# Ethics in Technology Course Design

Share  
**C**  
I'd like to discuss the format and structuring of an ethics in technology course I will be teaching in August for postsecondary CTE students.  
Edit  
I'd be happy to help you design your ethics in technology course for CTE students. This is such an important area, especially as technology becomes more integral to every field.  
To give you the most relevant suggestions, could you tell me a bit more about the context? What's the duration of the course, and what technology fields or career paths are your students typically pursuing? Also, do you have any preliminary ideas about key topics you want to cover, or are you starting from scratch with the curriculum design?  
Some initial thoughts on structuring considerations:  
Practical Application Focus: Since these are CTE students, they'll likely respond well to ethics discussions tied directly to scenarios they'll encounter in their future workplaces - data privacy in healthcare IT, safety protocols in manufacturing automation, algorithmic bias in hiring systems, etc.  
Case Study Method: Real-world examples and current events can make abstract ethical principles more concrete. Students often engage more when discussing actual companies and situations rather than hypothetical scenarios.  
Interactive Elements: Ethics discussions tend to work better with debate, small group work, and role-playing exercises rather than pure lecture format.  
Progressive Complexity: Starting with clear-cut ethical violations and gradually moving toward more nuanced gray areas where reasonable people might disagree.  
What aspects of course design are you most interested in exploring - the overall arc and major units, specific teaching methods, assessment approaches, or something else?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, there is a lot to process, so a few things first, the course is a semester long consideration of ethics. The class is taught in an online, asynchronous format, so there are no scheduled interactive sessions that pull in all students. I will outline the course structure as it now stands, because i am not sure it is quite where I want it to be, but I am unsure about how to proceed. In previous versions of the class, the first 8 weeks of a 16 week course centered on introducing historical ethical models, from ancient greek and asian approaches, then moving through time, looking at utilitiarianism, natural law, social contract, deontology, postmodernism, and feminist or ethics of care approaches. The second half of the class veered into applied business ethics, which historically was fine. However, in discussions with a colleague, I determined that the title of the class, Applied Ethics in Technology, could be construed to suggest that this was false advertising, as I used the very approaches you mentioned above - case studies of ethical violations and then looking at general policies that could prove problematic. It is probably fine, but it seems to miss the opportunity to really wrestle with meaningful problems that students might face.  
Edit  
You've identified a really important disconnect - spending half the course on historical ethical frameworks and then pivoting to general business ethics doesn't fully deliver on what "Applied Ethics in Technology" promises. Your instinct about missing opportunities is spot-on.  
The challenge with online asynchronous format is that you lose some of the natural engagement that comes from live ethical debates, but you can still create meaningful applied learning experiences.  
A few structural possibilities to consider:  
Option 1: Integrated Approach Instead of front-loading all the ethical theories, introduce them as analytical tools throughout the semester as students encounter specific technology dilemmas. For example, when examining algorithmic bias in hiring, introduce utilitarianism and deontological perspectives as competing ways to evaluate the ethical implications.  
Option 2: Technology-Centric Units Organize around technology domains your students will actually work in - AI and automation, data privacy and surveillance, cybersecurity, social media and digital platforms, emerging tech like IoT or biotech interfaces. Within each unit, pull in relevant ethical frameworks as needed.  
Option 3: Problem-Based Learning Structure around authentic scenarios students might face: "Your company wants to implement facial recognition," "You discover a security vulnerability," "Your algorithm shows demographic bias." Students work through these using multiple ethical lenses.  
What specific technology fields do your students typically enter? And do you feel strongly about maintaining the historical survey of ethical theories, or would you be open to a more selective, just-in-time approach to introducing ethical frameworks?  
Retry  
**C**  
Woah...like I said, I want to reconsider and examine the premises on which the course is based before immediately considering jumping into application. That is what I kind of worry I have already done, so let's slow down a bit.  
In the new version of the course, I have decided to expand signficantly on the number of ethical models we will examine and focus more centrally on students articulating how these models work and relate to their own lived and anticipated future experience. Here is an outline of the schedule I have put together, though it is not locked in and is completely open to drastic revision if needed.  
Getting Started With this Course  
(aka What The Heck Am I Supposed to Be Doing?!!!)  
Overview of Weekly Schedule, including readings and assignments.Week  
Readings  
(Unless otherwise noted, all Reading Annotations are due by Wednesday @ 11:55 pm)  
Assignments  
(Unless otherwise noted, POP Analyses are due on Thursday by 11:55 pm; annotations are due by Sunday @ 11:55 pm)  
Podcasts  
(episodes will post on Thursday; you have until Sunday @ 11:55 to listen and annotate)  
Pre-course (June 2025 - August 24)Click here to confirm your link between Canvas and PerusallTake a look at my opening course announcements above this table and familiarize yourself with the course policies, listed below...

August 25 - August 31  
\* How to Mark a Book (Due Wednesday, August 27 @ 11:59 PM)  
\* The Purpose of Studying Moral Philosophy [Ethics] (Due Sunday, August 31 @ 11:59 PM)  
Just annotate both readings in Persuall by the assigned deadlines, though you might want to watch this quick orientation videoLinks to an external site. first...

