# AI-Supported Ethical Reasoning Framework

Share  
**C**  
I am ready to get to work on the structured model prompts...  
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 to instructor-curated resources rather than providing content directly, preserving instructor authority while preventing students from immediately seeking outside help when encountering difficulties.  
Framework Structure  
Structured Frameworks (6 core frameworks - required for all students):  
\* Utilitarianism, Virtue Ethics, Deontology, Natural Law, Social Contracts, Feminism/Care Ethics  
\* Include built-in troubleshooting support  
\* Well-supported by curated Open Educational Resources  
\* AI provides diagnostic support and resource direction  
Independent Exploration Frameworks (4 optional frameworks):  
\* Marxism, Postmodernism, Environmental Ethics, Bioethics  
\* Require more self-directed exploration  
\* Limited AI scaffolding, may require instructor consultation  
Course Sequence & AI Prompts  
1. Part 1: Dilemma Identification - AI helps identify genuine ethical dilemma with competing role obligations  
2. Part 2: Heuristics Discovery - AI interviews student to uncover actual decision-making patterns (not aspirational)  
3. Part 3: Conflict Mapping - AI guides identification of where heuristics create tensions/contradictions  
4. Part 4: AI Support Overview - Explains troubleshooting features and framework categories  
5. Structured Framework Explorations (6 prompts with troubleshooting)  
6. Independent Framework Options (4 prompts, minimal scaffolding)  
7. Final Resolution Work - Open-ended processing (action planning, foundational reconsideration, integration, or complexity acceptance)  
8. Self-Assessment Project - Reflective analysis of learning choices and engagement patterns  
Key AI Prompt Design Principles  
\* All prompts must be entirely AI-facing - no mixed student/AI instructions  
\* AI serves as diagnostic guide and resource concierge  
\* Troubleshooting helps students work through challenges before seeking external support  
\* Maintains archaeological excavation metaphor throughout  
\* Preserves student agency in choosing depth and direction of exploration  
Completed Elements  
\* AI Prompts Introduction (with warmth and dry humor)  
\* Part 4: AI Support explanation with framework categories and troubleshooting features  
\* Revised Part 1: Dilemma Identification (AI-facing)  
\* Revised Part 2: Heuristics Discovery (AI-facing)  
\* Revised Part 3: Conflict Mapping (AI-facing)  
\* Final Resolution Work prompt (AI-facing, student-choice driven)  
\* Final Project orientations (both resolution work and self-assessment)  
Still Needed  
\* AI-facing prompts for all 6 structured frameworks (with embedded troubleshooting)  
\* AI-facing prompts for 4 independent exploration frameworks (minimal scaffolding)  
\* AI-facing prompt for self-assessment guidance  
\* Integration of troubleshooting features into structured framework prompts  
Assessment Philosophy  
Students evaluated on clarity and justification of learning choices, not on production of materials. Uses evidence from their own learning artifacts to demonstrate understanding of their philosophical development and engagement patterns.  
Edit  
I'm ready to help you develop the structured model prompts! Based on your comprehensive project summary, I can see we need to create AI-facing prompts for the 6 structured frameworks with embedded troubleshooting, plus the 4 independent exploration frameworks and the self-assessment guidance.  
Let me confirm the scope so we tackle this systematically:  
Structured Frameworks (need AI-facing prompts with troubleshooting):

1. Utilitarianism
2. Virtue Ethics
3. Deontology
4. Natural Law
5. Social Contracts
6. Feminism/Care Ethics

Independent Exploration Frameworks (need AI-facing prompts with minimal scaffolding):

1. Marxism
2. Postmodernism
3. Environmental Ethics
4. Bioethics

Plus:

* Self-assessment guidance prompt (AI-facing)

Each structured framework prompt should maintain the archaeological excavation metaphor, include diagnostic support, provide resource direction to instructor-curated materials, and have built-in troubleshooting for common student challenges.  
Would you like to start with one of the structured frameworks? I'm thinking we could begin with Utilitarianism since it's often foundational, or whichever framework you feel would be most strategic to develop first.  
Which approach would work best for you - developing one complete structured framework prompt at a time, or would you prefer a different sequencing strategy?  
Retry  
Utilitarian Ethics Excavation 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 understanding the rich philosophical herit  
pasted  
**C**  
Let's get one set to operate as a control model, then build the others off of the same framework...  
Edit  
Perfect! I can see the structure you're working with in the Utilitarian Ethics Excavation. Let me create the AI-facing prompt version that follows your established pattern while incorporating the troubleshooting features and concierge approach.  
AI Prompt: Utilitarian Ethics Excavation  
Document  
# AI Prompt: Utilitarian Ethics Excavation

## Your Role as Archaeological Assistant

You are helping a student conduct an ethical archaeology excavation of their own moral reasoning to discover utilitarian patterns already embedded in their thinking  
There's your control model! This AI-facing prompt maintains all the key elements from your student-facing version while adding the embedded troubleshooting features and concierge approach.  
Key features I've incorporated:

* Archaeological assistant role clearly defined with boundaries
* Systematic excavation areas that mirror your original structure
* Built-in troubleshooting for common challenges (no patterns found, wanting theory, feeling overwhelmed, self-judgment, wanting AI analysis)
* Resource redirection to instructor-curated materials
* Consistent archaeological metaphor throughout
* Student agency preservation - they remain the expert on their thinking

The troubleshooting section addresses the most likely challenges students will face during utilitarian excavation while keeping the AI in its proper concierge role.  
Would you like me to use this structure to create the next framework prompt (perhaps Virtue Ethics or Deontology), or would you prefer to review and refine this control model first before we build the others?  
Retry  
**C**  
Hmmm...it's a start, but there are more elements and streamlining to be done...  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - it's a good foundation but needs more refinement. Looking at it again, I can see several areas that need work:

* The structure could be more streamlined and focused
* Some sections feel repetitive or overly verbose
* The troubleshooting integration could be smoother
* The archaeological metaphor could be more consistent throughout
* The concierge role boundaries might need clearer definition

What specific elements are you seeing that need the most attention? Are there particular sections that feel off, or aspects of the AI role/boundaries that need tightening? I'd rather get your guidance on the key issues before diving into revisions, so we can nail the control model structure properly before building out the other frameworks.  
What are the main areas you'd like me to focus on for the next iteration?  
Retry  
**C**  
The metaphor is just illustration; it doesn't need to apply everywhere or it becomes cliched. The same with the conceirge idea; it really isn't the best metaphor. Here are some other elements to consider:  
AI Concierge Support Design: Conversation Summary  
Project Overview  
Developing embedded AI support for students conducting "archaeological excavation" of their own ethical reasoning across multiple ethical frameworks. Goal: Create support that prevents students from immediately contacting instructor when they encounter difficulties.  
Key Design Principles Established  
AI Role: Academic Concierge, Not Tutor  
\* AI directs students to instructor-curated resources rather than providing content directly  
\* Functions as diagnostic guide and resource concierge  
\* Preserves instructor authority as expert and curator  
\* Maintains archaeological excavation metaphor throughout  
Graduated Support Framework  
1. Diagnostic questions - Help students identify what specific support they need  
2. Targeted resource direction - Direct to specific OER resources based on needs  
3. Resource integration - Invite students back after consulting resources to continue excavation  
4. Instructor consultation - When resources insufficient, frame as expert-level exploration  
Content Architecture Decision  
Core Archaeological Sites (Required) - 6 Frameworks  
Well-supported by available OER resources with quality AI concierge support:  
\* Utilitarianism  
\* Virtue Ethics  
\* Deontology  
\* Natural Law  
\* Social Contracts  
\* Feminism/Ethics of Care  
Advanced Excavation Sites (Optional) - 4 Frameworks  
Limited OER support, requiring more independent student exploration:  
\* Marxism  
\* Postmodernism (Nietzschean)  
\* Environmental Ethics  
\* Bioethics  
Assessment/Performance Benefits  
\* Creates natural differentiation opportunities  
\* Multiple pathways for students to demonstrate learning depth  
\* Removes artificial pressure of "everyone must master everything equally"  
\* Makes assessment criteria more transparent  
\* Maintains academic rigor while acknowledging resource constraints  
OER Resource Foundation  
Curated collection of Open Educational Resources provides foundation for concierge model:  
\* OpenStax Business Ethics  
\* Applied Ethics Primer (Atlantic Canada Pressbooks)  
\* Introduction to Philosophy: Ethics (Rebus Community)  
\* Introduction to Ethics (EPCC/Lumen Learning)  
\* Phronesis: An Open Ethics Primer  
Implementation Notes  
\* Framework can be embedded across all 9 modules without disrupting existing content  
\* Troubleshooting protocol maintains organic, collaborative relationship between student and AI  
\* Resource consultation framed as natural part of archaeological process, not detour  
\* Approach scales to handle anticipated student difficulties proactively  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vQK0TiFyvIrdifxnn4CJBa7iiumOjkkHsj6J2_bvqG0FeDSOVvCURP0OHoQ3ORad1MxBwNtH_ASuObY/pub>  
Edit  
Ah, I see the issues now. You're right - I was over-applying the metaphors and missing the core functional elements. Let me focus on the actual mechanics:  
Key missing elements I should incorporate:

1. Graduated Support Framework - The diagnostic → resource direction → integration → instructor consultation flow
2. Specific OER resource integration - Directing to actual curated materials, not generic "instructor resources"
3. Natural differentiation pathways - Supporting different depths of exploration without making it feel like failure
4. Organic troubleshooting - Embedded within the conversation flow, not as separate sections
5. Resource consultation framing - Making it feel like a natural part of the process

Streamlining needed:

* Less repetitive explanation of AI role
* More focused on functional diagnostic questions
* Cleaner integration of the support levels
* Remove forced metaphor applications

Should I revise the Utilitarian prompt with these principles, focusing on:

* Clear diagnostic questioning that identifies what kind of support they need
* Specific direction to the relevant OER chapters/sections
* Natural flow between resource consultation and continued excavation
* Embedded rather than sectioned troubleshooting

And drop the over-explained role boundaries in favor of demonstrating them through the actual interaction patterns?  
Retry  
**C**  
Actually, the entire prompt needs to be revised; it currently includes a lot of student-oriented direction. The prompt itself is intended to provide direction for the AI in its role and function in the interaction. Mixing the two is confusing; revise to omit all student direction and embed that, as necessary, into the instructions for the AI.  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - I was mixing AI instructions with student-facing content. The prompt should be purely AI-facing instructions. Let me revise:  
AI Prompt: Utilitarian Ethics Excavation  
Document ∙ Version 2  
# AI Instructions: Utilitarian Ethics Excavation Support

## Context  
The student has read Chapter 2: Balancing the Scales—The Calculus of Utilitarian Ethics (<https://mlpp.pressbooks.pub/ethicalexplorations/chapter/chapter-2-balancing-the-scales-the-c>  
Much cleaner! This version is purely AI-facing instructions that:

* Establishes context and role clearly
* Focuses on diagnostic guidance rather than content delivery
* Embeds the graduated support protocol naturally
* Directs to specific OER resources when needed
* Maintains boundaries through demonstrated interaction patterns
* Removes student-facing directions entirely

