# AI-Assisted Course Design Ethics
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In looking at the course design, I realize that the AI prompts instruct the AI as to how to act as a research partner or thinking buddy, but I don't actually explicitly articulate the scope or nature of the assignments (Parts) from a student perspective. Could you review the content of the course and let's begin to conceptualize what those directions or information might need to include/look like...  
Edit  
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google.com  
After reviewing this comprehensive course design, I can see you've created a thoughtfully structured ethics course that uses AI as a thinking partner and emphasizes genuine ethical reasoning over content mastery. You're absolutely right that while the AI prompts are detailed and prescriptive about *how* to engage with AI, there's a gap in clearly articulating the assignments from the student perspective.  
Let me help you conceptualize what those student-facing directions might need to include:

## **Key Gaps in Current Student Information**

1. Assignment Purpose & Scope Clarity Students need to understand not just the mechanics of each Part, but *why* they're doing it and what constitutes sufficient depth. Currently, the AI prompts do much of the cognitive work of understanding the assignment's purpose.  
2. Success Criteria From Student Perspective While you have excellent learning dimensions for final assessment, students need intermediate markers of what "genuine engagement" looks like for each Part.  
3. Time Investment & Pacing Expectations Students need realistic estimates of how much time each Part should take and what "sufficient exploration" means.

## **Recommended Student Assignment Directions Structure**

For each Part, students would benefit from:

### **Opening Framework**

* Purpose Statement: Why this work matters for your ethical development
* Core Question: The central question this Part helps you answer
* Connection to Course Goals: How this builds toward your final learning demonstration

### **Scope & Depth Indicators**

* What You're Looking For: Specific types of insights, patterns, or tensions to identify
* How Much Is Enough: Concrete indicators of sufficient exploration
* Warning Signs: Red flags that you might be going too shallow or getting stuck

### **Process Guidance**

* Recommended Approach: Step-by-step process suggestions (not just AI prompts)
* Time Investment: Realistic time estimates for meaningful work
* Documentation Expectations: What to save and why

### **Quality Indicators**

* Evidence of Genuine Work: What demonstrates authentic engagement vs. going through motions
* Common Pitfalls: What to avoid or watch out for
* When to Seek Help: Clear triggers for reaching out

Would you like me to develop a specific example of how this might look for one of the Parts (perhaps Part 1 or Part 2) to see if this direction aligns with your vision? This could serve as a template for developing the others.  
Retry  
**C**  
In terms of quality and scope indicators, a fundamental course philosophy is that I do not want to insert prescriptive descriptions or suggestions of what is expected; I want students to struggle on their own to generate those kinds of rubrics for themselves. Perhaps I need to say that explicitly, but if the focus is on each student wrestling with learning on their own, trying to create standardized statements undermines that outcome.  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - that's a crucial philosophical distinction I missed. Creating prescriptive quality indicators would indeed undermine the core pedagogical approach of authentic self-directed wrestling with complexity.  
The gap isn't about providing rubrics or success criteria - it's about assignment framing that helps students understand what they're embarking on without prescribing how to do it well.

## **Reframed Approach: Assignment Context, Not Criteria**

Instead of quality indicators, students might need:

### **Assignment Framing**

* The Challenge: What intellectual/ethical work are you taking on?
* Your Agency: What decisions are entirely yours to make?
* The Stakes: Why does this matter for your ethical development?

### **Process Transparency**

* What This Phase Involves: The type of thinking/exploration you'll be doing
* Your Documentation Role: Why you're saving certain things (for your own learning journey)
* When It's Working: Not "how well" but "what it feels like" when the process is generative

### **Struggle Normalization**

* Expected Difficulties: This should feel hard/uncertain/messy because...
* Your Learning Authority: You determine what constitutes sufficient exploration for your situation
* Trust the Process: Why the struggle itself is valuable

This maintains student autonomy while providing enough context for them to understand what kind of intellectual work they're committing to, without prescribing what good work looks like.  
Would this approach better align with your course philosophy? The goal would be giving students enough context to engage meaningfully with the challenge while preserving their authority over determining quality and depth for themselves.  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes. Let's use this pattern to create an assignment description using these parameters for the Ethical Dillema experience.  
Edit  
Part 1: Ethical Dilemma Identification - Assignment Description  
Document  
# Part 1: Identifying Your Ethical Dilemma

