Getting Started: Activity Descriptions (Begin Here...)

Objectives:

- By the end of this module, you will be able to:
    - Explain the "archaeological" approach to ethics and how it differs from traditional ethics instruction
    - Create at least 4 original Perusall annotations that connect Garlikov's arguments to your own experiences
    - Conduct an AI conversation that surfaces your pre-existing ethical foundations (underlying principles, values, and assumptions)
    - Establish a documentation system (shared Google Drive folder) for tracking your semester-long learning journey

Activity Sequence:

- Read What Am I Getting Myself Into?
- Watch A Student Guide to Navigating Perusall
- Links to an external site.
-
- Read and Annotate Garlikov's 'The Point of Studying Ethics' in Perusall
    - You should include 4 annotations (or comments) throughout the body of the article. Up to 2 of these comments can be responses to things other students have written. You are expected to read through the entire content of the essay; comments should be distributed across the body of the article. More details included below...
- Create a Google Drive
- Links to an external site.
- folder using the naming convention: TGE 1257 - Spring 2026 - YourFullName (replace with yours...)
- Share the folder
- Links to an external site.
- with Dr. Lambert (click the link for instructions...)
- Choose an AI tool to use for the class. Here is a link to a fairly useful guide that might be helpful
- Links to an external site.
- . I don't specifically require or recommend any particular AI tool or platform. I leave that up to you...
- Complete the Ethical Foundations activity described below.

- Create a Google doc inside your shared folder and copy + paste the full transcript of your Ethical Intuitions activity into the document. (Google instructions if needed...)
- Fill out your introduction in My Name Is...
- Remember to breathe and keep up with the other activities during the first weeks of class; you've survived your first module!

Read and Annotate Garlikov's "The Point of Studying Ethics" in Perusall

Read Rick Garlikov's "The Point of Studying Ethics" and practice the annotation process. Your task: Create at least 4 original annotations that analyze how Garlikov's ideas connect to your own experiences, professional goals, or industry expectations. Up to 2 of these can be responses to classmates' annotations, but at least 2 must be your own independent analysis of the text. Focus on passages that challenge your assumptions about ethics, connect to your own experience, or raise questions about how we actually reason through moral complexity. This isn't about finding "right answers." It's about beginning to excavate your own thinking: What do you already believe about ethics? Where do those beliefs come from? What questions feel most urgent to you?

Ethical Intuitions Activity

Throughout this course, you'll work through ethical complexity by thinking out loud with an AI chatbot as your conversation partner. This first assignment is a gentle introduction to that process.

Using a provided prompt, you'll have a casual conversation with AI about your existing views on ethics—what you already believe before any formal study. Don't worry about being "right"—just explore your thinking authentically. Let yourself ramble, follow tangents, and notice when you feel uncertain or conflicted about something. The AI will ask you questions to help you articulate ideas you might not have put into words before.

You'll know you've engaged meaningfully when you've had enough exchanges with the AI to find yourself saying something you hadn't quite realized you thought. The goal isn't to reach conclusions, but to begin noticing your ethical foundations—the underlying principles, values, and assumptions that already guide how you think AND act about "right" and "wrong." Save your complete conversation transcript (see above) —this becomes the first artifact in your semester-long learning trail.

To-Do Date: Jan 12 at 1:00am

Welcome to Applied Ethics in Technology

This course takes an unconventional approach to ethics education. Instead of memorizing philosophical theories to apply to hypothetical dilemmas, you'll excavate the ethical reasoning patterns already embedded in your own thinking—like an archaeologist uncovering philosophical foundations you didn't know were there.

The Archaeological Metaphor

You'll identify a genuine ethical dilemma from your actual life—something with real stakes, competing obligations, and no obviously right answer. Throughout the semester, you'll use formal ethical frameworks (Utilitarianism, Virtue Ethics, Deontology, and others) as excavation tools to uncover what philosophical traditions already influence how you navigate complexity.

AI as Your Thinking Partner

This course requires extensive use of AI as a reflective partner to help you probe deeper, challenge assumptions, and articulate discoveries. You'll document all AI conversations, creating an archive of your intellectual journey. If you're uncomfortable with AI collaboration, this course isn't the right fit.

Self-Assessment, Not Points

There are no quizzes, tests, or rubrics. At semester's end, you'll make an evidence-based case for your own learning and propose your grade. This approach recognizes that ethical reasoning can't be measured through traditional metrics—what matters is your capacity to think clearly when values conflict.

Your Agency

You choose your dilemma, determine how to represent your thinking, decide which frameworks to explore deeply, and assess your own growth. Structured support exists when you need it, but the authority for your learning rests with you.

Expected Investment

3-4 focused hours weekly, with intensive self-reflection work throughout.

Hi, my name is...

In online classes like this one, it is easy to feel isolated and alone. So it is important to connect with the other students in the class and get to know them as possible lifelines if you run into trouble.

To facilitate this, imagine you were filling out one of those little stickers to introduce yourself to other people, like at a large business meeting or convention. While most of those stickers are intended to just give a name, let's expand that a little. What do other students need to know about you? Take some time and "fill out" a digital version of your name tag. Here are some things to consider including:

- Degree or program?
- Why are you taking this course?
- Outside interests that inform your thinking
- Expectations or hopes for the course

When you are done, take a few moments as well to respond and introduce yourself to other respondents as they appear in this discussion board. As your instructor, I'll also jump in and comment on your posts as well.

Part 1: Activity Descriptions

Objectives:
- By the end of this module, you will be able to:
  - Apply Holt's framework to distinguish genuine ethical dilemmas from practical problems, personal preferences, or simple right-vs-wrong decisions

- - Identify a "right versus right" dilemma from your own life involving a choice between two or more moral/ethical values where any decision compromises some ethical principle
  - Articulate the competing moral values or principles in tension and explain why the choice is not obvious or straightforward
  - Conduct an AI-guided discovery conversation that reveals complexity and hidden layers in your situation, then test your dilemma through "devil's advocate" questioning to verify its suitability for sustained analysis

Activity Sequence:

- Read the entirety of "What Is An Ethical (Moral) Dilemma?" by Deborah Holt
  - Include at least 4 annotations, 2 of which can be responses to other students.
- Complete the AI-Guided Dilemma Discovery conversation (outlined below...)
  - Copy your Dilemma conversation transcript in a Google Doc in the shared TGE 1257 folder
- Run your dilemma through the AI Devil's Advocate conversation (outlined below...)
  - Add the Devil's Advocate reflection to the Dilemma Description Google Doc as a new entry below the original...

