# AI Prompt Design for Ethical Exploration

Share  
Your Mission: Excavating the Bioethical Reasoning Already Operating in Your Ethical Thinking Time for another archaeological expedition! You're now digging into your ethical reasoning to uncover where bioethical thinking—the belief that healthcare decisions involve balancing autonomy, beneficence,  
pasted  
Your Mission: Archaeological Dig in Your Own Ethical Reasoning You're about to become an ethical archaeologist, excavating your own moral reasoning to discover what philosophical traditions are already operating in your thinking. This isn't about finding flaws in your reasoning—it's about understan  
pasted  
**C**  
I am working on creating AI prompts to assist my students in engaging in deep exploration of different ethical models. The two prompts I attached are examples. One was the last one created, the other the first. Since I have had to move between prompts due to AI plan restrictions, I want to determine if there has been focus drift between these two documents. I prefer the Virtue ethics model as the control variable, if that makes sense.  
Edit  
Looking at these two prompts as an educational designer, I can see some significant focus drift between your virtue ethics (control) and bioethics versions. Here's what I've identified:

## **Core Structural Changes**

Virtue Ethics Prompt (Control):

* Clean 3-step structure
* 30-45 minutes reading, 45-60 minutes AI work, 30 minutes documentation
* Focused excavation metaphor throughout
* Clear emphasis on student as expert archaeologist

Bioethics Prompt:

* Same 3-step structure maintained
* Similar time allocations
* Consistent excavation metaphor
* Maintains student-as-expert positioning

## **Significant Focus Drift Issues**

### **1. Complexity Explosion**

Your bioethics prompt has grown substantially more complex:

* Virtue ethics: 4 core excavation questions + 4 deep dig options
* Bioethics: 4 core excavation questions + 8 deep dig options (double the complexity)

### **2. Specificity Creep**

The bioethics version has become much more prescriptive:

* Virtue ethics: Open-ended questions like "What character traits do I value?"
* Bioethics: Highly specific scenarios like "Esther refused to turn the rebels into vampires despite their autonomous request..."

### **3. Documentation Burden**

The final documentation requirements have expanded significantly in bioethics, potentially overwhelming students.

### **4. Lost Elegance**

Your virtue ethics prompt has a beautiful simplicity and trust in student discovery. The bioethics version feels more like a comprehensive exam than an archaeological dig.

## **Recommendations for Realignment**

1. Trim the deep dig questions back to 4-5 maximum
2. Reduce scenario-specific language - let students find their own examples
3. Streamline the final documentation requirements to match your virtue ethics model
4. Maintain the open-ended, discovery-oriented tone that makes your virtue ethics prompt so effective

The core pedagogical approach remains sound, but the bioethics version needs pruning to maintain the focused, student-driven exploration that makes your virtue ethics model work so well.  
Retry  
Your Mission: Mining for Utilitarian Gold in Your Ethical Reasoning Time for another archaeological dig! You're now excavating your ethical reasoning to discover where utilitarian thinking—the "greatest good for the greatest number"—already operates in your decision-making patterns. Remember: you'r  
pasted  
**C**  
Could you compare the virtue assignment to the utilitarian, using the same process?  
Edit  
Looking at your virtue ethics (control) versus utilitarian prompts, I can see much better consistency here. The focus drift is minimal and manageable:

## **Structural Consistency ✅**

Both prompts maintain:

* Same 3-step structure and time allocations
* Consistent archaeological metaphor throughout
* Student-as-expert positioning
* Same core excavation approach

## **Minor Focus Drift Issues**

### **1. Slight Complexity Increase**

* Virtue ethics: 4 core excavation questions + 4 deep dig options
* Utilitarian: 4 core excavation questions + 5 deep dig options (modest increase)

### **2. Tone Shift (Very Minor)**

* Virtue ethics: "What surprised you about your own virtue-based thinking?"
* Utilitarian: "What surprised you about your own utilitarian thinking (or lack thereof)?"

The parenthetical addition suggests you might be anticipating resistance to utilitarian thinking, which wasn't present in the virtue ethics version.

### **3. Documentation Complexity**

The utilitarian version has slightly more detailed documentation requirements, but not dramatically so like the bioethics version.

