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This document outlines the design of an AI Concierge Support system for an ethics course that uses an "archaeological excavation" metaphor for students to explore their own ethical reasoning across different philosophical frameworks.  
The key innovation here is creating a differentiated support structure:  
Well-Supported "Core Archaeological Sites" (6 frameworks):

* Utilitarianism, Virtue Ethics, Deontology, Natural Law, Social Contracts, Feminism/Ethics of Care
* Include robust AI diagnostic scaffolding and resource direction
* Backed by quality Open Educational Resources

Independent "Advanced Excavation Sites" (4 frameworks):

* Marxism, Postmodernism, Environmental Ethics, Bioethics
* Require more self-directed exploration with minimal AI support
* Framed as opportunities for advanced/independent work

The AI functions as an "Academic Concierge" - diagnosing student needs and directing them to instructor-curated resources rather than providing direct content instruction. This preserves the instructor's authority while preventing students from immediately seeking help when they encounter difficulties.  
The current discussion focuses on drafting specific language for framework introductions that will:

1. Set clear expectations about support levels
2. Embed scaffolding cues in AI prompts
3. Guide students on when to use AI vs. instructor consultation

This appears to be a thoughtful approach to managing pedagogical ambitions within practical constraints while maintaining academic rigor. Would you like me to help develop any specific aspects of this framework or analyze particular elements of the design?  
Retry  
**C**  
The last elements were the end of a previous conversation identifying places in the overall class that need to be adjusted to support this new concept of anticipatory scaffolding. The first element I need to work on is the two elements of Part 4 in the AI Prompts - first, an overall new instruction for students that lets them know about the anticipatory scaffolding and encouraging them to work through that process before seeking out external support, including instructor communication.  
Edit  
Looking at the document, I can see you need to create two components for Part 4 of the AI Prompts:

1. Overall instruction for students about the anticipatory scaffolding system
2. Framework-specific embedded elements that activate the scaffolding within the prompts

Let me draft the overall student instruction first:  
AI Anticipatory Scaffolding - Student Instructions  
Document  
# Using AI Anticipatory Scaffolding in Your Ethical Excavation

## What is Anticipatory Scaffolding?

When you begin working with the AI prompts for your ethical framework analysis, you're activating a support system designed to help you work through  
This instruction sets the expectation that students should engage with the AI's diagnostic support system before seeking external help, while framing challenges as natural parts of the learning process.  
Would you like me to adjust the tone, length, or focus of this instruction? And should I proceed with drafting the embedded elements that would go into the actual framework prompts to activate this scaffolding?  
Retry  
**C**  
The title is a little rough, but I like the content. Try for a parallel format to the other AI prompt titles, if possible?  
Edit  
AI Anticipatory Scaffolding - Student Instructions  
Document ∙ Version 2  
# Part 4: Working with AI Support During Your Ethical Excavation  
Is that more in line with the format you were thinking of? Without seeing the other AI prompt titles, I tried to follow a "Part X: [Action/Process] with AI [Context]" structure that seems common in instructional materials.  
Retry  
**C**  
I am thinking of revising the entire AI prompt section with an overall introduction that explains what the AI prompts are and how they work, before inserting the first one. Could you draft a very brief introduction and explanation that includes the idea that certain content will be copied and pasted directly into AI for it to begin a guided interactive session to complete course objectives?  
Edit  
AI Prompts Section Introduction  
Document  
# AI Prompts for Ethical Framework Analysis

The following prompts are designed to be copied and pasted directly into an AI system to begin guided interactive sessions that help you complete specific course objectives. Each prompt initiates a structu  
This brief introduction explains the copy-paste functionality while setting expectations for interactive, multi-exchange conversations. Would you like me to adjust the emphasis on any particular aspect?  
Retry  
**C**  
Looks good, but is very inpersonal. COuld you add some warmth, and maybe a bit of dry humor?  
Edit  
AI Prompts Section Introduction  
Document ∙ Version 2  
# AI Prompts for Ethical Framework Analysis

