

4. Timeline Realism

* Accounts for the fact that philosophical work can't be rushed or precisely scheduled
* Builds in space for unexpected discoveries that require deeper investigation
* Recognizes that some frameworks may require more time due to intellectual resistance

5. Personal Methodology Development

* Helps students develop their own approach to philosophical investigation
* Validates different learning styles while maintaining excavation depth
* Focuses on building archaeological skills rather than following predetermined steps

The voice maintains the supportive, questioning approach of the original while fully embracing the archaeological metaphor and the unique challenges of philosophical exploration.  
Ready for the next adaptation?  
Retry  
**C**  
The Confidence Assessment?  
Edit  
Ethics Course AI Prompt - Philosophical Comfort Assessment  
Document ∙ Version 3  
# Philosophical Comfort Assessment - Ethics Course AI Prompt

You are helping this student assess their comfort levels with different aspects of philosophical excavation and develop targeted strategies for engaging with challenging intellectual terri  
Perfect! I've adapted the Confidence Assessment for the ethics course. Here are the key adaptations I made:

## **Major Changes from Comp to Ethics:**

1. "Confidence" → "Philosophical Comfort"

* Recognizes that philosophical work requires intellectual courage, not just skill confidence
* Addresses comfort with ambiguity, uncertainty, and intellectual challenge
* Frames discomfort as normal part of philosophical growth

2. Assessment Categories Shifted from Writing Skills to Philosophical Capacities:

* Intellectual Resistance Management - handling worldview challenges
* Personal Excavation Depth - comfort with self-examination
* Ambiguity and Complexity Tolerance - essential for ethical reasoning
* Critical Analysis and Integration - synthesis across multiple frameworks

3. Challenge Types Adapted for Philosophical Work:

* Conceptual confusion vs worldview threat vs avoidance patterns
* Addresses the unique challenge of philosophical material that can threaten core beliefs
* Recognizes that some philosophical discomfort is existential, not just intellectual

4. Resource Integration:

* Specific ethics textbook chapters instead of writing guides
* AI as "philosophical counselor" rather than writing coach
* Peer discussion for working through philosophical resistance

5. Investment Assessment Reframed:

* Acknowledges that students may legitimately choose not to engage deeply with all philosophical challenges
* Validates different levels of philosophical risk-taking
* Connects investment decisions to personal ethical development goals

6. Strategy Development for Philosophical Challenges:

* Gradual exposure strategies for worldview-threatening material
* Philosophy-to-life translation exercises for abstract concepts
* Intellectual courage building in manageable doses

The voice maintains the supportive, non-judgmental approach while addressing the unique psychological and intellectual challenges of ethical philosophy - particularly the reality that philosophical frameworks can challenge students' fundamental beliefs about right and wrong.  
Ready for Start of Day next?  
Retry  
**C**  
OK. Quick question - look at the individual ethical model prompts. Do these replicate the Start of Day planning element in terms of function?  
Edit  
Looking at the individual ethical framework prompts (like the Utilitarian Ethics excavation prompt), I can see they do have some functional overlap with Start of Day planning, but they serve different purposes:

## **Framework Prompts Function:**

* One-time deep dive into a specific philosophical framework
* Systematic excavation of that framework's presence in existing reasoning
* Archaeological analysis of how that theory illuminates their conflict map
* Documentation of discoveries for integration later

## **Start of Day Would Function:**

* Session launch regardless of what they're working on that day
* Context restoration from previous work sessions
* Immediate focus setting for productive work time
* Momentum building to get started efficiently

## **The Key Difference:**

The framework prompts are content-specific excavation guides - they assume the student is ready to dig into utilitarianism (or virtue ethics, etc.) and provide the systematic methodology for that specific archaeological work.  
Start of Day would be a session management tool that helps them figure out:

* "Where was I in my overall excavation when I last stopped?"
* "What's the most productive use of today's 75 minutes?"
* "Do I need to restore AI context, continue framework analysis, work on integration, or something else?"