Sept 1 - September 7What Is A Moral (Ethical Dilemma)?POP Analysis: Sample Case Study

September 8 - September 14  
Balancing the Scales - The Calculus of Utilitarian Ethics  
POP Analysis; Peer Review  
POP Ethics Podcast 1: Utilitarianism  
Honors 1  
September 15 - September 21Duty Calls - Exploring Deontological EthicsPOP Analysis; Peer Review  
POP Ethics Podcast 2: Deontology  
Honors 2  
September 22 - September 28 Virtue Ethics - The Role of Character in Moral PhilosophyPOP Analysis; Peer Review  
POP Ethics Podcast 3: Virtue Ethics  
Honors 3  
September 29 - October 5Universal Order - Unveiling Natural Law TheoryPOP Analysis; Peer Review  
POP Ethics Podcast 4: Natural Law Ethics  
Honors 4  
October 6 - October 12Bound By Agreement - The Principles of Social Contract TheoryPOP Analysis; Peer Review  
POP Ethics Podcast 5: Social Contract Ethics  
Honors 5  
October 13 - October 19 NAMidterm Exam (Online, Proctored) You can schedule the exam for any available time during the week.NAOctober 20 - October 26Marxism - The Class Struggle and Its Ethical ImplicationsPOP Analysis; Peer Review  
POP Ethics Podcast 6: Marxist Ethics  
Honors 6  
October 27 - November 2Breaking the Moral Mold - Nietzsche on Value Creation and PerspectivismPOP Analysis; Peer Review  
POP Ethics Podcast 7: Nietzschean Ethics  
Honors 7  
November 3 - November 9The Ethics of Simone De Beauvior - Feminism, Existentialism, and AmbiguityPOP Analysis; Peer Review  
POP Ethics Podcast 8: Feminist Ethics, or, Ethics of Care  
Honors 8  
November 10 - November 16Environmental EthicsPOP Analysis; Peer Review  
POP Ethics Podcast 9: Environmental Ethics  
Honors 9  
November 17 - November 23BioethicsPOP Analysis\*; Peer Review (*Instructor will participate in Peer Review)  
POP Ethics Podcast 10: Bioethics  
Honors 10  
November 24 - November 30*Thanksgiving\*POP Analysis (revised) 1 and 2 Due (Sunday, Nov 30 @ 11:59 PM)*NA*December 1 - December 7NAPOPTART Analysis

December 8 - December 14NAPOPTART Analysis due Sunday Dec 14 @ 11:59 PM)