## **What's Working Well**

1. Maintained elegance and focus from your virtue ethics model
2. Character-specific excavation questions (Princess Peach vs. Prudence) without over-specifying scenarios
3. Balanced deep dig options that invite genuine discovery
4. Consistent archaeological metaphor ("mining for utilitarian gold")

## **Minor Recommendations**

1. Trim to 4 deep dig questions to match your virtue ethics control exactly
2. Remove the "(or lack thereof)" parenthetical to maintain neutrality about what students might discover
3. Slightly streamline the documentation to match virtue ethics length

Overall, your utilitarian prompt maintains the pedagogical integrity and focused approach of your virtue ethics model much better than the bioethics version. The drift here is minimal and easily corrected with small adjustments.  
Retry  
**C**  
OK. Using Virtue as the control version, please revise utilitiarian and bioethics prompts.  
Edit  
Revised Utilitarian Ethics Prompt  
Document  
# Your Mission: Archaeological Dig in Your Own Ethical Reasoning

You're about to become an ethical archaeologist, excavating your own moral reasoning to discover what philosophical traditions are already operating in your thinking. This isn't about  
Revised Bioethics Prompt  
Document  
# Your Mission: Archaeological Dig in Your Own Ethical Reasoning

You're about to become an ethical archaeologist, excavating your own moral reasoning to discover what philosophical traditions are already operating in your thinking. This isn't about  
I've revised both prompts to match the focused elegance of your virtue ethics control version. Here are the key changes I made:

## **Major Revisions:**

Utilitarian Prompt:

* Reduced deep dig questions from 5 to 4 (matching virtue ethics)
* Removed the "(or lack thereof)" parenthetical to maintain neutrality
* Streamlined documentation requirements
* Maintained the archaeological metaphor consistently
* Kept Princess Peach references without over-specifying scenarios

Bioethics Prompt:

* Dramatically reduced deep dig questions from 8 to 4 (matching virtue ethics)
* Removed overly specific scenario references (like the vampire rebels example)
* Significantly streamlined the final documentation section
* Eliminated the overwhelming list of contemporary applications
* Maintained focus on student discovery rather than comprehensive coverage

## **What I Preserved:**

* The core 3-step structure and timing
* Student-as-expert positioning
* Archaeological excavation metaphor
* Character-based reading reactions (Prudence/Princess Peach/Esther)
* Focus on personal discovery over theoretical knowledge

Both revised prompts now maintain the pedagogical integrity and manageable scope of your original virtue ethics model while preserving the unique content focus of each ethical framework.  
Retry  
Time for another archaeological expedition! You're now digging into your ethical reasoning to uncover where deontological thinking—the "duty-based" approach focused on rules, intentions, and moral obligations—already operates in your decision-making patterns. Remember: you're the expert archaeologis  
pasted  
**C**  
Edit  
Looking at your deontological prompt against the virtue ethics control, I can see similar focus drift issues that appeared in your original bioethics version. Here's the comparison:

## **Focus Drift Issues**

### **1. Complexity Creep**

* Virtue ethics (control): 4 core excavation questions + 4 deep dig options
* Deontological: 4 core excavation questions + 6 deep dig options (50% increase)

### **2. Over-Specification**

The deontological version has become more prescriptive with specific theoretical references:

* "Golden Rule Excavation: 'Clodsley started with...'"
* "Categorical Imperative Mining: 'Help me test my approach using Kant's...'"
* "Prima Facie Duties Discovery: 'Ross identified duties like...'"

This contrasts with the virtue ethics version's more open-ended approach.

### **3. Documentation Expansion**

The final documentation section has grown more complex than your control version, particularly in the "Origin Excavation" section.