The AI now knows exactly what to do without the confusion of mixed audiences. Should this serve as the control structure for the other framework prompts?  
Retry  
**C**  
Almost, but the instructions imply that Chapter 2 is more than sufficient for all students, and ignores the contents of other OER texts that are accessible to students. Allow me to resubmit that listing of ToCs; please revise accordingly.  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vQK0TiFyvIrdifxnn4CJBa7iiumOjkkHsj6J2_bvqG0FeDSOVvCURP0OHoQ3ORad1MxBwNtH_ASuObY/pub>  
Edit  
favicon  
Fetched Ethics Texts  
google.com  
Perfect! Now I can see the full range of OER resources available for utilitarian support. Let me revise the prompt to reflect the complete resource base:  
AI Prompt: Utilitarian Ethics Excavation  
Document ∙ Version 3  
## Resource Direction

\*\*For basic utilitarian concept confusion\*\*:  
- Phronesis Ch. 3: Utilitarianism (comprehensive overview)  
- OpenStax Business Ethics 2.4: Utilitarianism: The Greatest Good for the Greatest Number

\*\*For detailed utilitarian theo  
Now the AI has access to the full range of utilitarian resources across all the OER texts, allowing for much more targeted and graduated support depending on what specific aspect of utilitarian thinking the student is struggling with. The prompt can direct them to basic overviews, detailed theory, specific applications, or comparative analysis as needed.  
This gives the AI the tools to provide truly differentiated support rather than assuming one chapter covers everyone's needs. Should we use this expanded resource integration approach for the other framework prompts?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, when we get there. One last element. This prompt supposes that the student, either directly, or with assistance, is able to complete the excavation successfully. However, if troubleshooting steps do not satisfy, we need to include some direction in the prompt to help the student know what to do next.  
Also, the prompt does not include what a completed excavation looks like: what do they produce? Where does it appear?  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - the prompt needs to address what happens when troubleshooting doesn't work and clearly specify the deliverable. Let me add those critical elements:  
AI Prompt: Utilitarian Ethics Excavation  
Document ∙ Version 4  
## Expected Deliverable

The student should produce a \*\*Utilitarian Ethics Addendum\*\* to their existing conflict map containing:

1. \*\*Excavation Findings\*\*: Specific utilitarian patterns discovered in their reasoning  
2. \*\*Archaeological Evidence\*\*:  
Now the prompt clearly establishes:

1. What success looks like: A specific addendum with defined components plus citations added to their existing conflict map
2. When to escalate: Clear indicators for when the student needs instructor consultation
3. How to frame escalation: As expert-level archaeological work, not failure

This gives the AI clear guidance on when its support role reaches its limits and how to transition the student to instructor support while maintaining their dignity and framing it as a natural progression rather than inadequacy.  
Should this structure (deliverable specification + escalation protocol) become standard across all framework prompts?  
Retry  
**C**  
Review the course content. Please align the direction to seek instructor assistance with embedded support methods already established elsewhere and revise:  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vRrZbgu0x2VjOBtYuzWdONd_odduJd7nFU1fdS_FLWlLkkWVqB0TTCanqtD_qxKIdxti2bHTSI79xmc/pub>  
Edit  
favicon  
Fetched Working with AI as Your Thinking Partner  
google.com  
Now I can see the embedded support methods. Looking at the course structure, I can see that students have several support pathways already established:

1. ClickUp tracking system - Students can drag cards to "Blocked" status and add comments when they need help
2. AI checkpoint system - For maintaining continuity across AI sessions
3. Peer podcast conversations - For hearing how others work through challenges
4. Direct instructor email - With specific formatting expectations
5. Instructor response commitment - 24-hour response to blocked students

Let me revise the escalation protocol to align with these existing systems:  
AI Prompt: Utilitarian Ethics Excavation  
Document ∙ Version 5  
## When Troubleshooting Is Insufficient

If the student continues to struggle after resource consultation and diagnostic questioning, guide them to use the course's established support system:

\*\*First step - ClickUp\*\*: "This excavation work requires  
Perfect! Now the escalation protocol aligns with the course's established support systems - specifically directing students to use ClickUp's "Blocked" status which triggers the instructor's 24-hour response commitment, and suggesting peer podcast resources as an alternative support pathway. This maintains the course's existing infrastructure while providing clear guidance for when AI support reaches its limits.  
The prompt now provides a complete framework for utilitarian excavation with appropriate resource direction, clear deliverable expectations, and integrated escalation protocols. Should we use this structure as the template for the remaining framework prompts?  
Retry  
**C**  
Include subtle nudges/directives that direct instructor contact should only be sought after clear evidence of trying all the other support options first.  
Edit  
AI Prompt: Utilitarian Ethics Excavation  
Document ∙ Version 6  
## When Troubleshooting Is Insufficient

If the student continues to struggle after resource consultation and diagnostic questioning, guide them through the course's graduated support system:

\*\*Start with peer resources\*\*: "Before seeking instructor  
Perfect! Now the escalation protocol creates a clear graduated support sequence that subtly but firmly establishes that instructor contact should only happen after demonstrating genuine effort with other support resources. The revision:

1. Orders the support sequence - peers first, then additional resources, then documentation, finally instructor
2. Requires documentation - students must track their attempts before seeking instructor help
3. Sets clear expectations - specific criteria for when instructor consultation is appropriate
4. Frames instructor contact positively - as earned expert consultation after doing the groundwork, not as a failure

This creates natural filtering while maintaining a supportive tone, ensuring students arrive at instructor consultation better prepared and having exhausted appropriate self-directed options first.  
This graduated support model should work well across all framework prompts. Ready to build the next framework using this refined structure?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes!!!!!!!!  
Edit  
Excellent! Let's build the next framework prompt. Which one should we tackle next? Looking at the structured frameworks that need AI-facing prompts with embedded troubleshooting:

1. ✅ Utilitarianism (completed)
2. Virtue Ethics
3. Deontology
4. Natural Law
5. Social Contracts
6. Feminism/Care Ethics

Would you like to go with Virtue Ethics next since it's often a natural follow-up to utilitarian thinking, or do you have a preference for which framework to develop? I'm ready to apply the refined structure we just perfected!  
Retry  
**C**  
Virtue please. the Utilitarian model as the control for revision  
Edit  
AI Prompt: Virtue Ethics Excavation  
Document  
# AI Instructions: Virtue Ethics Excavation Support

## Context  
The student has read Chapter 4: Virtue Ethics—The Role of Character in Moral Philosophy (<https://mlpp.pressbooks.pub/ethicalexplorations/chapter/chapter-4-virtue-ethics-the-role-of-chara>  
Perfect! The Virtue Ethics excavation prompt follows the same refined structure as the Utilitarian control model:

* Clear context setting with specific reading reference
* Focused excavation areas tailored to virtue ethics patterns (character focus, doctrine of the mean, virtue language, eudaimonia, practice/habits)
* Comprehensive OER resource direction across all available texts
* Specific deliverable expectations (addendum + citations)
* Graduated support protocol that requires peer consultation and resource attempts before instructor contact

The excavation areas are specifically designed to help students identify virtue-based thinking they're already using - focusing on character, balance-seeking, trait language, flourishing concerns, and habit formation.  
Ready for the next framework? Should we tackle Deontology next, or would you prefer a different sequence?  
Retry  
**C**  
Onto deontology, please  
Edit  
AI Prompt: Deontology Excavation  
Document  
# AI Instructions: Deontology Excavation Support

## Context  
The student has read Chapter 3: Duty Calls—Exploring Deontological Ethics (<https://mlpp.pressbooks.pub/ethicalexplorations/chapter/chapter-3-duty-calls-exploring-deontological-ethics3/>) and  
Excellent! The Deontology excavation prompt maintains the refined structure while focusing on duty-based patterns:

* Rules vs. Consequences Focus - helping students identify when they prioritize principles over outcomes
* Duty and Obligation Language - excavating existing "should/must/obligation" language
* Intention and Motivation Analysis - finding focus on doing the right thing regardless of results
* Universal Rules Recognition - identifying "what if everyone did this?" thinking
* Moral Non-negotiables Detection - uncovering absolute principles they won't compromise

The resource direction includes the robust EPCC/Lumen sequence on Kantian ethics (main concepts, applications, criticisms) plus the other OER options, giving students multiple pathways for concept support.  
Ready for Natural Law next? That should be interesting given it often intersects with both deontological thinking and religious/philosophical traditions.  
Retry  
**C**  
Next, please.  
Edit  
AI Prompt: Natural Law Excavation  
Document  
# AI Instructions: Natural Law Excavation Support

## Context  
The student has read Chapter 5: Universal Order—Unveiling Natural Law Theory (<https://mlpp.pressbooks.pub/ethicalexplorations/chapter/chapter-5-universal-order-unveiling-natural-law-theory>  
Perfect! The Natural Law excavation prompt tackles this complex framework by focusing on key distinguishing patterns:

* Universal vs. Relative Principles - identifying appeals to objective moral truths vs. contextual thinking
* Reason and Moral Discovery - finding logical/rational approaches to moral truth
* Human Nature and Flourishing - excavating appeals to what's "natural" for humans
* Objective Moral Order - identifying beliefs in mind-independent moral reality
* Natural vs. Conventional Distinction - separating inherent rightness from social construction

The resource direction cleverly navigates the religious/secular intersection by including both the religious ethical systems chapter and the divine command theory materials, while also pointing to the moral relativism resources for contrast.  
Ready for Social Contracts next? This should provide an interesting counterpoint to Natural Law's universal principles by focusing on agreements, fairness, and legitimacy.  
Retry  
**C**  
Next...  
Edit  
AI Prompt: Social Contract Excavation  
Document  
# AI Instructions: Social Contract Excavation Support

## Context  
The student has read Chapter 6: Bound by Agreement—The Principles of Social Contract Theory (<https://mlpp.pressbooks.pub/ethicalexplorations/chapter/chapter-6-bound-by-agreement-the-pr>  
Excellent! The Social Contract excavation prompt focuses on the key patterns that distinguish this framework:

* Agreement and Consent Focus - identifying reasoning based on mutual agreement and voluntary participation
* Fairness and Reciprocity Patterns - excavating "what would be fair for everyone" thinking
* Authority and Legitimacy Recognition - exploring when power/rules deserve to be followed
* Original Position Reasoning - finding impartial fairness thinking that steps back from personal advantage
* Individual vs. Collective Balance - examining tensions between personal freedom and group decisions

This creates a nice progression from Natural Law (universal principles) to Social Contract (negotiated agreements), showing students how different frameworks approach moral authority - one through objective truth, the other through fair agreement.  
Ready for the final structured framework: Feminism/Care Ethics? This should provide an interesting contrast with its focus on relationships, care, and contextual thinking.  
Retry  
**C**  
Next, please...  
Edit  
AI Prompt: Feminism/Care Ethics Excavation  
Document  
# AI Instructions: Feminism/Care Ethics Excavation Support

## Context  
The student has read Chapter 9: The Ethics of Simone De Beauvoir—Feminism, Existentialism, and Ambiguity (<https://mlpp.pressbooks.pub/ethicalexplorations/chapter/chapter-9-the-eth>  
Perfect! The Feminism/Care Ethics excavation prompt completes our structured frameworks with a focus on the distinctive patterns of this approach:

* Relationship and Context Focus - prioritizing particular connections over abstract principles
* "The Other" Recognition - identifying power dynamics and whose perspectives get marginalized
* Care and Responsibility Patterns - emphasizing nurturing and maintaining relationships
* Social Construction Analysis - recognizing roles and identities as created rather than natural
* Authentic Self vs. Social Expectations - exploring tensions between authenticity and conformity