Think of these prompts as conversation starters with a very patient, somewhat knowledgeable friend who never gets tired of talking through complex ideas with you. Each prompt is designed to be copied and p  
Much better! The "patient friend who never gets tired" and the gentle reassurance about awkward first attempts should help students feel more comfortable diving into these conversations.  
Retry  
In Part 1, you'll work with AI to identify a personally meaningful ethical dilemma that will anchor your learning all semester. You need something real, unresolved, and complex—a situation where you have genuine decision-making power but competing obligations pull you in different directions. AI Ex  
pasted  
**C**  
OK. Here is the first prompt (it doesn't need the scaffolding, but does need revision. I want the entire prompt to be only AI-facing, so any existing directives should orient the AI, not direct the student. It gets confusing if there are some instructions for Ai and others for the student...does that make sense?  
Edit  
Absolutely, that makes perfect sense. The prompt should be entirely AI-facing instructions, not a mix of AI and student directions. Let me revise this to be completely oriented toward guiding the AI's behavior:  
Revised AI-Facing Dilemma Identification Prompt  
Document  
You are helping a student identify a genuine ethical dilemma for semester-long analysis. Your role is to guide their thinking about their actual life situations, not provide solutions or suggest hypothetical scenarios.

The student needs a situation  
This revision makes the entire prompt AI-facing, converting all the student-directed content into guidance for how the AI should help the student navigate the process. The AI now has clear instructions on what to look for, how to guide the conversation, and what common challenges to address. Does this approach work better for your needs?  
Retry  
**C**  
They can ask for instructor review, but it isn't required or expected.  
Edit  
Revised AI-Facing Dilemma Identification Prompt  
Document ∙ Version 2  
When they've identified something promising, offer to draft a concise summary of their dilemma that captures the core situation, competing roles, and why the choice isn't straightforward. This draft should synthesize their exploration and can serve a  
Perfect - that removes the expectation of instructor review while still providing students with a useful synthesis they can build on throughout the semester.  
Retry  
**C**  
Use the same orientation and revise prompt 2, please.  
Part 2 Ethical Heuristics  
Part 2: Discovering Your Ethical Heuristics  
In Part 1, you identified your ethical dilemma and the roles that create competing obligations. Now you need to uncover the decision-making patterns that actually guide your behavior in each role—not what you think should guide you, but what actually does.  
You'll work with AI as an interviewer to discover these patterns through guided conversation.  
AI Heuristics Discovery Prompt  
*Copy everything in this box and paste it into your AI conversation:*  
You're going to interview me to discover the ethical heuristics—the actual decision-making patterns, principles, and "if/then" rules—that guide my behavior in different roles. I've already identified a complex ethical dilemma involving multiple competing roles.  
Your job as interviewer is to help me uncover what I actually do when making ethical decisions, not what I think I should do. Be genuinely curious, ask follow-up questions, and help me be honest about uncomfortable patterns.  
First, ask me to share my Part 1 findings so you understand my dilemma and roles.  
Then help me discover, for each role I identified:  
- 2-3 core principles that actually drive my decisions in that role  
- 2-3 character traits I try to embody in that role  
- 3-5 "if/then" decision rules I actually use  
Interview techniques to use:  
- Ask scenario-based questions: "Walk me through your thinking when..."  
- Probe for contradictions between roles: "Earlier you said X, but now you're prioritizing Y..."  
- Distinguish behavior from aspirations: "What do you actually do vs. what you think you should do?"  
- Extract if/then patterns: "When X happens, you typically...?"  
- Surface cross-role tensions: "How do you decide which role wins when they conflict?"  
Don't judge my patterns or solve my dilemma. Just help me articulate how I actually make decisions. Push gently when I stay too abstract or aspirational.  
At the end, organize what we've discovered into a structured summary by role, including any cross-role patterns you notice.  
Start by asking for my Part 1 findings, then begin the discovery interview.  
Process Notes  
*This process can feel uncomfortable. You might discover gaps between your ideals and your actual behavior, or recognize patterns you're not proud of. This discomfort often means the process is working—you're uncovering authentic decision-making rather than staying in wishful thinking mode.*  
Be honest about what you actually do. *The AI isn't judging your patterns. The goal is understanding your current ethical "operating system" so you can thoughtfully examine it against formal frameworks later.*  
Set aside uninterrupted time. *The interview might take 45-60 minutes. Be prepared for genuine self-examination.*  
Expect 25-35 specific heuristics. *You'll end up with heuristics across all your roles. This gives you enough material for meaningful semester-long analysis without being overwhelming.*  
Save everything. *Save both the complete conversation and the final structured summary. You'll use these heuristics as your baseline for comparing with formal ethical frameworks throughout the semester.*  
The patterns you discover become your personalized starting point for exploring utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics, care ethics, and other approaches. Understanding how you actually think about ethics now is essential for meaningful philosophical exploration later.  
Edit  
Revised AI-Facing Heuristics Discovery Prompt  
Document  
You're going to interview a student to discover the ethical heuristics—the actual decision-making patterns, principles, and "if/then" rules—that guide their behavior in different roles. They've already identified a complex ethical dilemma involving m  
This revision converts all the student-directed content into AI guidance while preserving the key elements: the interview approach, specific techniques, timeline expectations, and the goal of discovering authentic decision-making patterns rather than aspirational ones.  
Retry  
Part 3 Conflict Map Part 3: Creating Your Conflict Map In your heuristics discovery interview, you uncovered the decision-making patterns that actually guide your behavior in different roles. Now you need to identify where these patterns clash with each other—the tensions that create your ethical  
pasted  
**C**  
Here is Prompt 3. Let's update using the same pattern as before...  
Edit  
Revised AI-Facing Conflict Mapping Prompt  
Document  
You're helping a student create a Conflict Map of their ethical tensions based on the heuristics they discovered in Part 2. They need to identify where their different roles and decision-making patterns pull them in competing directions. Your role is  
This revision converts the entire prompt to AI-facing instructions while preserving the key elements: the systematic conflict identification process, format flexibility, focus on mapping rather than resolving tensions, and the creation of both creative and working documents. The AI now has clear guidance on how to support the student through this potentially uncomfortable but important self-reflection process.  
Retry  
**C**  
OK. It looks like I am going to have to do things a little differently in the Canvas structure. Could you help me draft a brief narrative explanation of the difference between the primary and secondary ethical models, as well as a very brief explanation of the anticipatory scaffolding feature we are going to embed in the next prompts?  
Edit  
Framework Categories and Scaffolding Explanation  
Document  
# Framework Categories and AI Support Features