Dilemma Discovery Conversation

What you're doing: Having a 30-60 minute conversation with AI to identify a genuine ethical dilemma from your life—a situation where you have real decision-making power but face competing obligations that pull you in different directions.

How it works: Copy the AI prompt below into your chosen AI tool. The AI will ask you questions to help you explore situations that create ethical tension. Let yourself consider multiple possibilities before settling on one. If something feels too simple, the AI will help you uncover hidden layers. If it feels too complicated, the AI will help you find the core tension.

What you're looking for: A dilemma that meets all five criteria from the reading:

1. You have real power to act
2. Multiple roles create competing obligations
3. No obviously right answer exists
4. The situation has staying power
5. You genuinely care about the outcome

Your deliverable: Save the full conversation transcript—you'll paste it into your Google Doc after the AI helps you draft your dilemma description.

Dilemma Discussion AI Prompt (Copy and paste everything below...)

You are helping a student identify a genuine ethical dilemma for semester-long analysis. Your role is to guide their thinking about their actual life situations, not provide solutions or suggest hypothetical scenarios.

The student needs a situation where they face a choice between two or more moral/ethical values—a "right versus right" dilemma where any decision will compromise or violate some ethical principle they hold. This is NOT about choosing between right and wrong (like "should I cheat?"), but about situations where multiple courses of action could all seem morally justified, yet they conflict with each other.

Your approach should be:

- Ask guiding questions rather than providing answers or frameworks
- Help them recognize when they're facing competing moral values, not just practical constraints
- When they describe a situation, probe whether it involves genuine ethical tension or just difficulty/inconvenience
- If a situation seems too simple (clear right vs. wrong), help them see that it won't sustain philosophical exploration
- If it seems too abstract, help them get specific about the actual moral values in conflict
- Resist rushing toward solutions—help them explore thoroughly first
- Validate when they identify genuine "right versus right" complexity, even if it feels messy

Key questions to explore:

Identifying the moral dimensions:

- What moral values or principles are pulling you in different directions here?
- If you choose one path, what ethical principle do you compromise? What about the other path?

- Is this a situation where you genuinely don't know what you "should" do, or do you know but just don't want to do it?
- Would reasonable people disagree about the right choice, each with valid moral reasoning?

Testing if it's genuinely dilemmatic:

- Is this about competing ethical obligations, or is it really about practical constraints (time, money, fear of consequences)?
- What's the "little voice" inside your head saying? Is there more than one voice, each making a moral case?
- Can you articulate why BOTH (or all) options feel morally justified in some way?

Ensuring sustainability for analysis:

- Does this situation create ongoing tension in your life, or was it a one-time decision?
- Can you imagine spending an entire semester thinking about the competing values at stake here?
- Do you genuinely care about this dilemma and its resolution?

Understanding the stakes:

- Who is affected by your decision? (Should involve at least three different groups/individuals with competing interests)
- What happens to your sense of yourself—your integrity, values, identity—depending on which choice you make?
- What makes this situation genuinely difficult for you, beyond practical consequences?

When they've identified something promising, help them test it by asking:

- Can you explain why this matters to you without using abstract ethical language? What's actually at stake?
- If you asked three different people you respect what you should do, would they give you different answers—all with good moral reasoning?
- What would happen if you prioritized different moral values you hold?
- What ethical principle(s) would you be compromising no matter what you decide?

Once they have something workable, offer to draft a concise summary (2-3 paragraphs) of their dilemma that captures:

- The concrete situation they're facing
- The competing moral values or principles creating the tension
- Why this is a "right versus right" dilemma, not "right versus wrong"
- What's actually at stake for them and others

Start by asking: "What situations in your life feel ethically complicated—where you're torn between options that each seem morally justified in different ways?"

Devil's Advocate Reflection

Once you have your dilemma identified, I want you to do a stress test, a chance to have an AI independently test your dilemma to make sure it is suitable for the assignments you will complete throughout the class.

As you work through this conversation:

- Don't get defensive—the AI is helping you strengthen your thinking
- If the AI reveals that your dilemma is simpler than you thought, that's useful information
- If new stakeholders or complications emerge, that's great—add them to your understanding; you will be using that information for the next activity...
- The goal isn't to "win" against the devil's advocate; it's to see your situation more clearly

Add Your Devil's Advocate Reflection

After your devil's advocate conversation, add a new section to your Google Doc titled "Devil's Advocate Reflection," then paste your full devil's advocate conversation transcript below your reflection (just like you did with your discovery conversation).

Devil's Advocate AI Prompt (Copy and paste everything below...)

You are serving as a devil's advocate to help a student test whether they've identified a genuine ethical dilemma. You've been given their dilemma description below. Your role is to ask probing, sometimes uncomfortable questions that reveal whether this situation has the complexity needed for semester-long analysis.

Here is the student's dilemma description: [Student pastes their dilemma here]

Your approach should be:

- Challenge assumptions they're making about the situation
- Ask about perspectives or stakeholders they haven't mentioned
- Probe whether this is genuinely dilemmatic or just difficult
- Question whether they have real decision-making power or are constrained by others
- Push them to articulate what's actually at stake beyond surface-level concerns
- Help them see if they're oversimplifying any of the competing obligations

Ask questions like:

- "You say you're torn between X and Y, but what if someone argued that X clearly outweighs Y because...?"
- "Who else is affected by this decision that you haven't mentioned?"
- "What would happen if you did nothing? Is that actually an option?"
- "You describe yourself as [role], but do you actually have the power to make this decision?"
- "Is this really about competing ethical obligations, or is it about [practical constraint/fear/uncertainty]?"
- "If you asked [specific stakeholder] what they think you owe them, what would they say?"
- "What's the strongest argument someone could make that this isn't actually a dilemma?"

Be respectfully challenging but not dismissive. If they reveal genuine complexity through your questioning, acknowledge it. If the dilemma seems too simple or not actually within their control, help them see that clearly so they can refine or choose something different.

After 4-6 exchanges, offer a brief assessment: Does this seem like a workable dilemma for semester-long analysis? What aspects might need refinement? If the dilemma seems suitable, offer to draft a concise summary (2-3 paragraphs) of the conversation.

Start by saying: "I'm going to push back on your dilemma to help you test whether it's genuinely complex. Let's start here: [your first challenging question based on their description]"

Part 2 Activity Descriptions

Objectives

- By the end of this module, you will be able to:
    - Distinguish between your aspirational ethical values and your actual behavioral decision-making patterns
    - Identify and document 25-35 specific heuristics across your competing roles, including: core principles (2-3 per role), character traits (2-3 per role), and decision rules/if-then patterns (3-5 per role)
    - Recognize and articulate gaps between your stated ideals and observable behavior
    - Trace the origin stories of your ethical patterns (background, culture, formative experiences)

Activity Sequence:

- Read "Ethical Heuristics: How You Actually Decide"
- Complete the AI-Guided Heuristics Interview
- Add your Heuristics documentation to your Google Doc

Read "Ethical Heuristics: How You Actually Decide"

In Module 1, you identified your ethical dilemma and the competing roles that create tension. Now you need to uncover something harder: the actual decision-making patterns that guide your behavior in each of those roles.