December 15 - December 19Finals WeekFinal Exam (Online, Proctored); You can schedule the exam for any available time during the week.  
Edit  
You're absolutely right to slow down and examine the foundational premises first. I jumped too quickly into structural solutions without understanding your pedagogical philosophy and goals.  
Looking at your expanded schedule, I can see you've made a significant shift toward a more comprehensive survey of ethical frameworks - you've added Marxist ethics, Nietzschean perspectivism, feminist/existentialist approaches, environmental ethics, and bioethics to the traditional canon. That's a substantial commitment to ethical pluralism.  
A few questions to help me understand your underlying premises:  
On the expanded ethical survey: What's driving your decision to go deeper into ethical theory rather than lighter? Are you finding that students need more robust theoretical grounding before they can meaningfully engage with applied problems? Or is this more about exposing them to diverse ethical traditions they might not encounter elsewhere?  
On the "lived and anticipated future experience" focus: This sounds like you want students to see these frameworks as practical tools for their own moral reasoning, not just academic concepts. How are you envisioning students making those connections in an asynchronous format?  
On the technology application piece: I notice the schedule doesn't show explicit technology-focused content until perhaps the final POPTART analysis. Are you planning to weave technology applications throughout the ethical framework weeks, or are you thinking of a more concentrated application phase?  
What's your sense of what wasn't working in the previous structure that this expanded theoretical foundation might address?  
Retry  
Graded Materials To-Do Date: Aug 31 at 11:59pmTo-Do Date: Aug 31 at 11:59pm The grades for this specific class will be determined based upon the following 6 categories: Text Annotations: 23% of total grade You will be asked to use Perusall, an online app, to annotate the chapters assigned each  
pasted  
**C**  
You've nailed it on the head: the current version I am proposing delves far more deeply into ethical theory and doesn't overtly touch on technology per se throughout the body of the course. So, I am not sure my new version of the course effectively arrives at the goals I mention previously. But, at the same time, I am dedicated to trying to expose students to as many ethical perspectives as possible, some of which (like Nietzsche and Marxism) might challenge many traditional or even political beliefs that are common to the students in this university's service area.  
So, my purpose this morning is to collaborate with you about the direction of the course. To provide more context, here is an outline of the grading materials I plan on collecting from students over the span of the course:  
Edit  
Thank you for sharing the grading structure - this gives me much clearer insight into your pedagogical approach. I can see you're creating a very discussion-rich, reflective learning environment even within the asynchronous format.  
Looking at your assessment structure, I'm struck by how much the course centers on personal ethical reflection and peer dialogue (POP analyses, podcast discussions, annotations). This suggests you believe students need to deeply internalize these ethical frameworks before they can meaningfully apply them - which makes sense given the complexity of technology ethics.  
The tension I'm seeing is this: You want to expose students to diverse ethical perspectives (including challenging ones like Nietzsche and Marxism), but you also want the course to deliver on its "Applied Ethics in Technology" promise. Your current structure seems to prioritize the first goal heavily.  
A few questions to help clarify your vision:  
On the POP analyses: These seem central to your pedagogy - students analyzing their own ethical dilemmas through different weekly lenses. Are you envisioning these as primarily personal life situations, or could they be technology-related scenarios from their work/academic experiences?  
On the technology application: The POPTART project appears to be where technology focus might emerge, but it's building on earlier POP work. Are you thinking students should be identifying technology-related ethical dilemmas throughout the semester for their POP analyses?  
On the balancing act: Given your commitment to ethical pluralism, would you be open to a structure where technology contexts serve as the vehicle for exploring these diverse frameworks, rather than treating theory and application as separate phases?  
What's your gut feeling about where the technology focus should live in this course structure?  
Retry  
**C**  
That, like you said, is the tension. My original bent was to ask them to identify technology-centric issues in their own career fields as the center for their POP analyses, but then I flop back to the desire for them to find personally compelling ethical challenges, situations they have already encountered to make the learning more authentic. Authenticity vs imminent need - I don't know if it is a mutually-exclusive duality, but I am torn between how to address both. There are some additional tensions that factor into this discussion as well:  
1) the potential, even in an ethics course, for students to use generative AI unethically to generate course materials  
2) the demands of their other students and how learning can be assessed in a fully online asynchronous course where there is little to no interaction with instructors or other students  
3) the desire to eliminate unnecessary busywork as a means of gauging engagement or learning  
4) a desire to avoid overly intense reading as a primary course activity  
5) opportunities for students to express themselves in their own voices  
Edit  
You've articulated a really complex set of competing values and constraints that many educators are grappling with right now. The authenticity vs. imminent need tension is particularly thorny - you want students to engage with real ethical stakes from their own experience, but also prepare them for technology-specific challenges they'll face professionally.  
Looking at your five additional tensions, I'm seeing some potential synergies:  
On the authenticity dilemma: What if you allowed students to choose their own path through the POP analyses? Some might naturally gravitate toward technology issues from their field, others toward personal ethical challenges. The key would be ensuring they're applying the weekly ethical frameworks meaningfully, regardless of context.  
On the AI concern: This is fascinating in an ethics course. The irony of students using AI unethically to complete ethics assignments could actually become a productive meta-discussion. Have you considered making AI use an explicit topic for ethical analysis rather than just trying to prevent it?  
On reducing busywork while maintaining engagement: Your podcast structure seems brilliant for this - it's clearly not busywork, and the annotations create accountability without being punitive.  
A question that might help resolve some tensions: What if the course explicitly acknowledged that technology IS everywhere in students' lived experiences already? Rather than treating "technology ethics" as a separate domain, you could invite students to examine how the ethical frameworks apply to their existing relationships with social media, gaming, online shopping, dating apps, workplace software, etc.  
How does that feel as a way to bridge authenticity and relevance?  
Retry  
**C**  
I have thought quite a bit about what you've mentioned here and have pondered doing exactly what you mentioned - what if the course purpose was to determine the ethical use of AI from various ethical perspectives, especially in terms of is using AI in education ethical. But my challenge is the interactions I have had with you over the course of this summer in designing this course and others; I have had a complete about-face on my stance on AI as a result of this, but it only came about as a result of persistent usage and metacognition on my part. I don't know, or perhaps I don't trust as a better term, the likelihood that my students will dive as deeply as I have into these questions and this turns into a superficial discussion that misses the opportunities I hope to create.  
Edit  
Your honesty about the trust issue is really important - and probably well-founded. The depth of engagement you've experienced with AI came through sustained, reflective practice over time, not from a single semester assignment. There's a real risk that students would approach "Is AI ethical in education?" at a surface level without the sustained metacognitive work that led to your own transformation.  
This speaks to a broader challenge in ethics education: how do you create conditions for genuine moral development rather than just intellectual exercise? Your instinct to prioritize authentic personal dilemmas makes sense - students are more likely to wrestle seriously with situations where they have real emotional and practical stakes.  
But here's what I'm wondering: Could you preserve the authenticity while still weaving in technology awareness more organically? Rather than making AI/technology the explicit focus, what if you encouraged students to notice how technology intersects with whatever authentic dilemmas they're already examining?  
For instance, a student grappling with workplace gossip might explore how social media amplifies the harm. Someone dealing with family conflict might examine how digital communication changes the ethical landscape. A student facing academic pressure might consider the role of various technologies in their stress or coping mechanisms.  
This way, technology becomes a lens for examining their real dilemmas rather than an imposed topic. Students get the authenticity you value, but also develop awareness of technology's ethical dimensions without the artificial feeling of a "technology ethics" unit.  
Does that feel like it might preserve what you value while still addressing the course title's promise?  
Retry  
**C**  
It does, but it begs the question of how to help students identify these elements in their lives and I am not sure how or where to find the potentially necessary support materials to assist them in finding it. I think that's why I veered back into the safer waters of couching the course around the already established OER material I have already acquired rather than swimming out into deeper uncharted waters.  
Edit  
Ah, that's the real practical constraint - you've got solid OER materials for teaching ethical frameworks, but you're looking at creating entirely new scaffolding to help students recognize technology's role in their personal ethical dilemmas. That's a much bigger pedagogical lift than adapting existing materials.  