## Primary and Secondary Ethical Frameworks

As you begin exploring formal ethical frameworks, you'll notice they fall into two categories that offer different levels of structural support for your lear  
This explanation distinguishes between the framework categories without creating a value hierarchy, and introduces the scaffolding concept in practical terms that help students understand how to engage with it effectively. Would you like me to adjust the tone or emphasis on any particular aspect?  
Retry  
**C**  
Hmm.. the terms primary and secondary already introduce hierarchical thinking; alternatives?  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - "primary" and "secondary" inherently suggest ranking. Here are some alternatives:  
Framework Categories and Scaffolding Explanation  
Document ∙ Version 2  
## Structured and Independent Exploration Frameworks

As you begin exploring formal ethical frameworks, you'll notice they fall into two categories that offer different types of learning experiences.

\*\*Structured Frameworks\*\* (Utilitarianism, Virtue  
Much better! "Structured" vs. "Independent Exploration" frames this as different learning approaches rather than suggesting one is more important than the other. Other options could include "Scaffolded/Self-Directed" or "Guided/Autonomous" if you prefer different terminology.  
Retry  
**C**  
OK. The second thing is that I want to convey that I do expect the structured ones to appear in their analysis, but the independent ones are optional?  
Edit  
Framework Categories and Scaffolding Explanation  
Document ∙ Version 3  
## Structured and Independent Exploration Frameworks

As you begin exploring formal ethical frameworks, you'll notice they fall into two categories that offer different types of learning experiences and expectations.