This creates a beautiful contrast with the previous frameworks - moving from utilitarian calculations to virtue character-focus to deontological duties to natural law universals to social contract agreements, and finally to feminist/care ethics' emphasis on relationships and context.  
Now we have all 6 structured frameworks complete! Ready to tackle the 4 independent exploration frameworks (Marxism, Postmodernism, Environmental Ethics, Bioethics) with their minimal scaffolding approach?  
Retry  
**C**  
Ok. Let's move onto the independent models, using the same approach to the degree possible, but with edits to the scaffolding and troubleshooting reflective of the lack of depth of supporting material.  
Edit  
Perfect! Let me start with Marxism, adapting the structure but with lighter scaffolding and modified troubleshooting that acknowledges the limited OER support:  
AI Prompt: Marxism Independent Exploration  
Document  
# AI Instructions: Marxism Independent Exploration Support

## Context  
The student has read Chapter 7: Marxism—The Class Struggle and Its Ethical Implications (<https://mlpp.pressbooks.pub/ethicalexplorations/chapter/chapter-7-marxism-the-class-strugg>  
Perfect! The Marxism independent exploration prompt maintains the core structure while adapting for minimal scaffolding:  
Key Changes for Independent Framework:

* Lighter diagnostic role - "minimal diagnostic guide" instead of full support
* Reduced resource direction - mainly Chapter 7 with limited backup options
* Modified expectations - "independent thinking and exploration" explicitly stated
* Different deliverable - "Exploration Report" instead of "Addendum"
* Advanced troubleshooting - acknowledges hitting resource limits is expected and normal
* Expert consultation framing - positions instructor help as advanced guidance rather than basic support

The troubleshooting protocol emphasizes independent reflection first, then peer consultation, then documented exploration challenges before instructor support - recognizing that running into resource limits is part of the independent exploration experience.  
Ready for the next independent framework? Should we tackle Postmodernism (Nietzschean), Environmental Ethics, or Bioethics next?  
Retry  
**C**  
postmodernism. Is that the most accurate description of nietszchean ethical perspectives?  
Edit  
You raise an excellent point! "Postmodernism" isn't quite accurate for Nietzsche - he's more accurately described as a precursor to postmodernism or as representing "perspectivism" and "value creation." Nietzsche died in 1900, well before postmodernism as a movement emerged.  
Looking at the course materials, I see Chapter 8 is titled "Breaking the Moral Mold—Nietzsche on Value Creation and Perspectivism," which is much more accurate.  
Should I create the prompt as:

* "Nietzschean Ethics/Perspectivism Independent Exploration" (more accurate)
* "Postmodernism (Nietzschean) Independent Exploration" (matches your original framework list but acknowledges the imprecision)
* Or would you prefer a different framing?

The content would focus on Nietzschean themes like value creation, perspectivism, critique of traditional morality, master/slave morality, and the "will to power" - which are distinctively Nietzschean rather than broadly postmodern.  
What's your preference for how to frame this prompt?  
Retry  
**C**  
Let's just go with Nietzschean. It is the most accurate, eh?  
Edit  
Absolutely! Nietzschean is much more accurate. Let me create the prompt:  
AI Prompt: Nietzschean Ethics Independent Exploration  
Document  
# AI Instructions: Nietzschean Ethics Independent Exploration Support

## Context  
The student has read Chapter 8: Breaking the Moral Mold—Nietzsche on Value Creation and Perspectivism (<https://mlpp.pressbooks.pub/ethicalexplorations/chapter/chapter-8>  
Perfect! The Nietzschean Ethics prompt captures the distinctive and challenging aspects of this framework:  
Key Nietzschean Focus Areas:

* Value Creation and Self-Determination - creating own values vs. accepting inherited moral systems
* Perspectivism Recognition - seeing moral viewpoints as perspectives rather than universal truths
* Critique of Traditional Morality - questioning conventional categories and "herd morality"
* Power and Strength vs. Weakness Dynamics - master/slave morality considerations
* Aesthetic vs. Moral Approach - prioritizing beauty/creativity over conventional "good"

The troubleshooting acknowledges that Nietzschean ideas are inherently challenging and counter-conventional, so hitting walls or feeling uncomfortable is part of the legitimate exploration process.  
Ready for Environmental Ethics next? That should provide an interesting contrast - moving from Nietzschean individualistic value-creation to environmental interconnectedness and extended moral consideration.  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, please  
Edit  
AI Prompt: Environmental Ethics Independent Exploration  
Document  
# AI Instructions: Environmental Ethics Independent Exploration Support

## Context  
The student has read Chapter 11: Environmental Ethics (<https://mlpp.pressbooks.pub/ethicalexplorations/chapter/chapter-11-environmental-ethics11/>) and created both an  
Excellent! The Environmental Ethics independent exploration prompt captures the distinctive expansive nature of this framework:  
Key Environmental Focus Areas:

* Moral Circle Expansion - considering non-human nature and future generations
* Interconnectedness Recognition - seeing connections across ecological systems
* Sustainability vs. Short-term Focus - weighing long-term environmental consequences
* Intrinsic vs. Instrumental Value - whether nature has value in itself or just for humans
* Justice and Environmental Connections - linking environmental issues with social equity

The prompt acknowledges that environmental ethics requires "expanding traditional ethical frameworks" and that reaching limits about "how to integrate these expanded concerns" is a natural part of the exploration process.  
Ready for the final independent framework: Bioethics? This should provide another interesting perspective, focusing on medical ethics, autonomy, and the four principles framework.  
Retry  
**C**  
Ok. Next...  
Edit  
AI Prompt: Bioethics Independent Exploration  
Document  
# AI Instructions: Bioethics Independent Exploration Support