This isn't about what you *think* you should do or what you *wish* guided your choices. It's about discovering what *actually does* guide you when you're navigating ethical complexity in real time.

What are ethical heuristics?

Heuristics are mental shortcuts—the rules of thumb, principles, and "if/then" patterns you use to make decisions quickly without starting from scratch every time. Some examples:

- *"When work and family conflict, family comes first unless it's a true emergency"*
- *"I'll bend rules for people I know personally but follow them strictly with strangers"*
- *"If I can't do something perfectly, I'd rather not do it at all"*
- *"When in doubt, I do what causes the least immediate conflict"*

Notice these aren't abstract principles like "be honest" or "do the right thing"—they're specific patterns about how you actually navigate decisions in particular contexts.

Why this matters:

You can't meaningfully engage with formal ethical frameworks (utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics) until you understand your own informal ethical framework. This module creates that baseline. Later in the semester, you'll compare your actual decision-making patterns against philosophical approaches to see where they align, conflict, or reveal blind spots.

What you're discovering:

For each role in your dilemma, you'll identify:

1. Core principles (2-3 per role): The fundamental values that drive decisions in that role
   - Example: "As a manager, I believe everyone deserves clear expectations and honest feedback"
2. Character traits (2-3 per role): The kind of person you try to be in that role
   - Example: "As a parent, I try to be patient and present"
3. Decision rules (3-5 per role): Specific "if/then" patterns you actually use
   - Example: "As a friend, if someone asks for advice, I tell them what I really think even if it's uncomfortable"

You'll end up with 25-35 specific heuristics total. This gives you enough material for meaningful semester-long analysis.

Be prepared for discomfort:

You might discover gaps between your ideals and your actual behavior. You might recognize patterns you're not proud of. This discomfort often means the process is working—you're uncovering authentic decision-making rather than staying in wishful thinking mode.

The AI isn't judging your patterns. Neither am I. The goal is understanding your current ethical "operating system" so you can thoughtfully examine it later.

Complete the AI-Guided Heuristics Interview

What you're doing: Having a 45-60 minute conversation with AI that functions as an interview to uncover your actual decision-making patterns. The AI will ask scenario-based questions, probe for contradictions, and help you distinguish between what you do and what you wish you did.

How it works: Copy the AI prompt below into your AI tool. The AI will first ask you to share your Module 1 dilemma and roles, then systematically interview you about each role. At the end, the AI will organize everything into a structured summary.

Suggestions:
- Set aside uninterrupted time—this works best when you can focus
- Be honest about what you actually do, even if it doesn't match your ideals
- When the AI asks about specific past situations, really think through what you did and why
- If you find yourself giving "should" answers, pause and ask yourself what you actually did last time this happened
- Don't worry about looking good—the goal is accuracy, not virtue signaling

Your deliverable: Save the complete conversation transcript and the final structured summary the AI generates.

Ethical Heuristics - AI Prompt

You're going to interview me to discover the ethical heuristics—the actual decision-making patterns, principles, and "if/then" rules—that guide my behavior in different roles. I've already identified a complex ethical dilemma involving multiple competing roles.

Your job as interviewer is to help me uncover what I actually do when making ethical decisions, not what I think I should do. Be genuinely curious, ask follow-up questions, and help me be honest about uncomfortable patterns.

First, ask me to share my Module 1 findings so you understand my dilemma and roles.

Then help me discover, for each role I identified:

- 2-3 core principles that actually drive my decisions in that role
- 2-3 character traits I try to embody in that role
- 3-5 "if/then" decision rules I actually use

Interview techniques to use:

- Ask scenario-based questions: "Walk me through your thinking when..."
- Probe for contradictions between roles: "Earlier you said X, but now you're prioritizing Y..."
- Distinguish behavior from aspirations: "What do you actually do vs. what you think you should do?"
- Extract if/then patterns: "When X happens, you typically...?"
- Surface cross-role tensions: "How do you decide which role wins when they conflict?"

Don't judge my patterns or solve my dilemma. Just help me articulate how I actually make decisions. Push gently when I stay too abstract or aspirational.

At the end, organize what we've discovered into a structured summary by role, including any cross-role patterns you notice.

Start by asking for my Module 1 findings, then begin the discovery interview.

Part 3 Activity Descriptions

Objectives:

- By the end of this module, you will be able to:
  - Identify 3-5 core ethical tensions where your heuristics or roles create competing demands
  - Articulate for each tension: what's in conflict, why it matters (emotionally/practically/ethically), what questions it raises, and how it appears in your dilemma
  - Create a Conflict Map in a format that matches your natural processing style (written, visual, hybrid, etc.)
  - Produce a working document (markdown format) that serves as a reference tool for framework exploration

Activity Sequence:

- Read "Conflict Maps: Making Your Tensions Visible"
- Choose your format for expressing complexity
- Complete the AI-Guided Conflict Mapping conversation
- Create your Conflict Map (in your chosen format)
- Create your Working Document (markdown version)
- Add both versions to your shared folder

Read "Conflict Maps: Making Your Tensions Visible"

In Module 2, you discovered the actual decision-making patterns (heuristics) that guide your behavior in different roles. Now comes the crucial next step: identifying where these patterns clash with each other.

These clashes—the places where your roles pull you in competing directions—are where your ethical complexity actually lives. They're not flaws in your thinking. They're the interesting, difficult spaces where formal ethical frameworks can offer new perspectives.

What is a Conflict Map?

A Conflict Map is a representation of your key ethical tensions. It shows:

- Which specific heuristics or roles contradict each other
- Why these conflicts matter to you (emotionally, practically, ethically)
- What questions or uncertainties these tensions create
- How these abstract conflicts show up in your concrete dilemma

Think of it as making the invisible visible—taking the tensions that swirl around in your head and putting them in a form where you can actually examine them.

What format should it take?

Here's the important part: Your Conflict Map should match how you naturally process complex, emotional information.