## The Challenge  
You're embarking on a semester-long exploration of your own ethical reasoning process. This requires finding a genuine ethical dilemma from your actual life—not a hypothetical scenario or s  
I've created an assignment description for Part 1 that follows your philosophical approach. It frames the intellectual challenge students are taking on, normalizes the difficulty they'll encounter, and preserves their authority over determining quality and scope while giving them enough context to engage meaningfully.  
The structure avoids prescriptive success criteria while helping students understand:

* What kind of work they're embarking on (excavating genuine complexity from their own lives)
* Why this matters (foundation for semester-long exploration)
* What agency they have (all the important decisions are theirs)
* Why struggle is expected and valuable (genuine complexity is uncomfortable)

Would you like me to adjust anything about this approach, or shall we use this as a template to develop similar descriptions for the other Parts?  
Retry  
**C**  
Let's add possible timeframe expectations and what the finished product (in whatever format) looks like and where it goes - i.e., you're not submitting something as an "assignment," it just goes into your Shared Google Drive folder and your card for that project moves to Completed in the ClickUp kanban.  
Edit  
Part 1: Ethical Dilemma Identification - Assignment Description  
Document ∙ Version 2  
The messiness and uncertainty you feel during this phase mirrors the messiness and uncertainty of real ethical decision-making. Learning to sit with that discomfort while continuing to think clearly is a core skill this course develops.

## Timeframe  
Perfect! I've added the practical completion details that maintain the non-prescriptive approach while giving students clear information about timeframe expectations and the workflow. The addition emphasizes that completion is determined by having something workable for sustained analysis rather than meeting external criteria, which aligns with your course philosophy.  
This template now provides students with everything they need to understand and engage with the assignment while preserving their authority over quality determination and learning pace. Would you like to use this same structure to develop descriptions for Parts 2 and 3, or would you prefer to refine this template further first?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, it is important to remember that this is a pilot course, so there is no previous experience to base these recommendations on; they're just guestimates.  
Edit  
Excellent point! Let me update that to reflect the pilot nature:  
Part 1: Ethical Dilemma Identification - Assignment Description  
Document ∙ Version 3  
\*\*Expected Time Investment\*\*: Since this is a pilot course, these are estimates based on the design rather than previous student experience. We anticipate most students will spend 2-3 weeks on dilemma identification, with individual sessions ranging  
That's much better - it acknowledges the experimental nature of the course and frames the time estimates as educated guesses rather than proven benchmarks. It also positions students as contributors to the course's development, which aligns with the collaborative learning philosophy.  
Should we proceed with creating similar assignment descriptions for Parts 2 and 3 using this same approach and pilot course framing?  
Retry  
**C**  
Instead of saying we, even though you are a valid partner in this, please update to I since I am the instructor of record.  
Edit  
Part 1: Ethical Dilemma Identification - Assignment Description  
Document ∙ Version 4  
\*\*Expected Time Investment\*\*: Since this is a pilot course, these are estimates based on the design rather than previous student experience. I anticipate most students will spend 2-3 weeks on dilemma identification, with individual sessions ranging f  
Perfect - now it properly reflects your role as the instructor of record. Should we move forward with creating assignment descriptions for Parts 2 and 3 using this same structure and voice?  
Retry  
**C**  
Also, an important part of this assignment is that they should be encouraged (if not required) to use the AI prompt for Part 1 as part of the assignment description.  
Edit  
Part 1: Ethical Dilemma Identification - Assignment Description  
Document ∙ Version 5  
## What This Phase Involves  
You'll work with AI as an interviewing partner to:  
- \*\*Excavate situations\*\* from your current life that create ethical tension  
- \*\*Test potential dilemmas\*\* against criteria for genuine complexity and staying power  
- \*\*  
Perfect! I've added explicit guidance about using the AI prompt as an essential part of the assignment. This emphasizes that the prompt isn't just suggested—it's designed to structure the AI conversation in a way that supports the specific type of discovery work this assignment requires.  
Now the assignment description includes all the key components: the intellectual challenge, student agency, the stakes, what the process involves (including use of the AI prompt), documentation expectations, timeframe, and completion logistics. Should we proceed with creating similar descriptions for Parts 2 and 3?  
Retry  
**C**  
Could you include an explicit reference to where the Part 1 prompt is found within the course content?  
Edit  
Part 1: Ethical Dilemma Identification - Assignment Description  
Document ∙ Version 6  
\*\*Using the AI Prompt\*\*: You'll find a specific AI prompt in the detailed Part 1 instructions in the full course materials designed to guide this dilemma identification process. This prompt helps the AI function as an effective interviewing partner r  
Good - now students know exactly where to find the specific AI prompt they need to use. This makes the assignment description complete and actionable while maintaining the non-prescriptive philosophical approach.  
Ready to move on to creating assignment descriptions for Parts 2 and 3 using this same structure?  
Retry  
**C**  
Could you also draft a separate (very brief) introduction to the idea that these assignments are cumulative; each one builds on the Parts before it, which is why I call them Parts?  
Edit  
Understanding the Course Parts  
Document  
# Understanding the Course Parts