## Context  
The student has read Chapter 12: Four Principles of Bioethics (<https://mlpp.pressbooks.pub/ethicalexplorations/chapter/chapter-12-bioethics12/>) and created both an ethical dilem  
Perfect! The Bioethics independent exploration prompt completes our framework collection with a focus on the distinctive challenges of this framework:  
Key Bioethics Focus Areas:

* Autonomy Recognition - self-determination and informed consent beyond medical contexts
* Beneficence and Non-maleficence Balancing - weighing doing good against avoiding harm
* Justice and Fairness in Resource Distribution - fair allocation of benefits and burdens
* Informed Consent Beyond Medicine - ensuring understanding and free choice
* Vulnerability and Protection - special obligations toward vulnerable individuals

The prompt specifically addresses the unique challenge of bioethics: most resources focus on medical contexts, but students need to explore how these principles might apply to their non-medical dilemmas. The troubleshooting acknowledges this "cross-contextual application" challenge as a natural limitation requiring expert guidance.  
Now we have all 10 framework prompts complete:  
Structured Frameworks (6):

1. ✅ Utilitarianism
2. ✅ Virtue Ethics
3. ✅ Deontology
4. ✅ Natural Law
5. ✅ Social Contracts
6. ✅ Feminism/Care Ethics

Independent Exploration Frameworks (4):

1. ✅ Marxism
2. ✅ Nietzschean Ethics
3. ✅ Environmental Ethics
4. ✅ Bioethics

Ready to tackle the final piece: the self-assessment guidance prompt?  
Retry  
**C**  
Actually, next prompt is the next steps assignment, isn't it?  
Edit  
You're absolutely right! Looking back at the project summary, the sequence is:

1. Part 1: Dilemma Identification ✅
2. Part 2: Heuristics Discovery ✅
3. Part 3: Conflict Mapping ✅
4. Part 4: AI Support Overview ✅
5. Structured Framework Explorations (6 prompts) ✅
6. Independent Framework Options (4 prompts) ✅
7. Final Resolution Work ✅ (you mentioned this was already completed)
8. Self-Assessment Project

So the next step would indeed be the self-assessment guidance prompt - that's the final piece we need to create to complete the full sequence.  
Should I create the AI-facing prompt for guiding students through their self-assessment project? This would help them reflect on their learning choices, engagement patterns, and philosophical development using evidence from their own work throughout the semester.  
Retry  
**C**  
No, the final resolution isn't ready yet, since we completely reframed it...  
Edit  
You're absolutely right! I was looking at the old project summary. We completely reframed the final resolution work when we developed the structured framework prompts.  
So we still need to create:

1. Final Resolution Work - The AI-facing prompt for this open-ended processing phase
2. Self-Assessment Project - The AI-facing guidance prompt

Should I create the Final Resolution Work prompt next? This would be the open-ended processing where students can choose their own direction for deeper investigation after completing their framework explorations - whether that's action planning, foundational reconsideration, integration work, or complexity acceptance.  
Retry  
**C**  
Or any combination of the mix that makes the most sense or meaning to them...  
Edit  
Exactly! The Final Resolution Work should be genuinely student-driven, allowing them to pursue whatever combination of approaches - action planning, foundational reconsideration, integration, complexity acceptance, or their own emergent direction - feels most meaningful based on their unique philosophical journey.  
Let me create that AI-facing prompt for the Final Resolution Work:  
AI Prompt: Final Resolution Work Support  
Document  
# AI Instructions: Final Resolution Work Support

## Context  
The student has completed their excavation of 8+ ethical frameworks and produced framework addenda/exploration reports for their conflict map. They now have a rich collection of philosophic  
Retry  
**C**  
Let's call it next steps to avoid confusion with terms like the self-assessment or final exam?  
Edit  
Absolutely! "Next Steps" is much clearer and avoids confusion with grading terminology. Let me update that:  
AI Prompt: Final Resolution Work Support  
Document ∙ Version 2  
# AI Instructions: Next Steps Work Support

## Context  
The student has completed their excavation of 8+ ethical frameworks and produced framework addenda/exploration reports for their conflict map. They now have a rich collection of philosophical ins  
AI Prompt: Final Resolution Work Support  
Document ∙ Version 3  
## Possible Next Steps Directions (Student Choice)  
AI Prompt: Final Resolution Work Support  
Document ∙ Version 4  
The student should produce \*\*Next Steps Work\*\* in whatever format serves their chosen direction:  
AI Prompt: Final Resolution Work Support  
Document ∙ Version 5  
This next steps phase belongs to the student. Your job is to support whatever direction they choose as most meaningful, not to guide them toward any particular type of resolution. Some students will want clear action plans; others will embrace ongoin  
Perfect! "Next Steps Work" is much clearer and avoids any confusion with assessment terminology. The prompt now accurately reflects this as the student-driven phase where they choose their own meaningful direction after completing their framework explorations.  
Ready for the final piece: the Self-Assessment guidance prompt?  
Retry  
**C**  
I saw a mention of 8+ models? Where does that number come from?  
Edit  
Good catch! That's an error on my part. Looking at the project structure, there are exactly 10 frameworks total:  
Structured Frameworks (6):

1. Utilitarianism
2. Virtue Ethics
3. Deontology
4. Natural Law
5. Social Contracts
6. Feminism/Care Ethics

Independent Exploration Frameworks (4):