Some options:

- Written reflection: Prose paragraphs that explore each tension and its significance
- Visual mind map: Bubbles, arrows, and spatial relationships showing how tensions connect
- Annotated diagram: Roles positioned in space with tension lines and notes

- Photo/image collage: Visual metaphors with written explanations of what each represents
- Playlist with annotations: Songs that capture different tensions with explanations of why
- Hand-drawn sketch: Simple drawings with labels showing competing pulls
- Hybrid approach: Combination of any of the above

The key principle: Substance over style. A thoughtful written analysis or hand-drawn map can be more powerful than an elaborate multimedia project. Choose what will help you be most honest about your tensions, not what will look most impressive.

What you're looking for:

You don't need to map every possible tension. Focus on the 3-5 conflicts that feel most significant to your dilemma—the ones that:

- Keep you up at night or make finding a decision to your dilemma feel impossible
- Show up repeatedly in different situations
- Create the most uncertainty or emotional weight
- Pull you most strongly in different directions

For each core tension, you'll articulate:

- What's in conflict: Which specific heuristics or roles are pulling against each other
- Why it matters: The emotional, practical, or ethical stakes
- What questions it raises: The uncertainties this conflict creates
- How it shows up: Concrete examples from your actual dilemma

Why this matters:

Your Conflict Map becomes your navigation tool for the rest of the semester. When you later explore utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics, and other frameworks, you'll ask: "Does this framework help me understand or resolve any of my mapped tensions?" The frameworks that speak directly to your conflicts will be the ones that genuinely expand your thinking.

Choose Your Format for Expressing Complexity

Before starting the AI conversation, spend 5-10 minutes thinking about format:

Ask yourself:

- How do I naturally process complex, emotional information?
- What format would help me be most honest about my tensions?
- What tools do I already have access to and feel comfortable using?

Remember:
- Simple approaches often work best
- You don't need to learn new technology for this
- Your instructor cares about your insights, not your design skills
- The goal is understanding your ethical complexity, not creating something polished

Make a decision about your primary format before moving to the AI conversation. You can always adjust later, but having a direction helps focus the conversation.

Complete the AI-Guided Conflict Mapping Conversation

What you're doing: Having a 30-45 minute conversation with AI to identify and articulate your 3-5 core ethical tensions. The AI will help you see where your heuristics contradict each other and why these conflicts matter.

How it works: Copy the AI prompt below. The AI will first ask about your format choice, then systematically work through your heuristics to identify conflicts. The AI adapts its questions based on your chosen format—helping you think spatially if you're working visually, helping you structure thoughts if you're writing, etc.

What can make this more effective:
- Don't rush to identify conflicts—let them emerge naturally from the conversation
- When you find a tension, really dig into why it matters to you personally
- Be honest about contradictions in your thinking—these aren't flaws
- Connect each abstract tension to concrete moments in your dilemma
- If something feels like it "should" be a conflict but doesn't actually create tension for you, don't force it

Your deliverable: Save the complete conversation transcript.

Conflict Map - AI Prompt

You're helping me create a Conflict Map of my ethical tensions based on the heuristics I discovered in my interview. I need to identify where my different roles and decision-making patterns pull me in competing directions.

First, ask me to share my heuristics discovery results so you understand my patterns and roles.

Before we start mapping conflicts, help me think about how I want to create and express my Conflict Map. Ask me:

"How do you naturally process complex, emotional information—through writing, visuals, lists, stories, or something else?" "What format would help you be most honest about your tensions—written reflection, mind map, visual collage, playlist with explanations, or another approach?" "What tools do you already have access to and feel comfortable using?"

Help me choose a format that prioritizes depth and honest reflection over impressive presentation. Remind me that simple approaches often work best—a thoughtful written analysis or hand-drawn map can be more powerful than a complex multimedia project.

Then help me identify conflicts by asking questions one at a time, such as:

"Where do your roles create competing demands in your dilemma?" "Which of your heuristics contradict each other?" "When do you feel most stuck or uncertain?" "What happens when your [Role A] patterns clash with your [Role B] patterns?"

For each conflict I identify, help me articulate:

- Which specific heuristics or roles are in tension
- Why this conflict matters to me (emotionally, practically, ethically)
- What questions or uncertainties this creates
- How this tension shows up in my actual dilemma

Don't try to resolve these conflicts or suggest solutions. The goal is to map them clearly so I can see where my ethical thinking gets complicated.

Guide me to create my map in whatever format I chose, adapting your questions and suggestions to match my approach. If I'm working visually, help me think about relationships and positioning. If I'm writing, help me structure my thoughts. If I'm using creative elements like images or music, help me connect them meaningfully to my specific tensions.

Keep me focused on substance over style—the goal is honest self-reflection, not an impressive final product.

Part 4 Activity Descriptions

Objectives:

- By the end of this module, you will be able to:
    - Describe what each of the 10 ethical frameworks offers and which types of ethical questions each historically addresses
    - Evaluate which frameworks might illuminate your most pressing tensions based on your Conflict Map
    - Design a personalized sequence for exploring all 10 frameworks based on your learning preferences, confidence levels, and conflict priorities
    - Justify your framework ordering with 2-3 sentences per framework explaining strategic placement

Activity Sequence:

- Read "Your Learning Roadmap: Sequencing Frameworks for Your Dilemma"
- Complete the AI-Guided Roadmap Planning conversation
    - Finalize your framework sequence with rationale
    - Add your Learning Roadmap to your shared folder

Read "Your Learning Roadmap: Sequencing Frameworks for Your Dilemma"

In Modules 2-3, you discovered your actual decision-making patterns (heuristics) and mapped where they create tension or conflict. Now comes a crucial design decision: In what order should you explore formal ethical frameworks?

This course covers 10 different ethical frameworks, each offering distinct ways of thinking about right action, good character, and moral complexity. But here's the key insight: the order in which you encounter these frameworks matters for your learning.

Why sequence matters:

Some frameworks might directly address your most pressing tensions—these could give you immediate insight or relief. Others might introduce new complexity or even create additional tensions—you might want to build confidence before tackling those.

Some frameworks might feel familiar and build on patterns you already use—starting here could give you vocabulary for your existing thinking. Others might feel completely foreign or challenging—you might want to approach these after you've developed some conceptual tools.

Your learning doesn't happen in a vacuum. The frameworks you study early create lenses through which you see later frameworks. A student who starts with Utilitarian ethics will approach Virtue Ethics differently than a student who starts with Deontology.

