

MORAL PARTICULARS AUDIT

Curriculum for Young Honest Seekers

A complete 12-session field course for teaching concrete Christian moral reasoning, grounder mapping, disagreement diagnosis, and cross-case integrity.

12 SESSIONS

SMALL GROUP

TEACHER GUIDE

ASSIGNMENTS

RUBRICS

TEMPLATES

The course in one sentence

Students learn to inspect what actually carries their moral judgments when abstract Christian claims become concrete moral particulars.

Best use

Run this as a moral reasoning lab: serious, creative, concrete, charitable, and unwilling to hide behind slogans.

Public tool: <https://xhairs.com/apps/moral-particulars-audit/>

CROSSHAIRS AUDIT LAB

A field course in concrete Christian moral reasoning

How to Use This Curriculum

This curriculum is designed for a dynamic teacher leading 6-12 young seekers through honest moral inquiry. It is intentionally rigorous, but it should feel like a lab, studio, and seminar rather than a lecture series.

Part	What it gives the teacher
Opening orientation	Philosophy, case set, learning outcomes, pacing, and teacher posture.
Sessions 1-12	Full lesson plans with objectives, timing, questions, and homework.
Tool literacy	Grounders, disagreement diagnoses, graph reading, and report interpretation.
Assessment	Assignments, rubrics, final dossier, and presentation guidance.
Appendices	Templates, discussion protocols, adaptations, and troubleshooting moves.

For sincere seekers

The course respects unresolved questions and treats doubt, conviction, and revision as morally serious data.

For Christian settings

The course does not mock faith commitments. It asks whether those commitments can be named, weighted, compared, and revised with integrity.

For mixed groups

The design avoids requiring theological agreement. Students can map Christian claims from inside, outside, or at the threshold of belief.

For creative teachers

Every session includes movement, role play, mapping, quiet writing, and disciplined conversation.

Non-negotiable norm

No participant may use the tool to diagnose another participant's soul, pressure someone into a stance, or turn severe moral cases into entertainment.

Pedagogical Philosophy

The course assumes that moral maturity grows when students can slow down, name what is doing the work, test consistency, and revise without shame.

- Concrete cases expose hidden dependencies. A general claim may sound stable until it meets a violent, sexual, civic, generosity, or belonging case.
- A moral stance is not yet a moral explanation. Students first identify the judgment, then identify what carries it.
- Grounders are plural. Scripture, conscience, tradition, reason, love, authority, and consequences can cooperate or compete.
- Disagreement diagnoses are morally loaded. Explaining why someone disagrees can reveal as much as the judgment itself.
- Graphs are not decoration. Concentration, coverage, and pattern drift show where the moral ledger leans.
- Revision is not defeat. A student may strengthen, soften, qualify, or suspend a judgment as an act of integrity.

What the teacher protects

The teacher protects seriousness, charity, exactness, and agency. The teacher does not protect students from every discomfort, and does not let discomfort become permission for cruelty.

Course Values

Value	Classroom meaning
Precision	Students answer the stated moral particular before expanding or revising it.
Charity	Students try to understand sincere disagreement before explaining it away.
Courage	Students do not avoid hard cases merely because the map may reveal tension.
Humility	Students treat their own certainty as inspectable.
Responsibility	No map is a permission slip. Students remain answerable for moral speech and action.

Course Architecture

The design follows a spiral: stance, grounders, disagreement, hard cases, patterns, critique, revision, and public reflection.

Unit	Sessions	Main question	Deliverable
Orientation	1-2	What exactly do I think?	Initial moral inventory
Grounders	3-5	What carries that judgment?	Grounder autopsy
Disagreement	6-7	How do I explain dissent responsibly?	Charity memo and safety memo
Patterns	8-9	Does my reasoning drift across cases?	Pattern-drift memo
Critique	10	What would a fair critic notice?	Revision log
Synthesis	11-12	What has honest inspection revealed?	Final dossier and presentation

Minimum Materials

- One laptop or tablet connected to the Moral Particulars Audit.
- Printed case set, grounder list, disagreement diagnosis list, and final dossier template.
- Sticky notes or index cards for grounder sorting and disagreement court.
- A visible 0-10 line on the floor or wall for human slider exercises.
- Private writing space. Students need some answers that are not performed for peers.

Recommended Pacing

Format	Use when	Adjustment
12 weeks	Best default for deep formation.	Use one session per week plus homework.
6 weeks	School club or short cohort.	Combine pairs: 1-2, 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, 9-10, 11-12.
Weekend intensive	Retreat context.	Use fewer cases, more private writing, and strong safety boundaries.
Semester course	Academic setting.	Add readings in ethics, hermeneutics, epistemology, and moral psychology.