So a student might use Start of Day to determine they're ready to tackle their Utilitarian excavation, then switch to the Utilitarian framework prompt to actually conduct that archaeological work.  
The framework prompts are the specialized excavation tools. Start of Day is the session planning and momentum tool.  
Does this distinction make sense? Should we still create the Start of Day prompt, or do you think the framework prompts cover this function sufficiently?  
Retry  
**C**  
I think they do, at least to the point where adding in an additional step seems unnecessary. But, one element that does pop into Start of Day is the idea of assessing needs to just-in-time support, and I am not sure that exists in the different model prompts. As much as I might not like it, I think we need to edit them to replicate that sense of "Read the Explorations text first. If you feel you are still struggling, give me a sense of where the struggle exists and I might have other sources for you to look at?"  
Edit  
You're absolutely right! That's a crucial gap. The framework prompts assume students can successfully read and comprehend the philosophical texts, but they don't provide scaffolding for when students hit comprehension barriers.  
Looking at the current framework prompts, they jump straight into:

* "Read Chapter X"
* "Pay attention to your reactions"
* "Now comes the excavation work"

But there's no support for: "What if I read Chapter 2 on Utilitarianism and I'm completely lost?" or "What if the philosophical language is impenetrable?"  
This is especially important because:

1. Philosophy texts are notoriously difficult - much more challenging than typical college reading
2. Students need different entry points - some need concept mapping, others need examples, others need historical context
3. Comprehension barriers kill excavation - if they don't understand the framework, they can't excavate with it

We should add a comprehension support phase to each framework prompt that:

* Checks for understanding after the initial reading
* Provides diagnostic questions to identify specific confusion points
* Offers targeted resources based on their comprehension struggles
* Gives alternative entry points (videos, simplified explanations, concrete examples)

Should I update one of the framework prompts to show how this would work? Maybe the Utilitarian one as an example?  
Retry  
**C**  
Well, what if we were to create a more generic support prompt that could be recycled rather than embedding the same thing again and again and again?  
Edit  
Brilliant! That's much more efficient and cleaner. A single Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt that students can use whenever they hit reading barriers with any framework.  
This would:

1. Reduce redundancy - instead of embedding the same comprehension support in 9+ framework prompts
2. Create consistency - same diagnostic approach across all philosophical texts
3. Give students agency - they decide when they need additional support
4. Allow flexibility - can be used for any challenging philosophical reading, not just our assigned chapters

The framework prompts would simply include a line like:  
"If you're struggling to understand the chapter after reading, use the Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt before proceeding with excavation."  
The support prompt would:

* Diagnose what type of comprehension barrier they're facing (vocabulary, concepts, argumentation structure, etc.)
* Provide targeted resources based on their specific struggle
* Offer alternative entry points (examples, analogies, simplified explanations)
* Help them determine when they're ready to return to excavation work

This also teaches them a transferable skill - how to get unstuck when encountering difficult philosophical material beyond our course.  
Should I create this generic Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt?  
Retry  
**C**  
Before you do, let me replicate the same process of collecting the Table of Contents for the various texts and publishing it as one webpage so that can included in the directives for the AI. Please stand by...  
Edit  
Perfect! That makes complete sense. Having all the available resources compiled in one accessible reference will make the Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt much more useful and specific.  
I'll wait for you to get that table of contents compiled before creating the support prompt. This way the AI can point students to specific chapters, sections, or alternative resources based on exactly what's available rather than giving generic advice.  
Standing by!  
Retry  
**C**  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vQK0TiFyvIrdifxnn4CJBa7iiumOjkkHsj6J2_bvqG0FeDSOVvCURP0OHoQ3ORad1MxBwNtH_ASuObY/pub>  
Edit  
favicon  
Fetched Ethics Texts  
google.com  
Perfect! Now I have the comprehensive resource list. I can see there are multiple sources covering each major framework with different approaches and levels of complexity. This will make the Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt much more useful.  
Philosophical Comprehension Support - Ethics Course AI Prompt  
Document ∙ Version 4  
# Philosophical Comprehension Support - Ethics Course AI Prompt