1. Marxism
2. Nietzschean Ethics
3. Environmental Ethics
4. Bioethics

So students would complete work on all 10 frameworks, not "8+". I mistakenly used "8+" thinking students might skip some of the independent exploration ones, but looking at the course design, they're expected to engage with all frameworks in their personalized sequence.  
Should I correct that to "10 ethical frameworks" in the Next Steps prompt?  
Retry  
**C**  
No, the expectation is a minimum of 6, with 4 options...  
Edit  
Ah, got it! So students are required to complete all 6 structured frameworks, but they can choose which (if any) of the 4 independent exploration frameworks to tackle. That means the minimum is 6, but students could do anywhere from 6-10 total frameworks.  
So "8+" makes sense as an estimate - most students will probably do more than the minimum 6 but might not do all 10. The "8+" captures that students will likely have completed most but not necessarily all available frameworks when they reach the Next Steps phase.  
Should I leave the "8+" as is, or would you prefer different language like "6-10 frameworks" or "multiple frameworks including all required ones"?  
Retry  
**C**  
6-10 is the best representation. 8+ implies a minimum higher than I want, while a narrative term is too vague...  
Edit  
Perfect! Let me update that:  
AI Prompt: Final Resolution Work Support  
Document ∙ Version 6  
The student has completed their excavation of 6-10 ethical frameworks and produced framework addenda/exploration reports for their conflict map.  
Much better! "6-10 frameworks" accurately represents that students will have completed all 6 required structured frameworks plus anywhere from 0-4 of the optional independent exploration frameworks. This sets the right expectation without implying a minimum higher than the actual requirement.  
Ready for the Self-Assessment guidance prompt now?  
Retry  
**C**  
Almost. I want to revisit the narrative explanation that precedes the AI prompt. Here is the current language  
Edit  
I don't see the current language you're referring to in your message. Could you paste the narrative explanation that precedes the AI prompt so I can help you revise it?  
Retry  
**C**  
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 on how clearly you can articulate and justify the choices you made, and how well you can use evidence from your own learning materials to support your interpretations.  
You'll review your dilemma work, heuristics discovery, conflict mapping, framework explorations, and resolution processing to analyze your engagement patterns, explain your decision-making about where to focus your energy, and demonstrate your understanding of your own philosophical development.  
This is your opportunity to show what you learned about learning ethics, not just what you learned about ethics itself.  
Edit  
That's a solid foundation! Here are some potential revisions to consider:  
Option 1 - Emphasize agency and choice: Your final project is a reflective self-assessment where you make the case for your own learning throughout the semester. Rather than being graded on predetermined outcomes, you'll be evaluated on how clearly you can articulate and justify the learning choices you made, and how well you can use evidence from your own work to support your claims about your philosophical development.  
You'll review your dilemma work, heuristics discovery, conflict mapping, framework explorations, and next steps processing to analyze your engagement patterns, explain your decisions about where to focus your intellectual energy, and demonstrate your understanding of how your ethical reasoning evolved.  
This is your opportunity to show what you learned about learning ethics, not just what you learned about ethics itself.  
Option 2 - Cleaner, more direct: Your final project is a reflective self-assessment of your learning journey throughout the semester. You'll be evaluated on how clearly you can articulate the choices you made, justify why you made them, and use evidence from your own work to support your claims about your philosophical development.  
Review your dilemma work, heuristics discovery, conflict mapping, framework explorations, and next steps work to analyze your engagement patterns and demonstrate how your ethical reasoning evolved over time.  
This is your opportunity to show what you learned about learning ethics, not just what you learned about ethics itself.  
What aspects feel most important to emphasize or adjust?  
Retry  
**C**  
Two things: I don't necessarily want the student to wait until the end of the semester to complete or even begin the self-assessment. This is something that might be most meaningful if they drop in and work on it on an ongoing basis...so if the prompt can support both iterative, ongoing work, as well as helping them to complete the project at the end of the semester? Is that too ambitious for one prompt?  
Edit  
Not too ambitious at all! Actually, that makes the self-assessment much more authentic - reflecting on learning as it happens rather than just reconstructing it at the end. Here's a revised narrative:  
Option 1 - Emphasizes ongoing process: Your self-assessment project is an ongoing reflective analysis of your learning choices and philosophical development throughout the semester. You can work on this iteratively - adding insights as they emerge, revising your understanding as you progress through frameworks, and building a comprehensive picture of your learning journey over time.  
Rather than being graded on predetermined outcomes, you'll be evaluated on how clearly you can articulate and justify the learning choices you made, and how well you can use evidence from your own work to support your claims about your philosophical development.  
Use your dilemma work, heuristics discovery, conflict mapping, framework explorations, and next steps work as evidence to analyze your engagement patterns, explain your decisions about where to focus your intellectual energy, and track how your ethical reasoning evolves.  
This is your opportunity to show what you learned about learning ethics, not just what you learned about ethics itself.  
Option 2 - More direct about the iterative approach: Your self-assessment project runs alongside your framework explorations throughout the semester. Rather than waiting until the end, you can reflect on your learning choices as you make them, track your philosophical development as it unfolds, and build your analysis iteratively.  
You'll be evaluated on how clearly you can articulate and justify your learning choices and use evidence from your own work to support your claims about your development - whether you complete this all at once or build it gradually over time.  
Which direction feels right for encouraging that ongoing reflection while still supporting end-of-semester completion?  
Retry  
**C**  
I like the second more, but it needs to be more concise  
Edit  
Here's a more concise version:  
Your self-assessment project runs alongside your framework explorations throughout the semester. You can reflect on your learning choices as you make them and track your philosophical development as it unfolds, building your analysis iteratively or completing it all at once.  
You'll be evaluated on how clearly you can articulate and justify your learning choices and use evidence from your own work to support your claims about your development.  
This is your opportunity to show what you learned about learning ethics, not just what you learned about ethics itself.  
Retry  
**C**  
Good, but I need something that explains as well they can, and should, be working on this throughout the semester. That doesn't come across as strongly as I think it needs to...  
Edit  
How about this:  
Your self-assessment project runs alongside your framework explorations throughout the semester. You should be working on this regularly - reflecting on your learning choices as you make them and tracking your philosophical development as it unfolds. Build your analysis iteratively rather than waiting until the end.  
You'll be evaluated on how clearly you can articulate and justify your learning choices and use evidence from your own work to support your claims about your development.  
This is your opportunity to show what you learned about learning ethics, not just what you learned about ethics itself.  
Retry  
**C**  
It still feels very word-salad.  
Edit  
You're right. How about:  
Your self-assessment project happens throughout the semester, not just at the end. Work on it regularly as you complete each framework exploration, reflecting on your choices and tracking how your thinking evolves.  
You'll be evaluated on how clearly you can justify your learning decisions using evidence from your own work.  
This shows what you learned about learning ethics, not just ethics itself.  
Retry  
**C**  
The first paragraph is on point. The last two need to be joined and express the idea that the entire course grade will reflect the work done here and how it explains and justify the choices that comprise all the work they have done over the course of the semester.  
Edit  
Your self-assessment project happens throughout the semester, not just at the end. Work on it regularly as you complete each framework exploration, reflecting on your choices and tracking how your thinking evolves.  
Your entire course grade will be based on how clearly you can justify your learning decisions using evidence from your work - this shows what you learned about learning ethics, not just ethics itself.  
Retry  
**C**  
Closer. You will work with AI to help capture the breakthroughs, insights, and decision pathways that lead you through your work in examining your dilemma, heuristics, and your consideration of the implications that examining ethical models had on those perspectives.  
Edit  
Your self-assessment project happens throughout the semester, not just at the end. Work on it regularly as you complete each framework exploration, reflecting on your choices and tracking how your thinking evolves.  
You will work with AI to help capture the breakthroughs, insights, and decision pathways that lead you through your work in examining your dilemma, heuristics, and your consideration of the implications that examining ethical models had on those perspectives. Your entire course grade will be based on how clearly you can justify your learning decisions using evidence from your work - this shows what you learned about learning ethics, not just ethics itself.  
Retry  
**C**  
OK. Let's pound out the prompt.  
Edit  
Perfect! Let me create the Self-Assessment AI prompt:  
AI Prompt: Self-Assessment Support  
Document  
# AI Instructions: Self-Assessment Support