Session Map at a Glance

This one-page map helps the teacher keep the whole arc visible while improvising creatively inside each session.

Session	Tool focus	Evidence of learning
1	Particulars versus abstractions	Initial moral inventory
2	Stance, scope, and qualifiers	Two precise stance statements
3	Authority grounders	Authority-grounder paragraph
4	Conscience, Spirit, reason, and love	Conscience/reason tension note
5	Slider weighting and starter profiles	Three privately mapped cases
6	Disagreement diagnosis	Disagreement charity memo
7	Hard-case safety	Safety memo
8	Cross-case consistency	Pattern-drift memo
9	Grounder concentration map	Graph interpretation paragraph
10	Report and critique	Critique and revision log
11	Final dossier workshop	Draft final dossier
12	Presentation and sending	Final presentation and 30-day practice

Spiral logic

The course returns to the same core moves with increasing pressure: state the particular, map the grounders, explain disagreement, compare cases, revise responsibly.

The Moral Particulars Case Set: 1a-6

The cases are intentionally uneven. Some are ordinary, some severe, some sexual, some civic, some generosity-centered, and some volatile. That mix is the point: students learn whether their moral method stays principled across different kinds of pressure.

Case	Moral particular	Pedagogical pressure
1a	It would be immoral not to kill abortion doctors if it protected the unborn.	Tests whether fetal-personhood commitments imply private lethal obligation, and what blocks that implication.
1b	It would be morally permissible to kill abortion doctors if it protected the unborn.	Tests the distance between obligation, permission, vigilantism, and ordinary prohibitions on killing.
2	It is immoral for divorced individuals to remarry.	Tests how texts, exceptions, covenant categories, and pastoral harm are weighted.
3	It is immoral to have meals with apostates from Christianity.	Tests the difference between moral contamination, church discipline, hospitality, and ordinary friendship.
4	It is immoral to knowingly exceed speed limits.	Tests whether civil law carries moral force when violation is common, minor, or socially tolerated.
5	It is immoral for married couples to engage in oral or anal sex.	Tests how natural-law reasoning, consent, scriptural silence, tradition, and disgust responses are separated.
6	It is immoral to practice circumcision or clitoridectomies.	Tests whether bundled practices are judged by the same principle or by different facts about harm, consent, covenant, and anatomy.

Handling note

Several propositions involve violence, sexuality, bodily alteration, or severe exclusion. The teacher should frame these as objects of moral analysis, never as prompts for fantasy, mockery, or advocacy.

The Moral Particulars Case Set: 7-12

These later cases continue the pressure test across state violence, deception, eternal stakes, war, divorce, and urgent need.

Case	Moral particular	Pedagogical pressure
7	It would be moral for a government to kill homosexuals for being homosexual.	Tests whether historical texts, civil law categories, and modern scope limits can be applied without special pleading.
8	It is immoral to intentionally make someone believe you feel the opposite of what you actually feel about something.	Tests how deception, privacy, tact, safety, emotional labor, and truthfulness are ranked.
9	It is immoral to spend this earthly life enjoying earthly pleasures when unGospelled unbelievers face eternity in Hell, when you will have eternity in Heaven to relax.	Tests whether eternal stakes imply maximal evangelistic sacrifice, and what principle permits ordinary enjoyment.
10	It is immoral to fight for a country in a war merely for more territory.	Tests just-war reasoning, obedience to authority, loyalty, and the morality of aggression.
11	It is immoral to divorce over a spouse merely romantically kissing another individual.	Tests how adultery, betrayal, covenant rupture, forgiveness, safety, and proportionality are defined.
12	It is immoral not to send money to help someone you know who is starving to death.	Tests whether proximity, ability, sacrifice, stewardship, and love of neighbor create a concrete duty.

Teacher move

Ask students to mark which details are actually present in the sentence and which details their imagination supplied. That distinction prevents accidental case substitution.

Learning Outcomes and Assessment

The course measures growth in disciplined moral inquiry, not ideological conformity.

Outcome	Evidence of learning
Claim discipline	Student can answer the written proposition without quietly replacing it.
Grounder literacy	Student can distinguish authority, inward, rational, communal, and consequence grounders.
Weighting judgment	Student can defend why one slider is stronger than another.
Disagreement charity	Student can explain sincere dissent without contempt or evasion.
Pattern awareness	Student can identify cross-case drift and test whether it is justified.
Revision integrity	Student can document a principled change, non-change, or unresolved question.