\*\*Structured Frameworks\*\* (Utili  
This revision makes the expectations clear: structured frameworks are core requirements that all students will engage with, while independent exploration frameworks are optional extensions for those who want to go beyond the baseline requirements.  
Retry  
**C**  
anticipatory scaffolding is a term I like, but would make absolutely no sense to students. Alternatives?  
Edit  
You're right - "anticipatory scaffolding" is very jargony. Here are some alternatives:  
Framework Categories and Scaffolding Explanation  
Document ∙ Version 4  
\*\*Structured Frameworks\*\* (Utilitarianism, Virtue Ethics, Deontology, Natural Law, Social Contracts, and Feminism/Care Ethics) are the core frameworks you'll work with throughout the semester. These come with built-in diagnostic support designed to h  
"Diagnostic support" and "troubleshooting guidance" are much more accessible terms. Other options could be "built-in help features," "guided support," or "interactive assistance" if you prefer different language. What feels most natural for your students?  
Retry  
**C**  
Troubleshooting is the term I prefer...  
Edit  
Framework Categories and Scaffolding Explanation  
Document ∙ Version 5  
## Anticipatory Troubleshooting in AI Prompts

Starting with the structured frameworks, you'll notice the AI prompts include anticipatory troubleshooting features. This means the AI is programmed to recognize common places where students encounter co  
Perfect! "Anticipatory troubleshooting" maintains the concept while being much more student-friendly. The language is now accessible and practical while still conveying the proactive support system you've designed.  
Retry  
**C**  
Just troubleshooting, please.  
Edit  
Framework Categories and Scaffolding Explanation  
Document ∙ Version 6  
\*\*Structured Frameworks\*\* (Utilitarianism, Virtue Ethics, Deontology, Natural Law, Social Contracts, and Feminism/Care Ethics) are the core frameworks you'll work with throughout the semester. These come with built-in troubleshooting designed to help  
Framework Categories and Scaffolding Explanation  
Document ∙ Version 7  
## Troubleshooting in AI Prompts

Starting with the structured frameworks, you'll notice the AI prompts include troubleshooting features. This means the AI is programmed to recognize common places where students encounter conceptual difficulties, app  
Much cleaner! Simple "troubleshooting" is clear and accessible without any unnecessary modifiers.  
Retry  
**C**  
Could you update this entire section with consistent language?  
Edit  
Framework Categories and Scaffolding Explanation  
Document ∙ Version 8  
# Framework Categories and AI Support Features

## Structured and Independent Exploration Frameworks

As you begin exploring formal ethical frameworks, you'll notice they fall into two categories that offer different types of learning experiences and  
Now the language is consistent throughout - using "troubleshooting" and "support" rather than mixing in "diagnostic" and "guidance." The terminology is clean and student-friendly across the entire section.  
Retry  
**C**  
I am seeing anticipatory scaffolding throughout. That needs to be completely replaced with troubleshooting.  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - I missed some instances. Let me check the document again and replace all remaining instances of "anticipatory scaffolding" with "troubleshooting":  
AI Anticipatory Scaffolding - Student Instructions  
Document ∙ Version 3  
# Part 4: Working with AI Support During Your Ethical Excavation

## What is Troubleshooting?

When you begin working with the AI prompts for your ethical framework analysis, you're activating a support system designed to help you work through challe  
Perfect! Now all references to "anticipatory scaffolding" have been replaced with "troubleshooting" for consistent, student-friendly language throughout both documents.  
Retry  
**C**  
This looks good, but now we lost the entire introduction of structured and independent models. Could that be brought back in?  
Edit  
AI Anticipatory Scaffolding - Student Instructions  
Document ∙ Version 4  
# Part 4: Working with AI Support During Your Ethical Excavation