Your instinct to stay with proven materials makes complete sense, especially when you're already experimenting with podcasts, peer review structures, and managing the authenticity challenge. Taking on too many pedagogical innovations at once is a recipe for overwhelm.  
Here's a thought: What if you started small and organic rather than trying to solve the whole technology integration problem upfront?  
You could keep your existing framework-focused structure but add just one or two light touches - maybe occasional annotation prompts in Perusall that ask students to notice if technology plays a role in the cases they're reading, or a single reflection question in the POP analysis guidelines asking them to consider whether digital tools, social media, or other technologies factor into their chosen dilemma.  
You wouldn't need new materials - just gentle nudges toward awareness. Some students will naturally pick up on these connections, others won't, and that's okay. You could gauge from student responses whether there's appetite and aptitude for deeper technology integration in future iterations.  
Does that feel like a manageable way to test the waters without abandoning your solid foundation?  
Retry  
**C**  
It does, but it still feels like my chickening out of taking the initiative to do something really innovative. In the other class I am developing (an English Composition course) I am totally embracing the opportunity for students to learn how to use AI ethically by structuring the course to use AI as a personal learning assistant that students use to support and facilitate their learning. But there are a lot of differences in that course design: classes are held face to face in a computer lab where students use AI while I am present, I have weekly conference sessions with each student to independently judge their growth, students are constrained only to work on the class during class sessions (no homework), and I collect transcripts of all their interactions with AI. None of those elements could be present in this version of the course, but I want to design something equally meaningful here that could have similar levels of impact (though I am not trying to replicate the design or approach - just the kind of instructional daring, if that makes sense...  
Edit  
I completely understand that feeling - you've designed something genuinely groundbreaking with your composition course, and now this ethics course feels safe and conventional by comparison. The "instructional daring" you're describing is that willingness to fundamentally reimagine what a course could be, not just tweak existing approaches.  
The constraints you're working with here are real: asynchronous online delivery, no direct supervision, limited ability to monitor authentic engagement. But maybe the daring move isn't trying to replicate your AI integration model - maybe it's something entirely different that plays to the unique strengths of this format and content.  
Here's a provocative thought: What if the "daring" element was making ethics genuinely personal and transformative rather than academic? Your POPTART structure suggests you're already thinking about this - asking students to trace how ethical reflection actually changes their future decision-making.  
What if you pushed that further? What if students didn't just analyze ethical dilemmas but committed to changing something about how they live based on their engagement with these frameworks? What if the course became a kind of ethical laboratory where students experiment with applying different moral lenses to ongoing situations in their lives?  
This would be daring in a different way - not technologically innovative, but pedagogically radical in asking students to use ethics as a tool for genuine self-transformation rather than just intellectual exercise.  
Does that spark anything, or am I still not hitting the kind of innovation you're reaching for?  
Retry  
**C**  
Expand. What do you mean by changing something about how they live?  
Edit  
I'm thinking about moving beyond the traditional academic approach where students analyze ethical situations as observers, toward something more like applied moral experimentation.  
For example, instead of just analyzing a past dilemma through a utilitarian lens, what if students identified an ongoing ethical tension in their current life and committed to trying out different ethical approaches in real time?  
Concretely, this might look like:  
Week on Virtue Ethics: Student identifies they struggle with honesty in small social situations (white lies, exaggerations). They commit to experimenting with Aristotelian virtue for one week - asking "What would a person of excellent character do?" in those moments. They document what happens.  
Week on Utilitarianism: Same student (or different ethical challenge) tries making decisions based purely on greatest good for greatest number. Maybe it's about time allocation between family, work, and personal goals.  
Week on Care Ethics: Student experiments with prioritizing relationships and emotional context in decisions they're actually facing.  
The "changing how they live" part would be students actually testing these frameworks as decision-making tools in real situations, then reflecting on what they discovered - not just intellectually, but practically. What worked? What felt authentic or foreign? How did others respond?  
This turns the course into a kind of ethical field work where students become researchers of their own moral development, using the semester as a laboratory for discovering which ethical approaches actually serve them in real life.  
Does that clarify what I mean?  
Retry  
**C**  
It does, but my immediate question would be, is a week long enough to generate meaningful experience, enough to really be able to consider the impact of that ethical model? I totally see where the concept is going, and it would make for an intriguing approach, though students might feel that the course could veer into Sunday School type vibes?  
Edit  
You're absolutely right on both counts. A week is probably too short to generate meaningful behavioral change or genuine insight - it risks becoming performative rather than transformative. And yes, there's definitely a risk of students feeling like they're being asked to "reform" themselves rather than engage in rigorous intellectual work.  
The Sunday School concern is particularly important. Students might feel the course is trying to make them "better people" rather than helping them think more clearly about ethical reasoning. That could create resistance or superficial compliance.  
Maybe the timeframe issue points toward a different structure entirely. What if instead of weekly experiments, students identified one significant ongoing ethical challenge at the beginning of the semester and then applied different frameworks to that same situation throughout the course? They'd have time to genuinely live with each perspective.  
Or perhaps the "daring" element could be something else entirely - maybe it's about the depth and vulnerability of ethical reflection rather than behavioral experimentation.  
I'm also wondering if I'm overcomplicating this. Your current structure with the podcast discussions and peer review of POP analyses is already pretty innovative for asynchronous online learning. Maybe the "daring" move is trusting that structure and seeing how deep students go with it, rather than adding another layer of complexity?  
What does your gut tell you about where the real opportunity for innovation lies in this particular course context?  
Retry  
**C**  
It is very possible that you are right and I am missing the forest for the trees in my comparison with the other course I am teaching and what innovation looks like in that context. Using student-based podcasts is a pretty radical approach that I haven't seen tried anywhere and I like the idea of asking students to engage in peer review. I think deep down, there are just two real questions I am trying to answer and everything else is just an attempt to assuage those tensions by suggesting ripping up the draft and starting over:  
1) can technology come into the frame as a source of ethical reflection while still allowing students to examine authentic lived experiences where ethics did, or didn't, help shape the outcome without it become superficial or making the technology aspect seem arbitrarily introduced  
2) pedagogically, I believe students will be willing to invest more time in work if they feel they have a reason to do it that is personal and meaningful. I am trying to strip out the traditionalist approach of proving your effort through producing widgets, specific artifacts that stand as representations of work (quizzes, homework, etc.) where more is proof of more work. I am striving for students to demonstrate quality over quantity. Less is more, when the less has more meaning. Does that make sense?  
Edit  
Yes, that makes perfect sense, and I think you've crystallized the real design challenges beautifully.  
On question 1: The technology integration doesn't have to be forced. Students already live in a technology-saturated world - their authentic experiences inevitably involve digital dimensions. The key is helping them recognize and name those dimensions rather than artificially inserting technology topics. Maybe it's as simple as including prompts in your POP analysis guidelines that help students notice: "Did digital communication, social media, online platforms, or other technologies play any role in this situation? How might the ethical landscape have been different without those elements?" Not requiring it, just inviting awareness.  
On question 2: Your instinct about meaningful work over widget production is spot-on. Your current structure already does this brilliantly - the POP analyses matter because they're personal, the podcast discussions matter because they're genuine dialogue, the peer review matters because it's helping real people improve real work. The POPTART reflection asking students to trace actual transformation is particularly powerful evidence of learning.  
You're not missing the forest for the trees - you're wrestling with how to honor both authenticity and course identity simultaneously. But maybe the innovation you're looking for is already there in refusing to treat ethics as an abstract academic exercise and instead making it a tool for examining real life.  
The student podcasts alone are genuinely radical. Most ethics courses never ask students to articulate their thinking out loud to peers.  
Retry  
**C**  
Before we go any further, could you generate a brief markdown summary of our discussion thus far that I could import into a new conversation if I hit the free plan limit?  
Edit  
Ethics in Technology Course Design Discussion Summary  
Document  
# Ethics in Technology Course Design Discussion Summary