### **4. Lost Elegance**

The clean, discovery-oriented tone of your virtue ethics model has been somewhat overwhelmed by theoretical terminology and specific frameworks.  
Would you like me to revise the deontological prompt using the same approach I used for the utilitarian and bioethics versions—trimming it back to match the focused elegance and manageable scope of your virtue ethics control model?  
The core structure and archaeological metaphor are solid, but it needs the same kind of streamlining to maintain pedagogical consistency across your series.  
Retry  
**C**  
Please revise accordingly  
Edit  
Revised Deontological Ethics Prompt  
Document  
# Your Mission: Archaeological Dig in Your Own Ethical Reasoning

You're about to become an ethical archaeologist, excavating your own moral reasoning to discover what philosophical traditions are already operating in your thinking. This isn't about  
I've revised the deontological prompt to match the focused elegance of your virtue ethics control version. Here are the key changes:

## **Major Revisions:**

* Reduced deep dig questions from 6 to 4 (matching your control version)
* Removed over-specific theoretical terminology (Kant's Categorical Imperative, Ross's prima facie duties, etc.)
* Streamlined the documentation requirements to match the simpler structure of virtue ethics
* Eliminated the expanded "Origin Excavation" section that had grown beyond your control model
* Maintained Clodsley references without over-specifying scenarios

## **What I Preserved:**

* The core 3-step structure and timing
* Student-as-expert archaeological positioning
* Focus on personal discovery over theoretical knowledge
* The natural flow from reading reactions to excavation to documentation
* Character-based engagement with the reading material

## **Consistency Achieved:**

Now all four prompts (virtue, utilitarian, bioethics, deontological) maintain the same:

* 4 core excavation questions + 4 deep dig options
* Manageable documentation requirements
* Discovery-oriented rather than theory-heavy approach
* Clean, focused pedagogical structure

The deontological prompt now maintains the pedagogical integrity of your original virtue ethics model while preserving its unique focus on duty-based reasoning patterns.  
Retry  
Your Mission: Excavating the Universal Moral Order Already Operating in Your Ethical Reasoning Time for another archaeological expedition! You're now digging into your ethical reasoning to uncover where natural law thinking—the belief that moral principles are woven into the fabric of reality itsel  
pasted  
**C**  
Review and revise using the same methodology, please  
Edit  
Revised Natural Law Ethics Prompt  
Document  
# Your Mission: Archaeological Dig in Your Own Ethical Reasoning

You're about to become an ethical archaeologist, excavating your own moral reasoning to discover what philosophical traditions are already operating in your thinking. This isn't about  
I've revised the natural law prompt to match the focused elegance of your virtue ethics control version. Here are the key changes:

## **Major Focus Drift Issues Corrected:**

### **1. Complexity Reduction**

* Original: 4 core excavation questions + 6 deep dig options (50% over your control)
* Revised: 4 core excavation questions + 4 deep dig options (matches virtue ethics)

### **2. Over-Specification Eliminated**

Removed overly detailed theoretical frameworks:

* Deleted the complex "Doctrine of Double Effect Excavation" with its four-part test
* Eliminated the detailed "Just War Theory Mining" with specific criteria lists
* Removed the lengthy "Contemporary Applications" section

### **3. Documentation Streamlined**

* Cut the expanded "Archaeological Discoveries Report" back to match your control model
* Eliminated the overwhelming detail in conflict map annotations
* Removed the extensive "Origin Excavation" section that had grown beyond your standard

### **4. Tone Consistency Restored**

* Returned to the discovery-oriented approach of your virtue ethics model
* Removed theoretical jargon while preserving the core natural law concepts
* Maintained Retribution character references without over-specifying scenarios

## **What I Preserved:**

* The 3-step structure and timing
* Student-as-expert archaeological positioning
* Focus on personal discovery over theoretical mastery
* The essential natural law concepts (universal principles, human nature, objective moral order)

Now all five prompts maintain consistent pedagogical integrity while preserving their unique ethical framework focus.  
Retry  
Your Mission: Excavating the Social Contract Foundations Already Operating in Your Ethical Reasoning Time for another archaeological expedition! You're now digging into your ethical reasoning to uncover where social contract thinking—the belief that moral obligations arise from mutual agreements an  
pasted  
**C**  
Review and revise  
Edit  
Revised Social Contract Ethics Prompt  
Document  
# Your Mission: Archaeological Dig in Your Own Ethical Reasoning

You're about to become an ethical archaeologist, excavating your own moral reasoning to discover what philosophical traditions are already operating in your thinking. This isn't about  
I've revised the social contract prompt to match the focused elegance of your virtue ethics control version. Here are the key changes:

## **Major Focus Drift Issues Corrected:**

### **1. Dramatic Complexity Reduction**

* Original: 4 core excavation questions + 7 deep dig options (75% over your control)
* Revised: 4 core excavation questions + 4 deep dig options (matches virtue ethics)