Major Assignments

Assignment	Due	Purpose
Initial moral inventory	After Session 1	Capture first-pass stances before group influence.
Grounder autopsy	After Session 4	Explain one strong judgment by separating real from decorative grounders.
Disagreement charity memo	After Session 6	Write a fair non-contemptuous explanation of dissent.
Pattern-drift memo	After Session 8	Compare two cases and inspect why reasoning changed.
Critique and revision log	After Session 10	Record fair criticism and principled revisions.
Final dossier	Session 12	Present the completed moral map and reflective synthesis.

Assessment posture

Grade or respond to precision, honesty, charity, and rigor. Do not grade students for landing on the teacher's preferred moral conclusions.

Teacher Posture and Safety

The teacher's energy matters. A dynamic teacher can make the room alive, but the energy must serve inquiry rather than performance.

Be vivid

Use stories, movement, examples, and role play. Let the room feel awake.

Be bounded

Make it clear when a case involves violence, shame, identity, or trauma. Slow the pace.

Be Socratic

Ask what follows, what changes, and what carries the judgment.

Be humane

Protect students from contempt, humiliation, and spiritual bullying.

Group Covenant

- 1 We answer the stated case before changing it.
- 2 We do not diagnose classmates' souls.
- 3 We distinguish analyzing a moral proposition from endorsing an action.
- 4 We do not use jokes to manage discomfort in severe cases.
- 5 We may pass publicly and write privately.
- 6 We revise without shame and hold conviction without swagger.
- 7 We treat disagreement as morally significant data, not as an excuse for contempt.

Safety pause script

Pause. The room is moving too quickly for the seriousness of this case. We are going to restate the proposition, name the potential harm in discussing it poorly, and proceed only with analytical care.

Facilitator Readiness and Safeguarding

A rigorous curriculum for young seekers needs adult steadiness. The teacher should be prepared to handle moral intensity, theological disagreement, and vulnerable personal history without turning the room into therapy or combat.

Learner readiness

Students should be able to hear difficult propositions, disagree without ridicule, write privately when needed, and distinguish analysis from endorsement.

Facilitator readiness

The teacher should be comfortable pausing the room, naming harm, refusing soul-diagnosis, and protecting students who need a private rather than public response.

Before the First Meeting

Preparation	Why it matters
Disclose the nature of the case set.	Students should know that some cases involve violence, sexuality, bodily alteration, and severe exclusion.
Secure appropriate permission if minors are involved.	Parents, guardians, or institutions may need to know the course includes sensitive moral material.
Prepare a private-writing option.	A student can remain engaged without performing every answer in front of peers.
Set a referral boundary.	The course is not counseling; distress, trauma, or crisis should be handled through appropriate care channels.
Define data privacy.	Students should know whether exported maps, reports, or written dossiers will be shared, stored, or graded.

When to Slow the Room

- Students begin joking about violence, sexuality, humiliation, or damnation.
- A participant tries to assign spiritual rebellion or an unredeemed soul to a classmate.
- The group starts defending conclusions before it has mapped the grounders.
- Someone becomes visibly distressed or unusually silent after a case is read.
- The teacher cannot tell whether students are analyzing the proposition or enjoying its severity.

Safeguarding principle

The course may apply real intellectual pressure, but it should never reward cruelty, voyeurism, coercion, or public exposure.

Session 1. The Problem of Moral Particulars

Students see why abstract moral claims become more revealing when placed beside concrete cases.

Core objective

Students see why abstract moral claims become more revealing when placed beside concrete cases.

Teacher preparation

Print the case set. Prepare four neutral examples of abstract claims that become complex in particular cases.

Learning Outcomes

- Distinguish moral slogan, rule, principle, judgment, and explanation.
- Explain why hard cases expose hidden dependencies.
- Practice treating discomfort as data rather than as defeat.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-10	Opening norm: sincere inquiry is not betrayal.
10-25	Mini-lesson on abstraction, particulars, and moral pressure.
25-45	Silent first-pass reactions to five cases: no defense yet, only stance and intensity.
45-65	Small group sorting: easy, hard, volatile, unclear, and under-described cases.
65-82	Whole-group debrief on what changed when cases became concrete.
82-90	Exit card: one judgment I hold strongly, one judgment I cannot yet explain.

High-Yield Questions

- Which cases felt clear before you tried to explain them?
- What details did your mind add that were not stated in the moral particular?
- What would count as a principled answer rather than a reaction?

Between-session assignment

Write a one-page moral inventory: three strong stances, three hesitations, and one case you want to avoid but should not.

Session 2. Stance Before Defense

Students learn to state their actual judgment before supplying an explanation.

Core objective

Students learn to state their actual judgment before supplying an explanation.

Teacher preparation

Prepare four altered versions of one case so students can test how small wording changes move the stance.