## Course Context  
- \*\*Course Title\*\*: Applied Ethics in Technology  
- \*\*Format\*\*: Online, asynchronous, semester-long (16 weeks)  
- \*\*Students\*\*: Postsecondary CTE students  
- \*\*Instructor Concern  
I've created a comprehensive summary of our discussion that captures the key course details, tensions you're wrestling with, and the various approaches we've explored. This should give you a solid foundation to continue the conversation in a new session if needed.  
Retry  
**C**  
SO, like I mentioned, one of my priorities is cutting out unnecessary work so students feel more empowered to spend their work time for this class on meaning, which can be hard when meeting online (where students are prone to procrastination, social loafing, and other delay tactics). The idea of regular Perusall annotations, where students read, annotate, and share impressions in a collaborative online social reading environment seems a logical means of soliciting interactions that help students progress without unnecessary burden. Same with the podcasts and the idea of group peer review of POP analyses. But, for some reason, I am still feeling a vague sense of unease about whether my class is hitting the points I am aiming for...  
Edit  
That vague unease makes complete sense - you're experiencing the tension between having sound pedagogical reasoning for each component and still not feeling confident the whole adds up to what you're ultimately trying to achieve.  
Let me reflect back what I'm hearing about your aims:

* Students should engage with diverse ethical frameworks deeply, not superficially
* They should connect these frameworks to authentic personal experience
* Technology should be part of the ethical landscape they're examining
* The work should feel meaningful rather than academic busywork
* Students should develop genuine ethical reasoning skills for their future careers