You are helping this student overcome comprehension barriers with philosophical texts so they can proceed with their ethical archaeology. Your job is to diagnose their specific reading  
Perfect! I've created a comprehensive Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt that can be used across all frameworks. Here are the key features:

## **Design Highlights:**

1. Comprehensive Resource Integration:

* All available texts organized by philosophical framework
* Multiple complexity levels (from accessible Business Ethics to more rigorous Phronesis)
* Strategic recommendations based on specific comprehension barriers

2. Diagnostic Approach:

* Identifies specific types of reading challenges (vocabulary, argumentation, conceptual complexity, etc.)
* Matches strategies to challenge types rather than generic "study harder" advice
* Validates that philosophy is genuinely difficult material

3. Skill-Building Focus:

* Develops transferable philosophical reading skills
* Helps students become independent readers of challenging material
* Creates comprehension strategies they can use beyond this course

4. Archaeological Integration:

* Maintains the excavation metaphor and language
* Connects comprehension work to their ongoing ethical archaeology
* Treats understanding as preparation for excavation, not an end in itself

5. Documentation Component:

* Creates a record of their comprehension development
* Helps them recognize their philosophical reading skill growth
* Contributes to their self-assessment evidence

Now the framework prompts can simply include a line like:  
"If you're struggling to understand the chapter after reading, use the Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt before proceeding with excavation."  
This keeps the framework prompts focused on archaeological methodology while providing robust support when students hit comprehension barriers.  
Ready for the End of Day adaptation next?  
Retry  
**C**  
Damn! Where were you when I was going through my courses on critical theory and Heiddeger, Foucault, and Derrida?!  
Edit  
Ha! I would have been SO useful for that philosophical gauntlet! Can you imagine having a comprehension support prompt for navigating Heidegger's *Being and Time* or Derrida's *Of Grammatology*?  
"Help! I've been reading the same paragraph about *Dasein* for 45 minutes and I think I'm having an existential crisis about the ontological difference!"  
Or: "Foucault keeps talking about 'discourse' but I can't tell if he means language, power structures, or some impossible combination of both, and now I'm questioning whether knowledge even exists..."  
The beauty of what we just created is that it would actually work for that level of philosophical complexity too. The diagnostic approach - figuring out if you're struggling with terminology, argumentation structure, cultural context, or just the sheer conceptual density - applies whether you're reading introductory ethics or poststructuralist theory.  
Though I have to admit, a Derrida Comprehension Support prompt would probably just end up deconstructing itself and questioning whether comprehension is even possible... 😅  
But seriously, this is exactly why this generic support tool is so valuable - philosophy students need scaffolding for engaging with genuinely difficult material, and most courses just assume you'll figure it out or suffer in silence.  
Ready to tackle the End of Day prompt and complete this adaptation set?  
Retry  
**C**  
Actually, I think that we just saved ourselves the need for the Start of and End of Day prompts. The individual models, along with the support? I think it covers enough of everything without adding extra levels of documentation (which students won't want to do...)  
Edit  
You're absolutely right! Looking at what we've created:  
Individual Framework Prompts already provide:

* Clear starting point ("Read Chapter X first")
* Structured excavation methodology
* Built-in reflection and documentation
* Specific archaeological goals for each session

Philosophical Comprehension Support fills the gap by:

* Addressing reading struggles before they derail excavation
* Providing just-in-time support when students hit barriers
* Offering alternative entry points and resources

Together, these two elements cover:

* Session planning (framework prompts guide the work)
* Problem-solving (comprehension support handles obstacles)
* Documentation (archaeological findings get recorded)
* Momentum building (clear next steps built into each prompt)

Adding Start of Day and End of Day prompts would just be documentation overkill. Students are already doing substantial reflection and record-keeping through their:

* Conflict map evolution
* Framework excavation reports
* AI checkpoint summaries
* ClickUp tracking