### **2. Over-Specification Eliminated**

Removed overly detailed theoretical frameworks:

* Deleted complex "Hobbesian Security vs. Freedom Analysis"
* Eliminated detailed "Rawlsian Veil of Ignorance Excavation" with specific methodology
* Removed extensive "Contemporary Policy Applications" section
* Cut the lengthy "Philosophical Orientation Discovery" section

### **3. Documentation Drastically Streamlined**

* Eliminated the overwhelming "Archaeological Discoveries Report" with 5+ categories
* Removed the extensive "Origin Excavation" and "Philosophical Orientation Discovery" sections
* Cut back to match your control model's manageable documentation requirements

### **4. Tone and Focus Restored**

* Returned to discovery-oriented questions rather than theory-heavy prompts
* Maintained the Equilibrians character references without over-specifying scenarios
* Preserved core social contract concepts (fairness, consent, legitimate authority) in accessible language

## **What I Preserved:**

* The essential social contract focus on fairness, mutual agreements, and legitimate authority
* The 3-step structure and timing that works across all your prompts
* Student-as-expert archaeological positioning
* Character-based engagement with reading material

Now all six prompts maintain consistent pedagogical integrity while preserving their unique ethical framework focus. The social contract version no longer overwhelms students with theoretical complexity but still enables genuine discovery of contract-based reasoning patterns.  
Retry  
Your Mission: Excavating the Class Consciousness Already Operating in Your Ethical Reasoning Time for another archaeological expedition! You're now digging into your ethical reasoning to uncover where Marxist thinking—the belief that ethical problems stem from economic exploitation, class conflict,  
pasted  
**C**  
Edit  
Revised Marxist Ethics Prompt  
Document  
# Your Mission: Archaeological Dig in Your Own Ethical Reasoning

You're about to become an ethical archaeologist, excavating your own moral reasoning to discover what philosophical traditions are already operating in your thinking. This isn't about  
I've revised the Marxist prompt to match the focused elegance of your virtue ethics control version. Here are the key changes:

## **Major Focus Drift Issues Corrected:**

### **1. Dramatic Complexity Reduction**

* Original: 4 core excavation questions + 8 deep dig options (100% over your control!)
* Revised: 4 core excavation questions + 4 deep dig options (matches virtue ethics)

### **2. Over-Specification Eliminated**

Removed overly detailed theoretical frameworks:

* Deleted complex "Historical Materialism Excavation"
* Eliminated detailed "Four Types of Alienation Mining" with specific categories
* Removed extensive "False Consciousness Detection" section
* Cut the lengthy "Species-Being and Human Flourishing" analysis

### **3. Documentation Drastically Streamlined**

* Eliminated the overwhelming multi-category "Archaeological Discoveries Report"
* Removed the extensive "Revolutionary vs. Reformist Orientation" and "Contemporary Application Discovery" sections
* Cut back to match your control model's manageable scope

### **4. Tone and Accessibility Restored**

* Returned to discovery-oriented questions rather than theory-heavy terminology
* Maintained Quilbert Redshift character references without over-specifying scenarios
* Preserved core Marxist concepts (class, exploitation, commodification, systemic analysis) in accessible language

## **What I Preserved:**

* The essential Marxist focus on economic structures, power dynamics, and systemic inequality
* The 3-step structure and timing consistent across all your prompts
* Student-as-expert archaeological positioning
* Character-based engagement with reading material

Now all seven prompts maintain consistent pedagogical integrity. The Marxist version no longer overwhelms students with extensive theoretical complexity but still enables genuine discovery of class-consciousness and economic analysis patterns in their reasoning.  
Retry  
Your Mission: Excavating the Existentialist Feminist Consciousness Already Operating in Your Ethical Reasoning Time for another archaeological expedition! You're now digging into your ethical reasoning to uncover where de Beauvoirian thinking—the belief that ethical problems stem from being defined  
pasted  
**C**  
Edit  
Revised De Beauvoir Ethics Prompt  
Document  
# Your Mission: Archaeological Dig in Your Own Ethical Reasoning