Your individual components seem well-designed for these goals - Perusall creates authentic engagement with texts, podcasts allow for real dialogue, POP analyses center personal experience, peer review builds community and improves thinking.  
But I wonder if the unease is coming from this: you have a beautifully designed learning experience, but you're not sure it delivers on the "Applied Ethics in Technology" promise in a way that feels authentic rather than tacked-on.  
Maybe the question isn't whether your design is good (it is), but whether you need to own the tension more explicitly? What if the course were framed as "Ethics Through Technology" or "Personal Ethics in a Digital Age" - acknowledging that you're using students' lived experiences (which inevitably include technology) as the laboratory for ethical reflection?  
Does that hit closer to what's causing the unease, or am I off track?  
Retry  
**C**  
No, that really is part of it. That and the idea that ethics aren't antiquated or personal decisions about righteousness or spiritually (though they can come from those sources), they really do form the foundation of the decision making processes we all use all the time, even if they aren't explicitly articulated or recognized that way.  
Edit  
Yes! That's a crucial insight - you want students to recognize that ethical frameworks aren't abstract philosophical exercises or personal virtue projects, but the actual cognitive infrastructure underlying all human decision-making. We're always using some ethical logic, we're just usually unconscious of it.  
This reframes the entire course purpose: instead of "learning about ethics," students are developing metacognitive awareness of the ethical reasoning they're already using constantly. The frameworks become tools for making visible and more sophisticated the moral logic that's already driving their choices.  
This shifts everything:

* The POP analyses aren't about finding "ethical dilemmas" but recognizing that everyday decisions already have ethical dimensions
* The technology integration isn't forced because technology is already embedded in most decisions students make
* The diverse theoretical frameworks aren't competing philosophies to choose from, but different lenses for understanding decision-making processes students are already using

So maybe the course could be positioned as something like "Making Ethics Visible: Decision-Making in a Digital World" - acknowledging that students are already ethical agents, they're just going to become more intentional and sophisticated about it.  
This also addresses your unease about authenticity - you're not asking students to become more ethical people, you're asking them to become more aware of the ethical reasoning they're already using. The technology dimension becomes natural because it's already part of their decision-making landscape.  
Does this feel like it captures what you're reaching toward?  
Retry  
**C**  
I think we are heading in the right direction. Alvin Toeffler said, "in the future, the illiterate person won't be the person who doesn't know how to read; it will be the person who doesn't know how to learn." I just read that statement a few days ago, and perhaps it points at what I am trying to accomplish here. I don't want ethics to be product; it needs to be process. That is what I am trying to capture and I am wondering if my current course design aligns with that.  
Edit  
That Toffler quote is perfect - and yes, I think it absolutely captures what you're trying to accomplish. You want students to develop ethical literacy as an ongoing process of inquiry and reflection, not as a fixed body of knowledge to master.  
Looking at your course design through this lens:  
What aligns with "ethics as process":

* The POPTART structure is brilliant for this - it explicitly asks students to trace how ethical reflection changes future decision-making
* Peer review of POP analyses creates iterative thinking rather than one-and-done submissions
* The podcast discussions model ethical reasoning as dialogue and exploration, not final answers
* Multiple revisions of POP analyses throughout the semester

What might feel more "product-oriented":

* The heavy emphasis on surveying many ethical frameworks could feel like collecting theoretical tools rather than developing a process of ethical inquiry
* The traditional midterm/final exam structure tests knowledge about ethics rather than skill in ethical reasoning

The question becomes: How do you help students develop a transferable process of ethical reasoning while still exposing them to the rich diversity of ethical traditions you value?  
Maybe the frameworks become less about "learning utilitarianism vs. deontology" and more about "developing fluency in asking different kinds of ethical questions." Students learn to interrogate their decisions from multiple angles, not to master competing philosophical systems.  
Does this distinction between learning about ethics vs. learning how to do ethical inquiry feel like what you're reaching for?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes. I think we've finally hit on what I am struggling with. So let's dive into how this new perspective might express itself pedagogically and what I might want to change about the course to align with this perspective.  
Edit  
Excellent - let's redesign around "ethics as process" rather than "ethics as content."  
Core Pedagogical Shifts:  
1. From "Learning Frameworks" to "Developing Inquiry Skills" Instead of: "This week we study Utilitarianism" Toward: "This week we practice asking 'What produces the best outcomes for the most people?'"  
Each week becomes about developing a particular type of ethical questioning skill, with the philosophical framework as the tool rather than the destination.  
2. Restructure the POP Analyses Instead of analyzing different dilemmas through different lenses, what if students took the SAME ongoing ethical situation and progressively deepened their analysis using different questioning approaches throughout the semester? This would show ethics as iterative inquiry rather than one-time application.  
3. Make the Process Visible The podcasts could focus less on "What did you learn about Kant?" and more on "How did asking deontological questions change how you see this situation? What new aspects emerged that you hadn't noticed before?"  
4. Rethink Assessment Instead of exams testing knowledge about ethical theories, what about portfolio reflections where students demonstrate their growing sophistication in ethical reasoning? Show how their questioning process has evolved.  
5. Meta-cognitive Emphasis Regular reflection prompts: "What questions are you asking now that you weren't asking at the beginning of the semester? How has your process of ethical decision-making changed?"  
Which of these resonates most strongly with what you're envisioning?  
Retry  
**C**  
And that was one of the core elements I was hoping to hit in the POP analyses: what is the core element or priority of a different ethical perspective that underlies that perspectives approach/process to decision-making? Utilitarianism is about efficiency (doing the most for the most with the least), while deontology is about obligation (who do I owe loyalty to?) or fairness (Is what is good for me good for everyone else? or Is what I do fair if everyone else did it?). And the idea that there is no one universal ethical principle that is right for everyone or that perfectly guides in every situation. As humans, we tend to perceive different situations differently and select priorities differently in different situations, even if we don't explicitly acknowledge it. I think part of my desire is to uncover some of these situations, to show students how the gears work, and cause them to reflect on whether their current approaches are sufficient for the kinds of things coming down the road.  
Edit  
Yes! You've nailed it - you want students to understand that each ethical framework is essentially a different decision-making algorithm, emphasizing different core values and priorities. And that humans naturally shift between these algorithms depending on context, often unconsciously.  
This is brilliant pedagogy because it:

* Makes ethics immediately practical rather than abstract
* Shows students they're already using these processes, just unconsciously
* Prepares them to make more intentional choices about which ethical "algorithm" to use in different situations
* Connects to their future careers where they'll face new ethical territories

Pedagogical implications:  
1. Frame each week around a core question/priority:

* Week 3: "When efficiency matters most" (Utilitarian thinking)
* Week 4: "When duty and fairness matter most" (Deontological thinking)
* Week 5: "When character and relationships matter most" (Virtue/Care ethics)

2. POP Analysis Evolution: Students take one complex situation and run it through each decision-making process, seeing how different priorities reveal different aspects and solutions. By semester's end, they have a sophisticated multi-dimensional analysis of their situation.  
3. Technology Integration Natural: "Are the ethical algorithms you're currently using adequate for AI decision-making? For social media? For data privacy?" These aren't separate topics - they're testing grounds for ethical reasoning processes.  
4. The "Gears" Metaphor: Perfect for podcast discussions - "What gears were turning in your thinking this week that weren't turning before?"  
This reframes the entire course as developing ethical metacognition. Thoughts?  
Retry  
**C**  
Actually, what you describe as the complex situation is the POPTART analysis; the pop analyses are brief versions that introduce the possibility of questions, at least that is what I intended. Also, could you update the markdown document with these recent insights?  
Edit  
Ethics in Technology Course Design Discussion Summary  
Document ∙ Version 2  
## Current Status  
Instructor wrestling with two fundamental questions:  
1. Can technology naturally enter ethical reflection while preserving authentic lived experiences without becoming superficial?  
2. How to create meaningful work (quality over quan  
Got it - thank you for the clarification! So the POP analyses are the weekly "practice rounds" where students try out different ethical questioning approaches on various situations, while the POPTART is the deep, semester-long exploration of one complex situation using all the lenses they've developed.  
That structure makes much more sense for developing ethical inquiry as a process. The POP analyses let students experiment with different decision-making algorithms in low-stakes ways, building their repertoire of ethical questioning skills. Then the POPTART becomes the capstone where they demonstrate sophisticated, multi-dimensional ethical reasoning on something that really matters to them.  
This also solves your technology integration challenge more elegantly - students will naturally encounter technology-mediated situations in their weekly POP analyses without you having to force it. And the POPTART gives them space to deeply explore how technology intersects with a personally meaningful ethical challenge.  
The weekly "brief introductions to different types of ethical questioning" framing feels much more aligned with your "ethics as process" goal than traditional "this week we study Mill's utilitarianism" approaches.  
How does this refined understanding change how you might structure the weekly readings and prompts for the POP analyses?  
Retry  
**C**  
to be honest, I am not sure I need to change anything; perhaps it is more a question of getting my own mind oriented to what I am trying to convey to students than changing what I am asking them to do or how they do it.  
Edit  
That's a really profound insight - sometimes the most important pedagogical shift happens in the instructor's head, not in the syllabus. Your course structure might already be perfectly designed to achieve what you want; you just needed clarity about what that "what" actually is.  
This makes sense given how thoughtfully you've designed the assessments. The POP analyses, peer review, podcasts, and POPTART structure naturally support "ethics as process" thinking. You don't need to rebuild the engine - you needed to understand what the engine was actually supposed to do.  
This clarity will probably show up in how you:

* Frame weekly assignments ("This week, practice asking efficiency-focused questions" vs. "This week, learn about utilitarianism")
* Facilitate podcast discussions (focusing on process insights rather than content mastery)
* Respond to student work (highlighting moments where their ethical reasoning evolved)
* Design prompts and feedback