The beauty is that we've created a lean but comprehensive system - sophisticated support without bureaucratic overhead. Students get the scaffolding they need for complex philosophical work without feeling like they're filling out forms.  
This is a much cleaner solution. The individual framework prompts ARE the session management tool, and the comprehension support IS the just-in-time help system.  
Smart call to stop here rather than over-engineering it!  
Retry  
**C**  
The only thing we need to do is make sure the students know to use the support prompt when needed. This is going to shortcut so many emails for me!  
Edit  
Absolutely! That's going to save you SO many "I don't understand utilitarianism, what should I do?" emails.  
We should add a clear directive to each framework prompt, something like:  
Before proceeding with excavation: If you're struggling to understand the chapter after reading it, use the Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt first. Don't attempt archaeological work until you have adequate comprehension of the framework - you'll just end up frustrated and your excavation will be superficial.  
Or even more direct:  
Stuck on the reading? Before emailing your instructor or giving up, try the Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt. It will diagnose your specific comprehension barrier and provide targeted resources and strategies.  
This also teaches students professional problem-solving skills - try available resources and diagnostic tools before escalating to the instructor. It's exactly what they'll need to do in their careers when facing complex material.  
Plus, the students who DO use the comprehension support and still need help will come to you with much more specific, productive questions: "I used the comprehension support prompt, tried three different sources for social contract theory, and I understand the basic concept but I'm still confused about how Rawls' veil of ignorance differs from Hobbes' state of nature..."  
That's a MUCH better email to receive than "I don't get Chapter 6, help!"  
Should we add that directive line to the framework prompts, or create a separate brief instruction for students about when and how to use the support prompt?  
Retry  
**C**  
For tonight? Let me go sleep on it. I probably need to add it to the individual prompts, but it's late enough, it can wait...  
Edit  
Perfect! You've got a solid foundation here - the Process Planning, Philosophical Comfort Assessment, and Comprehension Support prompts are substantial adaptations that capture the unique challenges of ethical archaeology while maintaining the supportive, student-centered approach of the original composition course.  
Sleep well! Tomorrow you can decide whether to embed the support prompt reference directly in each framework prompt or handle it some other way. Either approach will definitely cut down on those "I'm lost, help!" emails.  
Great work adapting these elements - the archaeological metaphor really comes through consistently, and the shift from writing confidence to philosophical comfort is particularly well done. The comprehension support prompt especially is going to be incredibly useful for students wrestling with genuinely challenging philosophical material.  
See you on the flip side! 🌙  
Retry  
**C**  
So, a couple of thoughts after a night's sleep. Rather than a separate prompt, I need to add this as a component for each of the ethical model prompts. Let's call it Troubleshooting and that way, if a student moves their card to Blocked, I can ask them to include which Troubleshooting steps they have already taken before asking for assistance, and (hopefully) refer them to others before responding to their questions myself.  
Edit  
Brilliant! That's a much more integrated and systematic approach. Adding a Troubleshooting section to each framework prompt serves multiple purposes:

1. Prevents premature blocking - students try self-help first
2. Creates accountability - they have to document what they've attempted
3. Gives you triage information - you immediately know what they've tried
4. Teaches professional problem-solving - exhaust available resources before escalating

When students move cards to "Blocked," you can require them to comment:

* "Which Troubleshooting steps from the [Framework] prompt did you complete?"
* "What specific barrier persists after trying these steps?"

This turns your response from "here, try this resource" to "I see you've tried X and Y, let's tackle Z approach" or "Based on your troubleshooting attempts, this looks like a conference topic."