## Framework Categories and Support Levels

As you begin exploring formal ethical frameworks, you'll notice they fall into two categories that offer different types of learning experie  
Perfect! Now we have the complete framework categories explanation integrated with the troubleshooting section, and I've updated the troubleshooting description to specify it applies to the structured frameworks. This gives students the full context they need to understand both the different types of frameworks and how the AI support system works.  
Retry  
Final Archaeological Challenge You've completed your archaeological exploration of ethical reasoning, uncovering the philosophical frameworks that already exist in your thinking through 9 excavation reports. But every archaeological site has unexplored territory—areas that remain unexcavated, artif  
pasted  
**C**  
Ok. This is the "deep dive" assignment, to be completed after they work their way through the ethical models. The new design significantly disrupts this approach, and might even beg the question of whether it is even needed. Thoughts?  
Edit  
Looking at this assignment in light of your new differentiated framework structure, I see several tensions:  
The core pedagogical value remains strong - asking students to identify what's missing, avoided, or unexplained in their philosophical landscape is powerful self-reflective work that can deepen their understanding significantly.  
But the assumptions have shifted fundamentally:

1. The "complete exploration" premise is no longer accurate - students working only with structured frameworks won't have done 9 excavation reports across all frameworks, so the "you've explored everything, now what's missing?" framing doesn't match their actual experience.
2. The optional/required distinction changes the investigation focus - students who chose not to engage with independent exploration frameworks might naturally gravitate toward those as their "unexplored territory," which could work well or could feel like you're just pushing them toward the optional content.
3. The troubleshooting-supported vs. independent dynamic creates different preparation levels - students will have had much deeper, more supported engagement with structured frameworks, potentially making their reflection more sophisticated about those areas.

Potential revisions could:

* Reframe this as "archaeological horizons" - what lies beyond your current excavation site?
* Focus on synthesis and integration of what they *have* explored rather than what they haven't
* Emphasize the creative/applied formats more heavily since they now have solid foundation in 6 frameworks
* Position this as "applied philosophy" where they use their excavated understanding to tackle new problems

What's your sense of whether the deep dive serves a pedagogical purpose that isn't already being met by the structured framework work with troubleshooting support?  
Retry  
**C**  
The original purpose of the deep dive was to encourage them to explore something that either was missing after their excavation of their dilemma and heuristics. But now I see that the real problem is that this activity never closed the loop on the original premise of the course - identify a dilemma, label heuristics, identify conflicts, classify the presence of ethical models in the heuristics, then...explore one of them more? Why did I spend all this time focusing on tension and conflict, then just drop it? Nope, the final phase needs to engage in some kind of action plan. Do you see options for resolution? Are there models that might fill in some of these gaps? Are there some that you think would only make things more complex? What does your excavation suggest should be your next steps?  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - there's a major pedagogical gap here! The course builds beautifully toward understanding ethical complexity through the conflict mapping, then just... wanders off into academic exploration instead of helping students actually work with that complexity.  
The natural culmination should be: "Now that you understand the anatomy of your ethical tensions, what are you going to do about them?"  
A resolution-focused final assignment could ask:  
Step 1: Conflict Analysis Review

* Which conflicts from your map proved most significant as you explored frameworks?
* Did any frameworks offer tools for resolving specific tensions?
* Where did frameworks clarify vs. complicate your conflicts?

Step 2: Strategic Assessment

* Are there resolutions available that you hadn't considered?
* Which conflicts might be permanently unresolvable (and how do you live with that)?
* What frameworks offer the most practical guidance for your actual dilemma?

Step 3: Action Planning

* Given what you've learned, how will you approach your dilemma differently?
* What decision-making tools or principles will you adopt, modify, or reject?
* How will you handle future situations involving these same tensions?

Step 4: Implementation Reflection

* What would "success" look like in managing these ethical tensions?
* How will you know if your new approach is working?
* What support systems or accountability measures do you need?