These aren't separate assignments—they're Parts of a single, integrated project that develops throughout the semester. Each Part builds directly on what you discovered in previous Parts, creating a cumulative underst  
This brief introduction clarifies the cumulative nature and sequential dependency of the Parts without being overly prescriptive. It helps students understand why the structure matters for their learning while maintaining the focus on their own discovery process.  
Would you like me to proceed with creating assignment descriptions for Parts 2 and 3 using the same template structure as Part 1?  
Retry  
**C**  
Please create a similar artifact for Part 2  
Edit  
Part 2: Heuristics Discovery - Assignment Description  
Document  
# Part 2: Discovering Your Ethical Heuristics

## The Challenge  
Now that you've identified your ethical dilemma, you need to uncover the decision-making patterns that actually guide your behavior in the different roles involved in that dilemma. This  
I've created the Part 2 assignment description following the same structure and philosophical approach as Part 1. It maintains the focus on genuine self-discovery rather than prescriptive criteria, emphasizes the archaeological nature of the work, and includes all the practical details about timeframe, deliverables, and workflow.  
The description builds naturally on Part 1 while introducing the new challenge of honest self-examination about actual (versus aspirational) decision-making patterns. Would you like me to create Part 3 next, or would you prefer to review and refine this one first?  
Retry  
**C**  
Please create Part 3  
Edit  
Part 3: Conflict Mapping - Assignment Description  
Document  
# Part 3: Creating Your Conflict Map

## The Challenge  
You've identified your ethical dilemma and discovered the decision-making patterns (heuristics) that guide your behavior in different roles. Now you need to map where these patterns clash with ea  
I've created the Part 3 assignment description following the same structure and philosophy as Parts 1 and 2. It builds naturally on the heuristics discovered in Part 2 while introducing the new challenge of mapping conflicts and choosing representation formats. The description maintains the emphasis on student agency in creative expression while providing clear practical guidance about deliverables and timeline.  
This completes the sequence showing how each Part builds cumulatively toward the philosophical exploration in Parts 4-5. Would you like me to review or adjust anything in these three assignment descriptions, or do they capture the approach you're looking for?  
Retry  
**C**  
Part 4, please  
Edit  
Part 4: Philosophical Excavation - Assignment Description  
Document  
# Part 4: Philosophical Excavation of Ethical Frameworks

## The Challenge  
You've mapped your ethical tensions and designed your personalized learning sequence. Now begins the archaeological work of examining how formal ethical frameworks illuminate,  
I've created the Part 4 assignment description following the same structure and philosophy as the previous Parts. This one captures the shift from personal excavation to philosophical exploration while maintaining the archaeological metaphor and emphasis on personal discovery rather than academic mastery.  
The description emphasizes how this Part builds on all the previous work while introducing the complexity of engaging with formal philosophical frameworks through the lens of personal ethical reasoning. Should I proceed with Part 5, or would you like to review and refine this approach first?  
Retry  
**C**  
Could you add clarification about the idea that 6 frameworks are expected, but there are additional frameworks that students can examine, but aren't officially required to, but that doing so can enhance or improve the quality of their self-assessment arguments for a higher grade?  
Edit  
Part 4: Philosophical Excavation - Assignment Description  
Document ∙ Version 2  
## What This Phase Involves  
For each framework in your learning sequence, you'll:  
- \*\*Read the assigned chapter\*\* with attention to your personal reactions rather than just content comprehension  
- \*\*Conduct archaeological analysis\*\* with AI to discov  
Perfect! I've added clarification about the framework expectations that maintains the student agency approach—it's their choice to explore beyond the minimum, but doing so can strengthen their learning and final self-assessment case. This aligns with the course philosophy of student-driven learning while providing clear guidance about baseline expectations.  
Should I proceed with creating the Part 5 assignment description now?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, please.  
Edit  
Part 5: Self-Directed Philosophical Investigation - Assignment Description  
Document  
# Part 5: Self-Directed Philosophical Investigation