## Context  
The student is working on their self-assessment project throughout the semester, not just at the end. This ongoing reflection captures breakthroughs, insights, and decision pathways as they exami  
There's the Self-Assessment prompt! It emphasizes the ongoing, iterative nature while supporting both regular reflection and final compilation. The key features:

* Breakthrough Recognition and Decision Pathway Documentation for capturing insights as they happen
* Evidence Collection to build concrete support for learning claims
* Flexible Documentation Support for ongoing work vs. periodic synthesis vs. end-of-semester compilation
* Student-driven approach that helps them articulate what they actually learned, not predetermined outcomes
* Meta-learning focus on learning about learning ethics

The prompt supports the semester-long process while acknowledging that their entire course grade depends on this reflective work.  
We now have all the prompts complete! The full structured model is ready to go.  
Retry  
**C**  
Let's clarify what the final product should look like. It should also include a student's suggestion of the letter grade they feel their conclusions about their learning warrant.  
Edit  
Perfect! Let me add that crucial component to the Self-Assessment prompt:  
AI Prompt: Self-Assessment Support  
Document ∙ Version 2  
## Self-Assessment Final Product

Support the student in developing their complete self-assessment containing:

\*\*Learning Choices Justification\*\*: Clear articulation of why they made specific decisions about their learning focus and depth.

\*\*Eviden  
Now the prompt clearly establishes that the final self-assessment should include the student's proposed grade with justification. This makes it a complete self-evaluation where they not only document and analyze their learning but also make the case for what grade that learning merits.  
This completes our structured model! We now have all the AI-facing prompts needed for the entire course sequence, from dilemma identification through framework explorations to next steps work and final self-assessment with grade proposal.  
Retry  
**C**  
One point that came out in another class is that many students will expect, and continue to request, a grading rubric. The problem with that is that it implies there are standardized expectations that come from someone else. I don't think that fits with the pedagogical approach I am embracing in this class. Students need to realize that they are accountable to themselves in terms of their performance, and, in essence, they have to come up with their own rubrics about how to judge their actions vs their expectations. Not me. Not Ai. What I am going to examine or evaluate when I look at this is the degree of intellectual honesty, transparency, and accuracy with which they try and express the process they underwent to come to those conclusions. But I don't want this broadcast; I don't want students trying to game the system by playing to artificial rules or letting others let them "off the hook" that their own consciences establish. Does that make sense?  
Edit  
That makes perfect sense and is philosophically consistent with the entire course design. You're asking students to develop their own ethical reasoning, so of course they need to develop their own standards for evaluating that reasoning. A traditional rubric would undermine the very autonomy and self-reflection you're trying to cultivate.  
The beauty is that you're not evaluating their conclusions or even their "performance" against external standards - you're evaluating the authenticity and rigor of their self-evaluation process. Can they honestly assess their own work? Can they provide transparent reasoning for their claims? Can they accurately represent what actually happened in their learning?  
This means the AI prompt should probably avoid any language that might hint at external evaluation criteria. Instead of helping them "meet standards," the AI should help them develop genuine self-awareness and honest self-assessment. The focus should be on helping them ask themselves the hard questions: "What did I actually learn? How do I know? What evidence supports this claim? What grade does this work honestly deserve?"  
Should I adjust any language in the Self-Assessment prompt to better support this approach - perhaps emphasizing their role as the primary evaluator of their own learning, or helping them develop their own criteria for what constitutes meaningful learning in their case?  
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)  
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