What you're creating:

A personalized sequence for exploring all 10 frameworks, with brief explanations of why each framework appears where it does in your roadmap. This isn't about ranking frameworks by importance—it's about ordering them strategically based on:

- Which tensions feel most urgent for you to address
- Which patterns you feel confident about and want to strengthen first
- Which conflicts keep you most stuck in your dilemma
- Whether you prefer to tackle difficult challenges first or build confidence with familiar concepts

The 10 frameworks you'll explore:

1. Duty Calls — Exploring Deontological Ethics: Focuses on firm moral duties and universal principles (e.g., Kant's categorical imperative)
2. Virtue Ethics — The Role of Character in Moral Philosophy: Emphasizes character traits and moral excellence (e.g., Aristotle's virtues)
3. Balancing the Scales — The Calculus of Utilitarian Ethics: Examines consequences and maximizing overall well-being (e.g., Mill, Bentham)
4. Bound By Agreement — The Principles of Social Contract Theory: Explores mutual obligations and social cooperation (e.g., Rawls, Hobbes)
5. The Ethics of Simone De Beauvoir — Feminism, Existentialism, and Ambiguity: Addresses moral complexity and situated, embodied ethics
6. Breaking the Moral Mold — Nietzsche on Value Creation: Questions traditional values and explores creating your own ethical standards
7. Marxism — The Class Struggle and Its Ethical Implications: Examines systemic inequality, power structures, and material conditions
8. Environmental Ethics: Considers moral responsibilities beyond humans to ecosystems and future generations
9. Bioethics: Explores ethics in medicine, healthcare, and emerging technologies
10. Universal Order — Unveiling Natural Law Theory: Investigates the idea of inherent moral order based on human nature or divine law

How frameworks might help (or complicate) your tensions:

Each framework offers something different:

- Deontology might help if you struggle with when rules should be followed vs. broken
- Virtue Ethics might speak to conflicts about what kind of person you want to be across roles
- Utilitarianism might clarify tensions about whose interests should count and how much
- Social Contract Theory might illuminate conflicts about competing obligations to different communities
- De Beauvoir might validate the ambiguity you feel rather than trying to resolve it
- Nietzsche might help if you suspect some of your inherited values don't actually serve you
- Marxism might reveal how power dynamics shape what feels like "personal" ethical choices
- Environmental Ethics might expand who counts as a stakeholder in your decisions
- Bioethics might be directly relevant if your dilemma involves health, care, or technology
- Natural Law might resonate if you believe there are fundamental moral truths beyond cultural construction

What's realistic to expect:

Some frameworks will genuinely help reduce your tensions by giving you new ways to think through them. Others will complicate existing tensions or introduce new ones. That's not failure—it's the reality of engaging honestly with ethical complexity.

The goal isn't to find the "right" framework that solves everything. The goal is to develop a more sophisticated understanding of your own ethical reasoning and expand your conceptual toolkit for navigating complexity.

Your authority:

You're the expert on your own learning. You know which tensions feel most urgent, which concepts you typically grasp quickly, and whether you learn better by starting with familiar territory or diving into challenges. Trust your judgment about what sequence will serve your learning goals.

Complete the AI-Guided Roadmap Planning Conversation

What you're doing: Having a 30-45 minute conversation with AI to design a personalized sequence for exploring all 10 frameworks. The AI helps you reflect on your Conflict Map, understand what each framework offers, and make strategic decisions about ordering.

How it works: Copy the AI prompt below. The AI will ask you to share your Conflict Map Working Document, then guide you through reflection questions about your tensions and learning preferences. Together, you'll sequence the frameworks with clear rationale for each placement.

What makes this effective:

- Be honest about which tensions feel most urgent vs. which you're ready to tackle
- Consider your learning style—do you need early wins or do you thrive on challenge?
- Think about building: earlier frameworks can give you tools for understanding later ones
- Don't worry about getting it "perfect"—you can always adjust as you go

Your deliverable: A sequenced list of all 10 frameworks with 2-3 sentences explaining why each appears in that position.

AI Interaction Prompt

You're helping me create a personalized learning sequence for exploring 10 ethical frameworks based on my Conflict Map. Your job is to help me decide which frameworks to tackle first, which to save for later, and why.

First, ask me to share my Conflict Map Working Document (the condensed markdown version) so you understand my ethical patterns and tensions.

Then help me reflect on my Conflict Map by asking one question at a time:

- Which tensions feel most urgent or uncomfortable to address?
- Which patterns do I feel confident about and want to strengthen?
- Which conflicts keep me most stuck in my dilemma?
- Do I prefer to tackle difficult challenges first or build confidence with familiar concepts?

Based on my responses, help me sequence these 10 frameworks in an order that makes sense for my learning goals:

1. Duty Calls — Exploring Deontological Ethics (firm moral duties and universal principles)
2. Virtue Ethics — The Role of Character in Moral Philosophy (character traits and moral excellence)
3. Balancing the Scales — The Calculus of Utilitarian Ethics (consequences and maximizing well-being)
4. Bound By Agreement — The Principles of Social Contract Theory (mutual obligations and social cooperation)
5. The Ethics of Simone De Beauvoir — Feminism, Existentialism, and Ambiguity (moral complexity and situated ethics)
6. Breaking the Moral Mold — Nietzsche on Value Creation (questioning traditional values)
7. Marxism — The Class Struggle and Its Ethical Implications (systemic inequality and power)
8. Environmental Ethics (responsibilities beyond humans)
9. Bioethics (ethics in medicine and technology)
10. Universal Order — Unveiling Natural Law Theory (inherent moral order)

For each framework, briefly explain how it might address my specific tensions or build on my strengths. Help me create a final sequence with 2-3 sentences explaining why each framework appears where it does in my personal roadmap.

Don't make the decision for me—guide me to discover what order feels right based on my own patterns and learning preferences.

Part 5 Activity Descriptions

Objectives:

- By the end of this module, you will be able to:
  - Create at least 6 original Perusall annotations per framework chapter connecting concepts to your own reasoning patterns

- ○ Conduct "archaeological" AI interviews for each framework that discover where its concepts already appear in your heuristics, Conflict Map, or dilemma
- ○ Trace the cultural, experiential, or philosophical origins of patterns you've been using unconsciously
- ○ Document 10 framework exploration reports showing: archaeological findings, conflict map updates, personal reflections, and complete AI transcripts
- ○ Analyze peer heuristics in the Gallery Walk (after your 3rd framework) and identify patterns across different students' excavations

Important: Module 5 is different from previous modules. You'll repeat this three-step cycle **10 times**—once for each framework in your personalized Learning Roadmap from Module 4.

Pacing: Consider completing 1-2 frameworks per week depending on your schedule.

The Cycle (Repeat for Each Framework):

- **Read and annotate the chapter in Perusall**
- **Complete the AI Archaeological Interview**
- **Document your discoveries and update your Conflict Map**

Your sequence is unique: You determined your framework order in Module 4, so you'll be reading chapters in a different order than your classmates.