## The Challenge  
You've completed your archaeological exploration of formal ethical frameworks and discovered how philosophical traditions illuminate your personal ethical reasoning. Now comes the  
Retry  
**C**  
This stage does not involve direct collaboration with the instructor - instead, this is work done with the AI...  
Edit  
Part 5: Self-Directed Philosophical Investigation - Assignment Description  
Document ∙ Version 2  
## What This Phase Involves  
Your investigation will proceed through these stages:  
- \*\*Reflective gap analysis\*\*: Review your completed archaeological work to identify what's missing, avoided, or unexplained in your philosophical landscape  
- \*\*Investi  
Part 5: Self-Directed Philosophical Investigation - Assignment Description  
Document ∙ Version 3  
## Your Learning Authority  
You determine what constitutes meaningful investigation for your philosophical development. AI can help you refine your approach and explore your ideas, but you're the expert on what gaps in your understanding deserve atten  
Good catch! I've updated Part 5 to clarify that this stage involves working with AI as the thinking partner rather than direct instructor collaboration, maintaining consistency with the course's AI-partnership approach throughout all Parts. Should I finish completing the timeframe and deliverables section for Part 5?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, please  
Edit  
Part 5: Self-Directed Philosophical Investigation - Assignment Description  
Document ∙ Version 4  
\*\*What You'll End Up With\*\*:  
- \*\*Investigation proposal and methodology\*\*: Clear articulation of your chosen focus, approach, and anticipated learning  
- \*\*Documentation of investigation process\*\*: Evidence of your engagement with your chosen methodo  
Perfect! I've completed the Part 5 assignment description with the timeframe and completion details that maintain consistency with the other Parts. The description emphasizes the self-directed nature of this final investigation while maintaining the AI partnership approach and connecting it clearly to the final self-assessment process.  
Now you have complete assignment descriptions for all five Parts that follow your course philosophy of student agency, authentic engagement, and cumulative learning while providing clear practical guidance about expectations, timeframes, and workflow. Would you like me to make any adjustments to any of these descriptions, or do they capture the approach you're looking for?  
Retry  
**C**  
Review the proposed timeframes for all parts; how much time is anticipated to be required to complete?  
Edit  
Looking at all five Parts, here's the total time breakdown:  
Current Time Estimates:

* Part 1: 2-3 weeks (30-60 minute sessions)
* Part 2: 1-2 weeks (45-75 minute focused conversation)
* Part 3: 1-2 weeks (30-45 minute mapping + creation time varying by format)
* Part 4: 4-6 weeks (3-5 hours per framework × 6+ frameworks = 18-30+ hours)
* Part 5: 3-4 weeks (varies significantly by investigation approach)

Total Range: 11-17 weeks  
This seems problematic for a standard semester (typically 15-16 weeks including finals). The current estimates suggest students could need the entire semester just for the Parts, leaving no time for:

* Weekly podcast participation
* Reading and reflection time beyond the archaeological work
* Any buffer for students who need more time
* Final self-assessment preparation

Potential Issues:

1. Part 4 seems particularly heavy - 18-30+ hours for framework exploration could be overwhelming
2. The upper range (17 weeks) exceeds typical semester length
3. No cushion for struggling students or those who want to go deeper