You're about to become an ethical archaeologist, excavating your own moral reasoning to discover what philosophical traditions are already operating in your thinking. This isn't about  
I've revised the de Beauvoir prompt to match the focused elegance of your virtue ethics control version. Here are the key changes:

## **Major Focus Drift Issues Corrected:**

### **1. Dramatic Complexity Reduction**

* Original: 4 core excavation questions + 8 deep dig options (100% over your control!)
* Revised: 4 core excavation questions + 4 deep dig options (matches virtue ethics)

### **2. Over-Specification Eliminated**

Removed overly detailed theoretical frameworks:

* Deleted complex "Immanence vs. Transcendence Excavation"
* Eliminated detailed "Intersectionality Awareness" section
* Removed extensive "Situational Ethics Mining" analysis
* Cut the lengthy "'Second Sex' Pattern Analysis"

### **3. Documentation Drastically Streamlined**

* Eliminated the overwhelming multi-category "Archaeological Discoveries Report"
* Removed the extensive "Philosophical Orientation Discovery" and "Contemporary Application Discovery" sections
* Cut back to match your control model's manageable documentation scope

### **4. Tone and Accessibility Restored**

* Returned to discovery-oriented questions rather than theory-heavy terminology
* Maintained Bridget character references without over-specifying scenarios
* Preserved core de Beauvoirian concepts ("othering," social construction, authenticity, ambiguity) in accessible language

## **What I Preserved:**

* The essential de Beauvoirian focus on social construction, "othering," and authentic existence
* The 3-step structure and timing consistent across all your prompts
* Student-as-expert archaeological positioning
* Character-based engagement with reading material

Now all eight prompts maintain consistent pedagogical integrity. The de Beauvoir version no longer overwhelms students with extensive theoretical complexity but still enables genuine discovery of existentialist feminist patterns in their moral reasoning.  
Retry  
Your Mission: Excavating the Environmental Consciousness Already Operating in Your Ethical Reasoning Time for another archaeological expedition! You're now digging into your ethical reasoning to uncover where environmental thinking—the belief that non-human nature has moral value, that humans are i  
pasted  
**C**  
Edit  
Revised Environmental Ethics Prompt  
Document  
# Your Mission: Archaeological Dig in Your Own Ethical Reasoning

You're about to become an ethical archaeologist, excavating your own moral reasoning to discover what philosophical traditions are already operating in your thinking. This isn't about  
I've revised the environmental ethics prompt to match the focused elegance of your virtue ethics control version. Here are the key changes:

## **Major Focus Drift Issues Corrected:**

### **1. Dramatic Complexity Reduction**

* Original: 4 core excavation questions + 8 deep dig options (100% over your control!)
* Revised: 4 core excavation questions + 4 deep dig options (matches virtue ethics)

### **2. Over-Specification Eliminated**

Removed overly detailed theoretical frameworks:

* Deleted complex "Anthropocentric vs. Non-Anthropocentric Mining"
* Eliminated detailed "Rights of Nature Excavation"
* Removed extensive "Climate Ethics Excavation" section
* Cut the lengthy "Technology vs. Lifestyle Change Tensions" analysis

### **3. Documentation Drastically Streamlined**

* Eliminated the overwhelming multi-category "Archaeological Discoveries Report"
* Removed the extensive "Philosophical Orientation Discovery," "Climate Ethics Excavation," and "Contemporary Application Discovery" sections
* Cut back to match your control model's manageable documentation scope

### **4. Tone and Accessibility Restored**

* Returned to discovery-oriented questions rather than theory-heavy terminology
* Maintained Tafari character references without over-specifying scenarios
* Preserved core environmental concepts (moral circle expansion, interconnectedness, sustainability) in accessible language

## **What I Preserved:**

* The essential environmental focus on non-human nature, interconnectedness, and sustainability
* The 3-step structure and timing consistent across all your prompts
* Student-as-expert archaeological positioning
* Character-based engagement with reading material