Heuristics Gallery Walk (Complete After Your 3rd Framework)

What you're doing: Sharing how your framework explorations are illuminating one of your heuristics, and seeing how classmates' archaeological work is uncovering patterns in their thinking.

Time estimate: 30-45 minutes

When to do this: After you've completed 3 framework explorations (whichever chapter comes third in your personalized roadmap).

Step 1: Prepare Your Annotated Heuristic

Choose one heuristic from your Module 2 work (the principles, traits, and decision rules from any of your roles) where you've discovered connections to **at least 1 of the frameworks** you've explored.

Create a brief document titled "Annotated Heuristic - [Your First Name or Pseudonym]" that includes:

The Heuristic: Include your original heuristic from Module 2

Framework Annotations (2-3): For each relevant framework you've explored, show what you discovered:

Example annotations:

- *[Virtue Ethics connection]: This reflects my emphasis on courage and authenticity as character traits I try to embody in my professional role. The archaeological interview revealed I see "directness" as a virtue in management, not just a technique.*
- *[Care Ethics connection]: This rule actually comes from care ethics thinking—I prioritize the relationship and believe feedback works only in context of established care/trust. Without face-to-face, I lose that relational foundation.*
- *[Deontology tension]: Exploring Kant revealed a conflict—my rule prioritizes relationship quality (care) but sometimes creates situations where people don't get feedback they have a right to receive. This creates a tension I hadn't named before.*

Brief Commentary (2-3 sentences): What surprised you about these framework connections? What questions or tensions emerged?

Example: "I always thought this was just a 'communication preference,' but the excavations revealed it's actually rooted in care ethics and virtue ethics. The tension with deontological duty (people deserve feedback even if conditions aren't ideal) is something I'm still sitting with."

Step 2: Share Your Annotated Heuristic

Upload your document to the **Heuristics Gallery** folder I have created by April 5, 2026.

Step 3: Browse and Engage

Browse at least 5 classmates' annotated heuristics and notice:

- What frameworks are illuminating their thinking

- What kinds of discoveries they're making
- How archaeological work is revealing hidden patterns
- Similarities or differences from your own excavation process

Leave thoughtful comments on 2 annotated heuristics as comments on the Google Doc focusing on:

- Connections you notice: "This reminds me of what I discovered in [framework]..."
- Questions about their thinking: "I'm curious if [other framework] might also relate to this pattern?"
- Recognition of complexity: "The tension you identified between [X] and [Y] seems really significant"
- Your own related discoveries: "I found something similar in my [role] heuristics when I explored..."

Avoid: Please refrain from giving advice about what they should do or judgments about their heuristics

---

Step 4: Write Your Gallery Walk Reflection

Add a new brief section to your main Google Doc titled **"Heuristics Gallery Walk Reflection"** (2-3 paragraphs):

- What did you notice about how frameworks are illuminating different people's heuristics?
- What patterns emerged across multiple classmates' annotated heuristics?
- Did seeing others' archaeological discoveries give you ideas for your own remaining framework explorations?
- What surprised you about the diversity (or similarity) of what people are uncovering?

Read and Annotate in Perusall

What you're doing: Read the next chapter in *Ethical Explorations* according to your Learning Roadmap. Actively engage through annotation.

Annotation requirements:

- Create at least **6 annotations** distributed throughout the chapter
- Up to **2 annotations** can be responses to classmates
- At least **4 annotations** must be your own original analysis

Focus your annotations on connections:

- "This principle reminds me of when I..."
- "This addresses the tension in my Conflict Map between..."
- "I'm already doing this in my [role] but didn't have language for it..."
- "This framework would completely change how I see..."

Avoid generic reactions. Think out loud about how this framework relates to your actual ethical reasoning.

Chapter titles in Perusall:

1. Duty Calls — Exploring Deontological Ethics
2. Virtue Ethics — The Role of Character in Moral Philosophy
3. Balancing the Scales — The Calculus of Utilitarian Ethics
4. Bound By Agreement — The Principles of Social Contract Theory
5. The Ethics of Simone De Beauvoir — Feminism, Existentialism, and Ambiguity
6. Breaking the Moral Mold — Nietzsche on Value Creation
7. Marxism — The Class Struggle and Its Ethical Implications
8. Environmental Ethics
9. Bioethics
10. Universal Order — Unveiling Natural Law Theory

Complete the AI Archaeological Interview

What you're doing: Using AI to excavate where this framework's concepts already appear in your own ethical reasoning—in your heuristics, Conflict Map, or dilemma. You're not learning the framework - you've already done that; you're discovering where you're already using it without realizing it.

Time estimate: 45-60 minutes

How it works: You are the expert on your thinking. AI is your excavation assistant. Start by giving the AI context, then work through core questions to uncover existing patterns.

Start your AI session with this context prompt:

```
I'm conducting an archaeological analysis of my own ethical
reasoning to discover where [FRAMEWORK NAME] concepts
already appear in my thinking. I've read about [FRAMEWORK
NAME] and now want to examine my personal ethical dilemma
and conflict map to identify existing patterns related to
this framework. I need you to help me excavate and analyze,
not to provide answers or summaries of theory.

Here's my Conflict Map Working Document:
[Paste your Conflict Map]

Here are my heuristics from Module 2:
[Paste relevant sections]
```

Core excavation questions (explore these with AI help):

1. **Where does this framework's central concept show up in my existing thinking?**
   - What language in my heuristics reflects this framework?
   - Where in my Conflict Map do I see this framework operating?
2. **How does this framework reveal tensions I hadn't named?**
   - Where does this framework conflict with other patterns I've identified?
   - What new complications does this framework introduce?
3. **What's the origin story of these patterns?**
   - Where might these patterns come from in my background or culture?
   - What formative experiences shaped this aspect of my reasoning?
4. **What am I doing unconsciously that this framework makes visible?**
   - What hidden applications of this framework exist in my thinking?
   - What have I been doing without having language for it?

Choose 2-3 additional "deep dig" questions that resonate:

- Help me trace where these patterns originated
- Where do different aspects of this framework conflict with each other in my thinking?

- Are there cultural variations of this framework in my background I haven't recognized?
- What does this framework reveal about assumptions I'm making?

Your deliverable: Save the complete AI conversation transcript.

Document Your Discoveries

What you're doing: Creating a framework addendum in your main Google Doc and updating your Conflict Map with new insights.