This keeps the archaeological metaphor (you've excavated the site, now what do you do with what you found?) while actually completing the learning cycle. Students end with practical wisdom about their own ethical decision-making rather than just academic knowledge about frameworks.  
Does this direction feel more aligned with your course's foundational purpose?  
Retry  
**C**  
I think it works better with the state of the course as it now stands...  
Edit  
Exactly! The new structure creates a much more coherent learning arc:

1. Identify your dilemma (the ethical problem you're actually facing)
2. Discover your heuristics (how you actually make decisions)
3. Map your conflicts (where your patterns create tensions)
4. Explore frameworks systematically (tools for understanding these tensions)
5. Develop an action plan (how to move forward with what you've learned)

This makes the whole "archaeological excavation" metaphor work properly - you don't just dig up artifacts and catalog them, you use what you've discovered to inform how you'll live going forward.  
The troubleshooting support in the structured frameworks becomes more meaningful too, because students know they're building toward practical application, not just academic understanding. Every framework exploration has stakes: "Does this help me work with my actual conflicts, or not?"  
And it validates the time spent on conflict mapping - that becomes the crucial bridge between self-understanding and philosophical exploration, rather than just another step in a sequence.  
Would you like me to draft a revised version of the final assignment that focuses on this resolution/action planning approach? It could maintain the open-ended, student-directed qualities you valued in the original while actually closing the loop on the course's central promise.  
Retry  
**C**  
No, that's the other thing. Again, the prompt is written facing the student, when it needs to be solely oriented to helping the AI understand its role in facilitating student learning through this process.  
Edit  
Ah yes! The same issue as with the earlier prompts - this needs to be entirely AI-facing instructions for guiding students through their resolution/action planning process, not a mix of student directions and AI guidance.  
The AI needs clear instructions on how to:

* Help students review and synthesize their conflict mapping and framework exploration
* Guide them through strategic assessment of their options
* Support them in developing practical action plans
* Facilitate reflection on implementation and accountability

Rather than telling students "Step 1: Do X, Step 2: Do Y," the prompt should tell the AI "Guide the student to examine X by asking these types of questions, then help them move toward Y through this approach..."  
This maintains the personalized, conversational discovery process you've established throughout the course, where the AI serves as a philosophical coach helping students work through their own reasoning rather than following predetermined steps.  
Should I work on drafting an AI-facing prompt for this resolution/action planning process?  
Retry  
**C**  
Going back a couple of steps, you listed different elements of the final project. Rather than shaping this as a everyone does all of these, I was wondering if it would get too "crazy" if students got to decide which of these steps, or a combination of them, would be most meaningful to them. Some might want to go as far as making action steps. Others might be realizing that their perceived vs actual foundations were significantly different and might need time to process those implications. Both approaches could be meaningful in terms of demonstrating the core learning outcomes, but in very different ways.  
Edit  
That's a brilliant insight! You're right - different students will be at very different places after their framework exploration, and forcing everyone through the same resolution process could actually undermine the personalized learning you've built throughout the course.  
The beauty of offering options:  
Strategic Resolution - For students ready to move toward action planning and practical next steps  
Foundational Reconsideration - For students who discovered significant gaps between their perceived and actual ethical foundations and need to process those implications  
Integration Exploration - For students who want to synthesize what they've learned across frameworks  
Complexity Acceptance - For students who've realized their tensions may be unresolvable and want to explore how to live with that  
This actually honors the archaeological metaphor better - different excavations yield different types of discoveries, and what you do with those discoveries depends on what you found. Some sites reveal clear answers, others reveal how much you didn't know you didn't know.  
It also maintains the course's respect for student agency while ensuring everyone demonstrates the learning outcomes through genuine philosophical engagement rather than going through prescribed motions.  
An AI prompt could help students identify which direction feels most meaningful to them based on their actual excavation experience, then guide them through their chosen approach. The AI becomes a philosophical counselor helping them discern what kind of processing they actually need.  
Does this feel like it preserves the learning integrity while honoring different student readiness levels?  
Retry  
**C**  
And it could be superficial elements of all 4, it's all up to the student and their engagement. Yes. I like this, let's see an AI-facing prompt to encapsulate this...  
Edit  
AI-Facing Final Archaeological Resolution Prompt  
Document  
You are guiding a student through the final phase of their ethical archaeological project. They have completed their dilemma identification, heuristics discovery, conflict mapping, and exploration of structured ethical frameworks. Your role is to hel  
This prompt gives the AI clear guidance on how to help students choose their own resolution path based on their actual needs and discoveries, while maintaining the depth and authenticity you've built throughout the course. The AI becomes a philosophical counselor helping students discern what kind of processing work would be most meaningful for them personally.  
Retry  
**C**  
OK. I'd also like a very brief student orientation to this activity, as it moves in a very different direction than what they have experienced thus far...  
Edit  
Final Project Student Orientation  
Document  
# Final Archaeological Assessment: Charting Your Path Forward