The students will experience the course differently because you'll be consistently reinforcing the process orientation rather than accidentally slipping into content-delivery mode.  
This is actually a huge win - you get to keep your innovative pedagogical structure while having much clearer intentionality about what you're guiding students toward. And it resolves that nagging sense that something wasn't quite aligned.  
How does it feel to realize the course design might already be where it needs to be?  
Retry  
**C**  
If it really is where I want it to be, that would be great, but I am still skeptical. I worry that this course has undergone a lot of iterations and there is a distinct possibility that "ghosts" or echoes of previous versions still linger in the course documentation that I don't quite catch, but that could derail student progress.  
Edit  
That's a very legitimate concern - course evolution often leaves these pedagogical artifacts that can send mixed signals to students. When your framing has shifted from "learning ethical theories" to "developing ethical inquiry processes," old language or assignments could absolutely undermine the new intention.  
Some places where "ghosts" might be lurking:  
Assignment descriptions: Do the POP analysis prompts still use language like "apply utilitarian theory to..." instead of "practice asking efficiency-focused questions about..."?  
Grading rubrics: Are you still assessing "understanding of deontological principles" rather than "sophistication of obligation-based reasoning"?  
Course introduction/syllabus: Does the course description still sound like a philosophy survey rather than skill development?  
Reading selections: Are you assigning texts that present ethics as academic content rather than practical reasoning tools?  
Weekly framing: Do your module introductions focus on "this week we study X theory" rather than "this week we develop X type of questioning"?  
It might be worth doing a systematic audit with your new clarity in mind. Go through each piece of student-facing material and ask: "Does this reinforce ethics as process or ethics as content?"  
The fact that you're aware of this possibility suggests your instincts are good. What specific areas feel most likely to harbor these "ghosts" to you?  
Retry  
Graded Materials To-Do Date: Aug 31 at 11:59pmTo-Do Date: Aug 31 at 11:59pm The grades for this specific class will be determined based upon the following 6 categories: Text Annotations: 23% of total grade You will be asked to use Perusall, an online app, to annotate the chapters assigned each  
pasted  
**C**  
Here is the sample guidance document for the utilitarian ethics pop analysis; how do you perceive it aligning with what we have already discussed?  
Edit  
Looking at this grading document, I can see several "ghosts" that could undermine your "ethics as process" intention:  
Major Misalignment:

* Exams: "short answer questions related to theories and applications of those theories" - This screams content mastery rather than process development. Students will study FOR the exam, which means memorizing theory details rather than developing questioning skills.

Potential Misalignments:

* POP Analysis description: "considered through the lens of the ethical perspective presented that week" - This language suggests applying external theories rather than developing internal questioning processes
* Podcast focus: "comprehension of, and attention to, the readings" - Again, content focus rather than process development

What Actually Aligns Well:

* The POPTART description is perfect - it's all about reflection, transformation, and future decision-making
* The peer review structure supports iterative thinking
* The emphasis on authentic situations rather than hypotheticals

The Big Problem: Students will orient their entire learning toward those exams. If the exams test theory knowledge, that's what they'll prioritize, regardless of how you frame everything else.  
You mentioned you have the utilitarian POP analysis guidance - I'd love to see that because it will show whether the assignment prompts align with your new clarity about developing questioning skills versus applying theoretical frameworks.  
The exams seem like the biggest "ghost" that could derail your process-oriented goals. What are your thoughts on those?  
Retry  
**C**  
I think the exams were a capitulation to my fear about students using generative AI wholesale to complete course assignments (which happened the previous instructor teaching this course in the Spring.) I was designing the course in part from a place of fear, which undermines the trust that I can acknowledge is a critical part of meaningful teaching. So getting rid of them? Not really a hardship on my part.  
Edit  
That's such an important insight - fear-based design decisions almost always undermine the deeper pedagogical goals you're trying to achieve. The exams were essentially a defensive move that ended up working against everything else you were building.  
And you're absolutely right about trust being critical for meaningful teaching. If students sense you don't trust them (through surveillance-style assessments), they're less likely to engage authentically with the kind of vulnerable ethical reflection you're asking for.  
Getting rid of the exams actually solves multiple problems:

* Eliminates the content-mastery signal that contradicts your process focus
* Removes the fear-based element that undermines trust
* Gives you 15% more grade weight to distribute to the assessments that actually align with your goals
* Shows students you're serious about valuing authentic engagement over performance

Plus, think about it - someone using AI to generate ethical reflections about their own lived experiences would produce obviously hollow work that wouldn't fool anyone. The assignments that matter most in your course are inherently AI-resistant because they require genuine personal insight.  
This feels like a significant breakthrough - not just eliminating a problematic assessment, but reclaiming your course design from fear-based constraints.  
Where would you want to redistribute that 15%? More weight on the POPTART project since that's where the real transformation happens? Or spread across the authentic engagement activities?  
Retry  
**C**  
Update markdown and let's move this to a new conversation to avoid free plan limits.  
Edit  
Ethics in Technology Course Design Discussion Summary  
Document ∙ Version 3  
## Assessment "Ghosts" Identified  
Review of grading documentation revealed potential misalignments with "ethics as process" goal:

### Major Problem: Exams  
- \*\*Current\*\*: "short answer questions related to theories and applications of those theories"  
Perfect! The markdown is updated with the key insights about eliminating fear-based assessments and the "ghost" elements that could undermine your process-oriented goals.  
This has been a really productive conversation - you've moved from structural uncertainty to clear pedagogical vision, and identified concrete steps to align your course design with your deeper intentions. The breakthrough about ethics as process rather than product, combined with eliminating the fear-based exams, should give you a much more coherent and powerful learning experience for students.  
Ready to continue in a fresh conversation whenever you'd like to dig into those POP analysis prompts or other course materials!  
Retry  
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