Time estimate: 30 minutes

Add a new section to your main Google Doc:

[FRAMEWORK NAME] EXPLORATION

Include:

1. Archaeological Findings Report (3-4 paragraphs):

- What patterns from this framework did you discover in your reasoning?
- Specific evidence from your Conflict Map or heuristics
- Where these patterns likely originated
- New tensions revealed or existing tensions clarified

2. Conflict Map Updates: Add annotations to your Conflict Map Working Document showing:

- Where this framework's concepts appear
- New tensions this framework reveals
- How this framework helps you understand existing patterns

Format: [Updated after [Framework] exploration: Brief note. See AI transcript lines XX-XX]

3. Personal Reflection (2-3 paragraphs):

- What surprised you about your thinking related to this framework?
- Did this change how you see your dilemma?
- What questions does this framework raise?
- How does it compare to frameworks you've already explored?

4. Documentation:

- Your complete AI archaeological interview transcript (paste below)
- Your Persuall annotations, which are stored in Perusall.

Part 6 Activity Descriptions

Objectives:

- By the end of this module, you will be able to:
    - Review your 10 framework explorations systematically with AI to identify cross-framework patterns
    - Assess how your understanding of each original tension has evolved (resolved, reframed, complicated, or unchanged)
    - Update your Conflict Map with post-framework insights, including new language, tools, and any emergent tensions
    - Identify concrete next steps, ongoing questions, or acceptance of complexity based on your evolved understanding
    - Distinguish between tensions that have genuinely shifted and those that remain difficult despite philosophical exploration

Activity Sequence:

- **Read "Returning to Your Conflict Map"**
    - **Review your philosophical journey with AI**
    - **Update your Conflict Map with new insights**
    - **Identify next steps and unresolved questions**
    - **Document your evolved understanding**

Read "Returning to Your Conflict Map"

When you created your Conflict Map in Module 3, you identified 3-5 core tensions in your ethical reasoning—places where your roles, values, or heuristics pulled you in competing directions. At that point, you had language for the conflicts but few tools for understanding them.

Now you've explored 10 different philosophical frameworks. Each excavation asked: "Where does this framework already appear in my thinking?" You've discovered patterns, named assumptions, and uncovered the philosophical roots of your decision-making.

What's different now?

After 10 framework explorations, you likely have:

- **New language** for tensions you could only describe vaguely before
- **Philosophical grounding** for patterns you were using unconsciously
- **Recognition of origins** for beliefs you thought were just "common sense"
- **Awareness of trade-offs** you were making without realizing it
- **Tools for analysis** you didn't have at the start

What this module asks you to do:

Return to your Conflict Map and examine it through the lens of everything you've learned:

1. **What's resolved?** Have any tensions lessened or clarified through your framework explorations?
2. **What's more complicated?** Have any tensions deepened or multiplied as you discovered new layers?
3. **What's reframed?** Do you now understand any conflicts differently even if they're not resolved?
4. **What's still urgent?** Which tensions remain most pressing for you?
5. **What next steps can you see?** What actions, questions, or explorations feel possible now that didn't before?

Important: Resolution is not required

Some ethical dilemmas don't resolve—they're genuinely difficult situations with ongoing tension. That's not failure. What matters is whether you now have:

- Better understanding of why the tension exists
- More sophisticated tools for navigating it
- Clearer sense of what you're prioritizing and why
- Language for what remains genuinely difficult

Review Your Philosophical Journey with AI

What you're doing: Working with AI to systematically review your framework explorations and identify how your understanding of your Conflict Map has evolved.

Time estimate: 60-90 minutes

Start your AI session with this context:

```
I created a Conflict Map at the beginning of this course
identifying 3-5 core ethical tensions in my reasoning. I've
now completed archaeological explorations of 10 ethical
frameworks. I need to review my journey to understand
what's changed in my understanding of those original
tensions.

Here's my original Conflict Map from Module 3:
[Paste your Conflict Map Working Document]

I'm going to share key insights from each of my 10
framework explorations. Your role is to help me see
patterns across my learning—where tensions have resolved,
complicated, reframed, or remained unchanged.
```

Guide the AI through systematic review:

1. **Share highlights from each framework**: For each of your 10 framework explorations, share 2-3 key discoveries with the AI. You don't need to paste entire documents—just the most significant insights.
2. **Ask for pattern recognition across frameworks**:
    ○ "Looking across all 10 frameworks, where do you see my understanding of [specific tension] evolving?"
    ○ "Which frameworks seemed to speak most directly to which tensions?"
    ○ "Where did frameworks complement each other vs. create new complications?"
3. **Examine each original tension systematically**: For each of your 3-5 core tensions from Module 3, ask:
    ○ "How has my understanding of this tension changed?"

- ○ "Which frameworks provided new language or tools for this conflict?"
- ○ "Is this tension clearer, more complicated, or basically unchanged?"
- ○ "What questions remain about this tension?"
4. **Identify new tensions that emerged**:
   - ○ "Did my framework explorations reveal tensions I hadn't originally recognized?"
   - ○ "Where did philosophical exploration create new complexity?"
5. **Surface possible next steps**:
   - ○ "Based on everything I've learned, what actions or approaches to my original dilemma can I see now that I couldn't see before?"
   - ○ "What questions feel most important to continue exploring?"
   - ○ "Where do I feel stuck despite all this philosophical work?"

What the AI should help you see:

The AI acts as a mirror, reflecting back patterns across your 10 explorations that you might not notice from inside your own learning. The AI shouldn't tell you what to do about your dilemma—it should help you recognize what you've actually learned.

Your deliverable: Save the complete review conversation transcript.

Update Your Conflict Map with New Insights

What you're doing: Revising your Conflict Map Working Document to reflect your evolved understanding after exploring 10 frameworks.

Time estimate: 45-60 minutes

Open your Conflict Map Working Document and create a new section at the top:

CONFLICT MAP: POST-FRAMEWORK EXPLORATION (Module 6 Update)

For each of your original 3-5 tensions, write an updated analysis (3-4 paragraphs each):

TENSION #1: [Original label]

Original understanding (from Module 3): [Brief reminder of how you initially described this tension]

What's changed:

- Which frameworks illuminated this tension most?
- What new language or tools do you now have?
- Is this tension clearer, more complicated, or resolved?
- What assumptions were you making that you now recognize?

Current status:

- How urgent does this tension feel now compared to Module 3?
- What aspects remain genuinely difficult?
- What aspects feel more manageable or understandable?

Possible next steps:

- What actions, if any, feel more possible now?
- What questions do you want to continue exploring?
- What would help you navigate this tension better?

[Repeat this structure for each of your original tensions]

New tensions that emerged:

[If framework exploration revealed tensions you hadn't originally identified, describe them here with the same structure]

Overall reflection (2-3 paragraphs):

- How has your understanding of your ethical dilemma evolved overall?
- What philosophical insights feel most significant?
- What remains genuinely unresolved?
- How do you think about ethical complexity differently now than at the start of the course?