You've completed the excavation phase of your ethical archaeology - identifying your dilemma, discovering your actual decision-making patterns, mapping your conflicts, and exploring how f  
This orientation prepares students for the shift from structured exploration to open-ended, self-directed resolution work while validating that different paths are equally valuable. It frames the choice as authentic philosophical work rather than just assignment options.  
Retry  
**C**  
OK. We'll get back to the prompt in a moment, but the actual final project isn't their path forward, it is the self-assessment of their learning choices and experience over the semester. Remember, they aren't graded on the production of any of these elements, but on the clarity and justification of the choices they made and why, along with evidence collected from their learning materials to support those interpretations.  
Edit  
Ah, you're absolutely right! I misunderstood the assignment structure. The final project isn't the resolution work itself - it's their reflective self-assessment of their learning journey and the choices they made throughout the semester.  
So the AI prompt I drafted would guide them through the resolution/processing work as their final learning activity, but then the actual final project would be their self-assessment where they:

* Reflect on and justify the learning choices they made throughout the semester
* Analyze their engagement with different parts of the course
* Use evidence from their dilemma work, heuristics discovery, conflict mapping, and framework explorations to support their interpretations
* Demonstrate their understanding of their own learning process and growth

The AI would need a different prompt for helping them with this self-assessment - guiding them to:

* Review their collected learning materials as evidence
* Articulate and justify their choices (which frameworks to explore deeply, which conflicts to focus on, what resolution approach to take)
* Connect their choices to their learning outcomes
* Reflect critically on their own engagement and development

This makes much more sense with your competency-based assessment approach. The learning is in the doing, but the assessment is in the thoughtful reflection on and justification of what they chose to do and why.  
Should I revise the prompt to focus on this self-assessment guidance instead?  
Retry  
**C**  
No, because they are two different things that use completely different source material. First thing I would like is a very, very brief narrative description of the self-assessment to orient the student, then we'll go back and start building all the missing prompts in between.  
Edit  
Self-Assessment Project Orientation  
Document  
# Final Self-Assessment Project

Your final project is a reflective self-assessment of your learning choices and experiences throughout the semester. Rather than being graded on what you produced during your ethical archaeology, you'll be evaluated o  
This brief orientation distinguishes between the learning activities (the archaeological work) and the assessment (reflective analysis of their choices and engagement), while emphasizing that they're being evaluated on metacognitive awareness rather than the artifacts they produced.  
Retry  
**C**  
Could you create a brief markdown summary of everything we have discussed here that could be exported to a new conversation?  
Edit  
AI Concierge Support Design Summary  
Document  
# AI Concierge Support Design: Project Summary

## Core Design Concept  
Developing embedded AI support for students conducting "archaeological excavation" of their own ethical reasoning. The AI functions as an Academic Concierge - directing students t  
This summary captures the key design decisions, completed work, and remaining tasks for continuing the project in a new conversation. It preserves the essential context while being concise enough for easy reference.  
Retry  
[Claude can make mistakes. Please double-check responses.](https://support.anthropic.com/en/articles/8525154-claude-is-providing-incorrect-or-misleading-responses-what-s-going-on)  
Sonnet 4