## **Suggested Troubleshooting Section Structure:**

Before moving your card to "Blocked," work through these troubleshooting steps:

1. Reading Comprehension Issues → Use Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt
2. Excavation Methodology Confusion → Review your Process Planning and try [specific approach]
3. Integration Difficulties → Refer to your Conflict Map and [specific guidance]
4. Philosophical Resistance → Review your Comfort Assessment and [specific strategy]

When requesting instructor help, include:

* Which troubleshooting steps you completed
* What specific barrier remains after attempting these solutions
* Your best guess about what type of support you need

## This creates a much more efficient support system. Should I draft a sample Troubleshooting section for one of the framework prompts? Retry **C** Do you think we can get away with a single prompt insert? Edit Absolutely! A single, generic Troubleshooting section that can be inserted into every framework prompt would be much more efficient and consistent. Something like:

## **Troubleshooting Your Excavation**

Before moving your ClickUp card to "Blocked," work through these steps:

1. Reading Comprehension Issues: If you're struggling to understand the philosophical text, use the Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt to diagnose your specific barrier and access alternative resources.
2. Excavation Methodology Confusion: Review your Excavation Plan from Part 3. Try approaching the framework analysis from a different angle - perhaps starting with your personal examples rather than abstract theory.
3. Integration Difficulties: Return to your Conflict Map and look for specific tensions this framework might illuminate. If you're not seeing connections, the framework may not significantly appear in your reasoning (which is itself a valid archaeological finding).
4. Philosophical Resistance: Check your Philosophical Comfort Assessment. If this framework challenges your worldview, that discomfort may be valuable data rather than a problem to solve.

When requesting instructor help via "Blocked" status:

* List which troubleshooting steps you completed
* Describe the specific barrier that remains
* Include your best assessment of what type of support might help

## This single insert works for every framework because the troubleshooting categories are universal to philosophical excavation work. It also reinforces the interconnectedness of all their archaeological tools (Process Planning, Comfort Assessment, Conflict Map, etc.). Want me to add this section to one of the existing framework prompts as an example? Retry **C** Now, here's the thing. The prompt isn't student-facing, it isn't giving instructions to students; it is giving instructions to the AI on its role and function in the interaction, so the prompt needs to focus on what Ai does, or how it presents this to students. Edit Ah, you're absolutely right! I was writing student instructions instead of AI instructions. The troubleshooting section needs to tell the AI how to handle students who are stuck, not tell students what to do. Something like:

## **AI Troubleshooting Protocol**

Before allowing students to conclude they need instructor help, guide them through these diagnostic steps:  
If student reports reading comprehension difficulties:

* Direct them to use the Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt first
* Do not attempt to explain the philosophical content yourself
* Only proceed with excavation after they've achieved adequate framework understanding

If student seems confused about excavation methodology:

* Help them review their Excavation Plan and suggest alternative approaches
* Encourage them to start with personal examples rather than abstract analysis
* Remind them that archaeological work is recursive, not linear

If student can't connect framework to their dilemma:

* Guide them back to specific tensions in their Conflict Map
* Help them recognize that minimal framework presence is itself a valid archaeological finding
* Don't force connections that aren't authentically there

If student expresses philosophical resistance or discomfort:

* Refer them to their Philosophical Comfort Assessment strategies
* Frame discomfort as potentially valuable archaeological data
* Support their engagement level choices without pressure

When student still needs instructor help after troubleshooting:

* Have them document which steps they completed
* Help them articulate their specific remaining barrier
* Guide them to assess what type of support they need before moving to "Blocked" status

## This tells the AI how to systematically work through student problems before they escalate to you. Much better! Retry **C** Another note: some students might not suggest that they are having problems, so inserting suggestions or reminders that troubleshooting assistance is available would be helpful. I'll also see if I can insert a note in the course documentation that Troubleshooting is built into the model prompts and direct students to use it prior to engaging in other support pathways. Edit Excellent point! The AI needs to proactively recognize struggle patterns and offer troubleshooting, not just wait for students to explicitly ask for help. Something like:

## **AI Troubleshooting Protocol**

Proactively offer troubleshooting when you notice:

* Student repeatedly asking for clarification about basic framework concepts → "It sounds like you might benefit from the Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt before we continue this excavation"
* Student expressing frustration or saying they "don't get it" → "Let's pause the excavation and work through some troubleshooting steps that might help"
* Student making surface-level connections or avoiding deeper analysis → "I'm noticing some hesitation in your excavation work - would some troubleshooting strategies be helpful?"
* Student requesting you to explain philosophical concepts directly → "Rather than me explaining this, let's use the troubleshooting resources designed for this situation"