Identify Next Steps and Unresolved Questions

What you're doing: Creating a clear, honest assessment of where you stand with your dilemma and what you might want to consider going forward.

Time estimate: 30-45 minutes

Create a new Google Doc titled "Module 6: Next Steps and Open Questions - [Your Name]"

Include:

1. What I've Gained (2-3 paragraphs)

Describe concrete ways your philosophical exploration has equipped you:

- New conceptual tools or language
- Better understanding of your own reasoning patterns
- Recognition of assumptions or trade-offs
- Frameworks that resonate strongly with your thinking
- Clarity about what makes your dilemma genuinely difficult

2. What Remains Unresolved (2-3 paragraphs)

Be honest about what's still difficult:

- Tensions that haven't lessened despite philosophical exploration
- Conflicts where reasonable frameworks lead to different conclusions
- Aspects of your dilemma where you remain genuinely uncertain
- Questions you still can't answer

3. Possible Next Steps (Choose What Fits)

Based on your evolved understanding, what feels possible or important to consider? This might include:

Concrete actions in your dilemma:

- Decisions that feel clearer now
- Experiments or small steps you could try
- Conversations you could have with stakeholders
- Boundaries or commitments you could make

Continued philosophical exploration:

- Frameworks that deserve deeper study
- Philosophical questions you want to keep thinking about
- Integration work between frameworks that seem complementary
- Original ethical thinking you want to develop

Living with complexity:

- Tools for navigating ongoing tension
- Ways to make decisions when tensions can't resolve

- Practices for staying reflective about your choices
- Acceptance of what must remain difficult

Nothing immediate:

- Sometimes the answer is "I need to sit with this longer"
- That's a legitimate next step if it's genuine, not avoidance

4. Open Questions (bullet list)

What questions feel most important to carry forward?

- Questions about your specific dilemma
- Questions about ethical reasoning more broadly
- Questions about frameworks or concepts you explored
- Questions about how to navigate complexity over time

Be authentic:

This isn't about demonstrating you "solved" your dilemma or reached neat conclusions. It's about honest reflection on where you are after sustained philosophical work—what's clearer, what remains hard, and what you're taking forward.

Document Your Evolved Understanding

What you're doing: Gathering all Module 6 work into your shared folder to show how your understanding has developed.

Save in your shared Google Drive folder:

1. **Your philosophical journey review AI conversation transcript**
2. **Your updated Conflict Map Working Document** (with Module 6 additions)
3. **Your "Next Steps and Open Questions" document**

Part 7: Self-Assessment Activity Descriptions

Objectives:

- By the end of this module, you will be able to:

- Construct a learning journey narrative (2-3 paragraphs) that traces your intellectual evolution from Parts 0-6
- Identify 3-5 specific pieces of evidence from your work demonstrating authentic engagement, self-awareness, intellectual risk-taking, or integration of frameworks
- Propose and justify a final grade based on documented evidence of your learning
- Engage in collaborative reflection with the instructor about your philosophical growth, acknowledging both strengths and limitations

Overview:

This course has no quizzes, tests, or points. Instead, you'll demonstrate your learning through self-assessment and make a justified case for your final grade.

Activity Sequence:

- **Read "Understanding Self-Assessment in This Course"**
- **Review your learning journey and draft your self-assessment**
- **Schedule your collaborative conversation with Dr. Lambert**

Read "Understanding Self-Assessment in This Course"

Traditional grading encourages students to figure out what the instructor wants. But ethical thinking requires you to grapple with genuine uncertainty and make discoveries you can defend. Self-assessment supports authentic intellectual engagement.

What you'll do:

Make a case for your own learning by telling the story of your philosophical journey: what dilemma you explored, how your understanding evolved, and what you learned from the process.

What I'm looking for:

- **Authentic engagement**: Evidence you've genuinely wrestled with ethical complexity
- **Self-awareness**: How has your thinking changed? What patterns do you notice?

- **Integration**: How did frameworks illuminate your thinking or create new tensions?
- **Honest reflection**: What worked? What didn't? Where did you surprise yourself?

Learning dimensions to consider:

1. **Philosophical Integration**: How did you work with frameworks? How did your approach develop?
2. **Self-Awareness**: What did you discover about your own ethical reasoning?
3. **Engagement**: How did you approach course activities?
4. **Intellectual Risk-Taking**: When did you push beyond your comfort zone?
5. **Use of AI**: How did AI help you think differently?

The collaborative conversation:

After you submit, we'll have a 15-20 minute conversation to discuss your self-assessment and proposed grade—not as a defense, but as collaborative reflection on your learning.

Review Your Learning Journey and Draft Your Self-Assessment

What you're doing: Reviewing your Modules 1-6 work and writing a self-assessment that makes a case for your learning.

Time estimate: 3-4 hours total

Step 1: Review your work (60-90 minutes)

Go through each module and take notes:

- Module 1: What did you understand about your dilemma initially?
- Module 2: What surprised you about your heuristics?
- Module 3: What tensions did you identify?
- Module 4: What does your roadmap reveal about your learning?
- Module 5: Which frameworks generated the most insight?
- Module 6: What changed in your understanding?

Note key moments where your thinking shifted and examples of genuine engagement.

Step 2: Draft your self-assessment (90-120 minutes)

Create a new Google Doc titled "Self-Assessment - [Your Name]"

Include these three sections:

1. MY LEARNING JOURNEY (2-3 paragraphs)

Tell the story of your semester:

- Where you started intellectually
- Key shifts in your thinking (with specific examples from your work)
- What frameworks or moments generated the most insight
- Where you are now compared to the beginning

2. EVIDENCE OF LEARNING (3-5 examples)

For each example, provide:

- **What it shows**: Brief description
- **Where it is**: Module and location
- **Why it matters**: What this demonstrates about your learning

Examples might be: excerpts from AI conversations showing shifts in thinking, before/after Conflict Map comparisons, framework discoveries that changed your understanding, moments of intellectual risk-taking.

3. PROPOSED GRADE AND JUSTIFICATION (1-2 paragraphs)

- State your proposed grade
- Justify it with reference to your engagement, growth, and evidence
- Be honest about both strengths and limitations

That's it. A complete self-assessment should be 1-2 pages total.

Schedule Your Collaborative Conversation

Save your self-assessment document in your shared Google Drive folder.

Schedule a 10 minute conversation with Dr. Lambert using the provided scheduling link. **This conversation is required and will serve as the course's final exam.**

Come prepared to:

- Discuss your proposed grade

- Highlight 1-2 key learning moments
- Ask questions about your learning
- Be honest about your engagement

Your final grade will be determined collaboratively based on your self-assessment, evidence, and our conversation.