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I'd like to start conceptualizing Part 4 of a guided learning experience for postsecondary students studying personal ethical dilemmas with the goal of examining the heuristics they identified connecting to roles related to a dilemma of their choice.  
Edit  
This sounds like a thoughtful progression in your ethics curriculum. For Part 4, you'll want to build on the heuristics students have already identified and help them examine how these decision-making shortcuts function within the specific roles involved in their chosen dilemma.  
Here are some key conceptual elements to consider for this part:  
Role-Heuristic Analysis Framework Students could systematically examine how their identified heuristics manifest differently across the various stakeholder roles in their dilemma. For example, if a student is exploring a workplace whistleblowing scenario, they might analyze how the "loyalty heuristic" operates differently for the employee, supervisor, HR representative, and external regulatory body.  
Contextual Influence Exploration Help students recognize how role-specific pressures, responsibilities, and information access shape which heuristics become prominent. A healthcare administrator might rely heavily on "efficiency heuristics" while a patient advocate emphasizes "care-focused heuristics" in the same situation.  
Heuristic Conflict Identification Students can examine tensions that arise when different roles rely on competing heuristics. This creates rich ground for understanding why ethical dilemmas persist and why well-intentioned people in different positions can reach opposing conclusions.  
Metacognitive Reflection Component Include opportunities for students to step back and consider how their own role or perspective influences which heuristics they notice or prioritize in others' decision-making.  
What specific learning outcomes are you hoping students will achieve in this part? And how does this connect to what they've accomplished in the previous three parts?  
Retry  
**C**  
At this point, they have already created a narrative description of their ethical dilemma, along with roles they play within this situation and extant internal and external tensions (Part 1). They have fleshed out the nature of those roles and identified possible values, principles and heuristics for each role, essentially a type of ethical algorithm for each role (Part 2). Based on tensions, ambiguities, and ambivalences identified in conjunction with an AI agent, the student then decides how to proceed with exploring possible ethical models that could add to their algorithms, either to reinforce existing ethical strengths or possibly adjusting those algorithms through the inclusion of new heuristics suggested by models they haven't considered that align with practical or aspirational ethics or that could mitigate unresolved tensions in their existing algorithms. This then leads the student, with AI assistance, to chart a study plan on which order they will examine the ethical models within the course context. In Part 4, my goal is to create an AI guide that can help an AI support a student thinking about how they might be able to create and track their learning and insights as they progress through the work. Students will be working independently without a unifying sequence, so it is important to allow them to consider what learning might look like. Students aren't expected to turn in content for ongoing grades, but rather to create evidence to support a self-assessment of their own learning at the end of the semester with sufficient artifacts to warrant their claims.  
Edit  
This is a sophisticated self-directed learning design. For Part 4, you're essentially creating a metacognitive scaffolding system that helps students become intentional architects of their own ethical development. Here's a conceptual framework for your AI guide:  
Learning Design Facilitation The AI guide should help students think through what meaningful learning looks like in their specific context. This might involve helping them consider questions like: "Given your roles and tensions, what would constitute evidence that you're developing more nuanced ethical reasoning?" or "How will you know if an ethical model is genuinely useful versus just intellectually interesting?"  
Artifact Strategy Development Since students need to create evidence for self-assessment, the guide should help them envision a portfolio approach. Students might consider reflective journals tracking shifts in their thinking, before/after ethical algorithm mappings, critical incidents where they applied new frameworks, or comparative analyses showing how different models illuminate different aspects of their dilemma.  
Progress Monitoring Systems The guide could help students design their own check-in processes - perhaps regular reflection prompts that help them assess whether they're moving beyond surface-level engagement with ethical models toward genuine integration into their decision-making processes.  
Insight Capture Mechanisms Students will need ways to document not just what they're learning, but how their understanding is evolving. The guide might help them develop systems for tracking "aha moments," paradigm shifts, or places where new models challenge their existing assumptions.  
Self-Assessment Preparation The guide should help students think forward to their final self-assessment, considering what kinds of evidence will best demonstrate their growth and learning to themselves and potentially to you.  
Would you like me to develop any of these areas further, or are there other aspects of this learning architecture you'd like to explore?  
Retry  
**C**  
I'd also like to respect the principles of multiple ways of engagement, activity, and representation embodied in UDL design theory as a part of this phase. Students can take a number of creative pathways to manifest this process, and not just prioritize essay writing as the sole authorized mechanism.  
Edit  
Excellent point - incorporating UDL principles will make this much more inclusive and allow students to leverage their diverse strengths and preferences. Here's how Part 4 could embrace multiple modalities:  
Engagement Variations The AI guide could help students identify their optimal learning conditions and interests. Some might thrive on philosophical debate simulations, others on case study analysis, visual mapping exercises, or real-world application projects. The guide could offer diagnostic questions to help students discover what genuinely energizes their ethical inquiry.  
Activity Diversification Students could choose from various ways to work through ethical models - creating decision trees or flowcharts, role-playing scenarios with different stakeholders, developing multimedia presentations, designing games or simulations, conducting interviews with practitioners, creating artistic interpretations, or building interactive digital tools. The key is that the activity meaningfully engages with the ethical content while honoring different processing styles.  
Representation Flexibility For documenting learning and creating artifacts, students might choose video reflections, podcast episodes, visual portfolios, interactive timelines, concept maps, creative writing, performance pieces, digital storytelling, or hybrid approaches. The AI guide could help them consider which representation modes best capture and communicate their particular insights.  
Scaffolding Choice Architecture The guide could present options as branching pathways rather than linear requirements, helping students understand the learning goals while offering multiple routes to achieve them. It might ask questions like "How do you best process complex ideas?" or "What format would most authentically represent your learning journey?"  
This approach honors that ethical reasoning itself is diverse - some people think through dilemmas visually, others through narrative, others through systematic analysis, and still others through embodied or collaborative processes.  
How are you envisioning the AI guide presenting these choices to students?  
Retry  
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