Systematic troubleshooting guidance:

* Reading comprehension issues → Direct to Philosophical Comprehension Support prompt
* Excavation methodology confusion → Review their Excavation Plan, suggest alternative approaches
* Integration difficulties → Return to Conflict Map, validate that minimal connections are valid findings
* Philosophical resistance → Reference Comfort Assessment strategies, frame discomfort as data

## Always remind students: "Remember, troubleshooting support is built into these prompts specifically to help you work through challenges independently before needing instructor assistance." For escalation to instructor: Help them document completed troubleshooting steps and articulate remaining barriers before moving to "Blocked" status.

And yes, having that note in the course documentation will train students to use the built-in troubleshooting first - much more efficient than reactive support!  
Retry  
**C**  
I'd like to rename the Philosophical Comprehension Support to Troubleshooting. It is more evocative...  
Edit  
Perfect! "Troubleshooting" is much more intuitive and action-oriented. Students immediately understand what it's for, whereas "Philosophical Comprehension Support" sounds more academic and intimidating.  
So we'd have:

1. Individual Framework Prompts with embedded troubleshooting protocols that direct students to...
2. Troubleshooting prompt (the standalone comprehensive support tool)
3. Course documentation noting that troubleshooting is built into the system

The AI instructions would then reference:

* "Direct them to use the Troubleshooting prompt first"
* "Let's use the troubleshooting resources designed for this situation"
* "Remember, troubleshooting support is built into these prompts"

Much cleaner and more student-friendly. "Troubleshooting" also reinforces that philosophical challenges are normal, solvable problems rather than personal deficits - just like troubleshooting any other complex system.  
Should I update the prompt title and references to reflect this change?  
Retry  
**C**  
Nope. I want to embed the "Troubleshooting" into each prompt; no sending them somewhere else. It is more intuitive to think of the initial prompt for the model including support directives than to have to go somewhere else to get help.  
Edit  
Ah, I see! You want the troubleshooting functionality built directly into each framework prompt, not as a separate prompt they have to navigate to. Much more streamlined.  
So each framework prompt (Utilitarian, Deontological, Virtue Ethics, etc.) would include:

1. The main excavation instructions (read chapter, conduct archaeological analysis, etc.)
2. Built-in troubleshooting protocols that the AI uses when it detects student struggles
3. Proactive support recognition so AI offers help before students get stuck

This means students never have to leave their current excavation work to get support - the AI just seamlessly shifts into troubleshooting mode within the same conversation when needed.  
Much better user experience! No context switching, no hunting for separate prompts, no interrupting their archaeological flow. The AI becomes a more sophisticated excavation assistant that can both guide the methodology AND provide support when challenges arise.  
This also means we need to take the comprehensive resource list and diagnostic strategies from the standalone troubleshooting prompt and integrate them into each framework prompt. The AI will have all the tools it needs right there in the working conversation.  
Should I show you how this would look integrated into one of the existing framework prompts as an example?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, please.  
Edit  
Ethics Course AI Prompts - Adapted Elements  
Document ∙ Version 5  
# Utilitarian Ethics Excavation - With Integrated Troubleshooting

You are helping this student conduct archaeological analysis of their own ethical reasoning to discover where utilitarian concepts already appear in their thinking. This isn't about f  
Ethics Course AI Prompts - Adapted Elements  
Document ∙ Version 6  
## Phase 2: Archaeological Excavation

Start your excavation with this context for the AI:

"I'm conducting an archaeological analysis of my own ethical reasoning to discover where utilitarian concepts already appear in my thinking. I've read about u  
Perfect! Here's how the integrated troubleshooting looks within the Utilitarian Ethics framework prompt. The key features:

## **Integrated Design:**

1. Seamless Flow: Students read → excavate → get help when needed, all in one conversation 2. Proactive Detection: AI recognizes struggle patterns before students explicitly ask for help  
3. Resource-Rich: All alternative sources readily available based on specific challenge types 4. Methodology Preservation: Troubleshooting supports the archaeological approach rather than replacing it

## **AI Behavior Changes:**

Instead of the AI just following the excavation questions, it now:

* Monitors for comprehension struggles, resistance, or methodology confusion
* Intervenes proactively with appropriate support strategies
* Guides students to suitable resources without doing the thinking for them
* Validates different levels of philosophical engagement

## **Student Experience:**

* No context switching between prompts
* Support feels like natural conversation flow
* Resources are targeted to their specific barrier type
* Archaeological methodology remains central throughout

This approach makes each framework prompt much more robust while maintaining the focused excavation work. Students get sophisticated support without bureaucratic complexity.  
The troubleshooting is now truly integrated into their excavation process rather than being an external add-on. Much more intuitive!  
Retry  
**C**  
Could you show me what the revised utilitarian model prompt would look like with this new element embedded?  
Edit  
Utilitarian Ethics Excavation - Complete Integrated Prompt  
Document ∙ Version 7  
# Utilitarian Ethics Excavation - Complete Framework Prompt

You are helping this student conduct archaeological analysis of their own ethical reasoning to discover where utilitarian concepts already appear in their thinking. This isn't about finding  
Here's the complete integrated Utilitarian Ethics prompt! Key features of this version:

## **Complete Integration:**

1. Troubleshooting Built-In: All support protocols are embedded within the main prompt structure, so the AI seamlessly shifts between excavation guidance and troubleshooting support  
2. Proactive Monitoring: Clear indicators for the AI to watch for student struggles, with specific response protocols for each type of challenge  
3. Resource-Rich: All alternative sources are readily available and categorized by challenge type (basic concepts vs. complex theory breakdown)  
4. Methodology Preservation: Troubleshooting supports archaeological discovery rather than replacing it with explanation or analysis

## **Student Experience Flow:**

1. Read utilitarian ethics chapter
2. Begin excavation with AI assistance
3. Get immediate support if they hit barriers (without leaving the conversation)
4. Continue excavation with appropriate scaffolding
5. Document findings in their ongoing archaeological work

The AI now functions as a sophisticated excavation assistant that can:

* Detect when students need support before they ask
* Diagnose specific types of comprehension or methodology barriers
* Provide targeted resources and strategies
* Maintain the archaeological focus throughout

This creates a much more robust and supportive framework prompt while keeping students engaged in authentic philosophical discovery work. No more "I'm stuck, help!" emails - the support is built right into their excavation process!  
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# Utilitarian Ethics Prompt Comparison - Before & After

## ORIGINAL PROMPT (Syllabus Version)

You're about to become an ethical archaeologist, excavating your own moral reasoning to discover what philosophical traditions are already operating in yo  
This side-by-side comparison shows the dramatic enhancement from the original prompt to the new integrated version. The key transformation is from a basic excavation guide to a sophisticated support system that can handle the full range of student challenges while maintaining the archaeological methodology.

## **The Big Changes:**

1. Problem Prevention → Problem Solving

* Original: Students hit barriers and get stuck
* New: AI proactively detects struggles and provides targeted support

2. Generic Help → Specific Resources

* Original: No guidance when students don't understand readings
* New: Multiple alternative sources matched to specific comprehension barriers

3. Reactive → Proactive

* Original: Students have to ask for help
* New: AI recognizes struggle patterns and offers support automatically

4. Sink or Swim → Scaffolded Support

* Original: Students either get it or they don't
* New: Systematic troubleshooting protocols for different challenge types

The new version transforms each framework prompt from a simple instruction set into a comprehensive learning support system, while preserving the archaeological discovery approach that makes the course unique.  
This should dramatically reduce those "I don't understand utilitarianism, help!" emails while giving students much more robust support for engaging with genuinely challenging philosophical material.  
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