Would you like me to suggest revised timeframes that might be more realistic for a semester structure, or do you prefer to see how the pilot course plays out with these estimates and adjust based on actual student experience?  
Retry  
**C**  
No. Part of the course philosophy is that students need to regulate their own time management and, as a corollary, take active accountability for what they do and don't complete. Not finishing a task is not explicitly grounds for failure; it will require them to make an argument about what they learned from failure, how it fits into what they tried to accomplish within the context of the course and the degree to which they take accountability for those decisions.  
Edit  
Ah, that's a crucial philosophical distinction I was missing! The timeframes aren't meant to be constraints that must fit within semester boundaries - they're honest estimates that put the responsibility squarely on students to make strategic decisions about their learning.  
This approach actually reinforces several key course principles:  
Student Agency Over Time Management: Students must decide how to allocate their time across Parts, which frameworks deserve deeper attention, when "good enough" serves their learning goals, and how to balance this course against other commitments.  
Authentic Learning Outcomes: If a student chooses to go deep on 4 frameworks rather than rushing through 6, that becomes part of their learning story and self-assessment argument. If someone doesn't complete Part 5 but has profound insights from Parts 1-4, they need to make a compelling case for that learning.  
Real-World Preparation: Learning to manage competing demands, make strategic trade-offs, and take accountability for incomplete work mirrors actual professional and personal ethical decision-making.  
Failure as Learning Data: An incomplete Part isn't automatically a course failure - it's material for reflection about decision-making, priorities, and learning process that could actually strengthen a self-assessment argument if handled thoughtfully.  
The timeframes serve as honest planning information rather than success criteria, which perfectly aligns with the course's emphasis on authentic engagement over performance metrics. Thank you for that clarification - it's a sophisticated pedagogical approach that treats students as genuine agents in their own learning.  
Retry  
**C**  
Also, it is expected that students are able to do things concurrently; podcasts are not necessarily an excuse or leave to not work on other elements of the course. Also, the class is fully online and asynchronous, which assumes students should be devoting a minimum of 3-4 hours per week to course activities, though individual focus may vary.  
Edit  
Absolutely - that provides much better context for interpreting the timeframes. With students expected to dedicate 3-4+ hours weekly to course activities and work concurrently across different elements, the estimates make much more sense:  
Concurrent Work Expectations:

* Students can be working on Part 2 heuristics discovery while listening to podcasts from peers exploring frameworks
* Part 4 framework exploration can happen alongside podcast participation, with each informing the other
* The asynchronous format allows students to distribute their 3-4 weekly hours across whatever combination of Parts, reading, AI conversations, and podcast engagement serves their learning

Strategic Time Allocation:

* A student might spend 2 hours one week on Part 3 conflict mapping and 1 hour listening to podcasts
* Another week they might focus 3 hours on framework exploration and skip podcast listening
* The timeframe estimates help students plan their semester arc while maintaining weekly engagement

Learning Integration:

* Hearing peers discuss frameworks in podcasts can inform students' own Part 4 explorations
* Working on multiple Parts simultaneously allows insights from one area to illuminate another
* The concurrent approach mirrors real-world ethical reasoning, where multiple considerations happen simultaneously rather than sequentially

This concurrent model also explains why the total timeframe estimates can exceed semester length - students aren't expected to complete Parts linearly before moving to the next, but to manage their learning strategically across all course elements based on their priorities and available time.  
Retry  
**C**  
Could you also create an entry for the Final Self-Assessment, using the same parameters of explanation, etc.  
Edit  
Final Self-Assessment - Assignment Description  
Document  
Final Self-Assessment - Assignment Description  
Document ∙ Version 2  
# Final Self-Assessment

## The Challenge  
You've completed your semester-long exploration of your own ethical reasoning process. Now comes the culminating intellectual work: making a compelling case for your own learning based on evidence from your j  
I've created the Final Self-Assessment description following the same structure and philosophical approach as the Parts. It emphasizes student ownership of their learning evaluation while providing clear guidance about the process and expectations.  
Key elements include:

* Students proposing their own grades based on evidence
* Focus on learning dimensions relevant to their actual experience
* Emphasis on concrete evidence over quantity of examples
* Recognition that this builds lifelong self-assessment skills
* Maintains the collaborative rather than evaluative tone for the final conversation

This completes the full set of assignment descriptions that maintain your course philosophy while providing students with clear context for meaningful engagement. Does this capture the approach you're looking for?  
Retry  
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