Now all nine prompts maintain consistent pedagogical integrity. The environmental ethics version no longer overwhelms students with extensive theoretical complexity but still enables genuine discovery of environmental consciousness patterns in their moral reasoning.  
Retry  
**C**  
Building on the concepts covered in the previous AI prompts, I would like to design an additional next step prompt based on the following idea. Here's the description; I would like to brainstorm what it will entail rather than jumping right into drafting...  
Part 5: Deep Dive Challenge Prompt  
\* Instructions for identifying frameworks that *didn't* appear in archaeological dig  
\* Guidance for selecting one "missing" framework for serious engagement  
\* Structured exploration: Why didn't this resonate? What would adopting it require? Integration assessment process  
Edit  
This is a brilliant pedagogical move! It addresses the natural blind spots that emerge from the archaeological approach and forces students to grapple with their philosophical resistance patterns. Let me brainstorm the key components this prompt would need:

## **Core Concept Challenges**

Framework Identification Process:

* How do students systematically review their 8+ archaeological reports to identify consistent "absences"?
* Should they look for frameworks that appeared minimally vs. not at all?
* Do we want them to focus on frameworks that felt "foreign" or "uncomfortable" during reading?

Selection Criteria Questions:

* Should students choose the framework that felt most alien to their thinking?
* Or the one they actively resisted during reading?
* What about frameworks they found intellectually interesting but couldn't locate in their own reasoning?

## **Structured Exploration Components**

Resistance Analysis:

* What specifically made this framework feel wrong/uncomfortable/unnatural?
* Is the resistance philosophical, cultural, experiential, or emotional?
* Can they trace the origins of their resistance?

Adoption Thought Experiment:

* "If I had to argue from this framework for one day/week/month, what would change?"
* What would they have to give up in their current thinking?
* What new questions or considerations would emerge?

Integration Assessment:

* Is this framework completely incompatible with their existing patterns?
* Could elements be integrated without abandoning core commitments?
* What would a "hybrid" approach look like?

## **Pedagogical Structure Questions**

Depth vs. Breadth:

* Should this be a single framework deep dive or compare 2-3 missing frameworks?
* How much time should students spend with uncomfortable ideas?

AI Assistance Role:

* Should AI help them role-play arguing from the unfamiliar framework?
* Or help them identify integration possibilities?
* What's the balance between challenge and support?

What aspects of this intrigue you most? Are you thinking this forces students to confront their philosophical comfort zones, or more about developing intellectual empathy for different approaches?  
Retry  
**C**

1. I would assume that items that are not categorized after all the reports are complete would be the first place to look
2. For the next few questions, I think an overarching answer would be: it depends on the student's interest. Are they interested in conflicts/heuristics that were unaddressed, or theories that did not appear in their classification process, or theories they resisted or didn't agree with. The goal is to underscore autonomy and allowing student agency to choose their learning path, with the understanding that both in this prompt and elsewhere in the class, they will be asked to explain and defend their choices.
3. Again, the depth of the dive is up to them. Their goal is to demonstrate how they met the course outcomes of: "Develop critical perspectives or arguments about the subject matter, grounded in evidence-based analysis." and "Demonstrate self-reflection, intellectual elasticity, widened perspective, and respect for diverse viewpoints. "
4. There are a lot of different avenues students could take with the outcomes of this deep dive; show how or why this theory was left out of their heuristics, engage in speculative analysis of the impact of integrating "foreign" principles into their conflict map; seek to address a primary conflict that has yet to be addressed, but needs to...the list goes on.

Edit  
Excellent - this clarifies the pedagogical philosophy beautifully. You're creating a capstone experience that honors student agency while ensuring they demonstrate the core learning outcomes. Let me brainstorm the structural components:

## **Opening Framework**

Student Choice Architecture:

* Present multiple pathways without prescribing which is "better"
* Require them to articulate WHY they chose their particular avenue
* Built-in reflection on what their choice reveals about their learning priorities

## **Potential Pathways (Student Selects One)**

Path A: Unaddressed Conflicts/Heuristics

* "I have reasoning patterns that didn't fit any of the 8+ frameworks"
* Requires creating original analysis or finding additional philosophical traditions

Path B: Missing Framework Integration

* "Theory X never appeared in my reasoning, but I want to understand why and what it would change"
* Requires deep engagement with unfamiliar philosophical territory

Path C: Resistance Analysis

* "I actively disagreed with Theory Y during reading - let me explore this resistance"
* Could lead to either deeper rejection (with sophisticated reasoning) or unexpected integration

Path D: Conflict Resolution Focus

* "My most challenging conflict remains unresolved - can a 'missing' framework help?"
* Applied philosophy approach using their real dilemma

## **Structural Requirements (Regardless of Path)**

Choice Justification: Why this approach over others? Evidence-Based Analysis: How does this demonstrate critical thinking with evidence? Self-Reflection Component: What does this reveal about their intellectual development? Perspective Widening: How has this expanded their view? Respect for Diverse Viewpoints: How do they engage fairly with unfamiliar ideas?

## **Assessment Flexibility**

Students could demonstrate outcomes through:

* Traditional analysis papers
* Speculative integration experiments
* Comparative framework analysis
* Personal philosophical manifesto
* Creative applications to contemporary issues

Does this capture the autonomy-with-accountability balance you're aiming for?  
Retry  
**C**  
Actually, rather than pigeonhole them by presenting the pathways immediately, hold those off until the student has a chance to suggest something of their own. If it is close to one of these pathways, go with their idea. If it isn't, suggest they pass the idea by me (instructor) before going too far down the rabbit hole. If they struggle too much and seem completely at a loss, then suggest the pathways.  
Edit  
Perfect - that's much more pedagogically sophisticated! You're creating a genuine discovery moment rather than a multiple choice exercise. Let me brainstorm this scaffolded approach:

## **Opening Structure**

Step 1: Open-Ended Exploration

* "Now that you've completed your archaeological digs, what do you notice about what's missing, unresolved, or unexplored?"
* "What questions or tensions emerged from this process that you'd like to investigate further?"
* Let them brainstorm freely first

Step 2: Student-Generated Proposal

* Have them articulate their own idea for deeper investigation
* Require them to explain why this particular avenue interests them
* Ask them to connect it to the course learning outcomes

Step 3: Responsive Guidance

* AI evaluates if their proposal aligns well with learning outcomes
* If it's close to proven pathways → encourage and support their direction
* If it's too far afield → "This sounds interesting, but you might want to run it by your instructor to make sure it meets the assignment requirements"
* If they're completely stuck → offer the pathway options as scaffolding

## **AI Prompt Logic**

Supportive Response Criteria:

* Does it demonstrate critical thinking with evidence?
* Will it require self-reflection and perspective widening?
* Does it engage respectfully with diverse viewpoints?
* Is it substantive enough to show learning?

Redirect Criteria:

* Too superficial (just summarizing theories)
* Too personal (therapy session rather than philosophical analysis)
* Too ambitious (writing a dissertation)
* Off-topic (abandoning ethical reasoning entirely)

This preserves student agency while providing appropriate guardrails. The AI becomes a thinking partner rather than a choice-menu presenter.  
Retry  
**C**  
Bear in mind, these aren't proven pathways; all of this is pilot for a course I will run for the first time. I am just spitballing ideas of directions a student might want to go.  
Edit  
Ah, you're absolutely right - these are educated guesses about what students might gravitate toward, not validated pathways! That makes the open-ended approach even more crucial for your pilot. You'll be gathering data about what directions students naturally want to explore.

## **Revised Brainstorming Approach**

Step 1: Genuine Open Discovery

* Let students identify their own gaps, tensions, or curiosities
* See what emerges organically from their archaeological process
* Document what they propose for your course development insights

Step 2: Student Agency with Safety Net

* Support reasonable proposals that connect to learning outcomes
* For unclear/problematic directions: "Run this by your instructor first"
* Only offer scaffolding pathways if they're genuinely stuck

Pilot Learning Opportunity: This design lets you discover:

* What kinds of gaps/tensions students naturally notice
* Which directions they find most compelling
* Whether your hypothetical pathways match student interests
* What other directions emerge that you hadn't anticipated
* How well students can self-direct when given genuine choice

Assessment Flexibility: Since you don't know what forms student work will take, the learning outcomes provide the evaluative framework rather than specific deliverable formats.  
This approach treats both you and your students as co-researchers in the learning process - perfect for a pilot where you're genuinely curious about what works and what students need.  
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)  
This conversation has reached its [maximum length](https://support.anthropic.com/en/articles/8606394-how-large-is-the-context-window-on-paid-claude-plans).  
Start a new conversation  
Sonnet 4