Learning Outcomes

- Use the stance categories support, oppose, unsure, and qualifier-required.
- Separate the written proposition from nearby but different propositions.
- Identify when a qualifier changes the claim rather than clarifying it.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-12	Warm-up: what is the exact sentence asking?
12-30	Mini-lesson on proposition discipline and scope control.
30-52	Case surgery: students underline agents, actions, conditions, and moral predicate.
52-70	Qualifier lab: students add one qualifier, then test whether they now answer a different question.
70-86	Tool demo: every input applies to the selected particular only.
86-90	Exit card: the most common way I accidentally changed the question.

High-Yield Questions

- Are you answering the stated case or a neighboring case?
- Is your qualifier morally relevant, emotionally protective, or merely evasive?
- What would you need to know before your stance becomes responsible?

Between-session assignment

Choose two cases and write the most careful version of your stance in one sentence each.

Session 3. Authority Grounders

Students inspect Scripture, divine command, God's nature, tradition, and pastoral authority without flattening them into one bucket.

Core objective

Students inspect Scripture, divine command, God's nature, tradition, and pastoral authority without flattening them into one bucket.

Teacher preparation

Prepare a simple board with five lanes: Scripture, command, God's nature, tradition, pastors.

Learning Outcomes

- Name the difference between text, interpretation, authority, and application.
- Recognize when tradition or pastoral trust is doing the work Scripture is credited with doing.
- Ask what kind of authority would be sufficient for a concrete judgment.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-10	Opening reflection: what makes an answer feel Christian?
10-30	Mini-lesson on authority grounders and interpretive distance.
30-50	Grounder card drill: defend the same case from one assigned authority lane.
50-70	Mislabeling exercise: students identify when a claimed grounder is really another grounder.
70-85	Tool practice with two cases, weighting only authority grounders.
85-90	Exit card: one authority lane over-credit or under-credit.

High-Yield Questions

- Is the grounder the biblical text, a church interpretation of the text, or trust in a teacher?
- Could the same authority grounder support a different conclusion if interpreted differently?
- When does deference become moral outsourcing?

Between-session assignment

For one case, write a grounder paragraph that separates text, interpretation, and authority trust.

Session 4. Conscience, Spirit, Reason, and Love

Students learn to treat inward and rational grounders as inspectable without dismissing them.

Core objective

Students learn to treat inward and rational grounders as inspectable without dismissing them.

Teacher preparation

Prepare examples where conscience and social norm agree, conflict, and become hard to separate.

Learning Outcomes

- Distinguish conscience from social familiarity, emotional recoil, and spiritual certainty.
- Use reason, coherence, consequences, love of neighbor, and flourishing as distinct lanes.
- Explain why sincerity does not by itself settle moral accuracy.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-10	Check-in: one case where my conscience speaks loudly.
10-28	Mini-lesson on inward witness and public reasons.
28-48	Human slider line: students physically locate grounder strength from 0 to 10.
48-68	Reason and love test: does the same judgment survive when translated into harm, coherence, and neighbor-love language?
68-84	Tool practice: map three non-authority grounders for one case.
84-90	Exit card: which lane is hardest for me to separate from the others?

High-Yield Questions

- What makes a feeling morally informative rather than merely intense?
- Can love of neighbor oppose what my community taught me?
- When consequences matter, how do we keep them from becoming pure expediency?

Between-session assignment

Write one paragraph on a case where conscience and reason point in different directions.

Session 5. Slider Discipline and Weighting

Students learn that a grounder can be present, dominant, weak, or merely ornamental.

Core objective

Students learn that a grounder can be present, dominant, weak, or merely ornamental.

Teacher preparation

Prepare three sample profiles: Scripture-first, Spirit and conscience, Reason and harm.

Learning Outcomes

- Use 0-10 weights as comparative estimates, not false precision.
- Explain the difference between total weight, average weight, and coverage.
- Identify when too many high sliders hide a lack of discrimination.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-12	Warm-up: what does a 7 mean that a 4 does not mean?
12-30	Mini-lesson on disciplined estimation.
30-48	Profile seeding: students apply one starter profile, then revise it.
48-65	Calibration drill: compare two students' maps without asking who is right.
65-82	Coverage preview: why one giant case is different from five moderate cases.
82-90	Exit card: one slider I moved after realizing it was decorative.

High-Yield Questions

- Would your judgment change if this grounder were removed?
- Is the slider high because the grounder is decisive or because it sounds respectable?
- Which grounder carries load across cases rather than in only one case?

Between-session assignment

Map three cases privately and write two sentences explaining the lead grounder in each.

Session 6. Disagreement Diagnosis

Students learn to explain disagreement without laziness, contempt, or premature soul-reading.

Core objective

Students learn to explain disagreement without laziness, contempt, or premature soul-reading.

Teacher preparation

Prepare anonymized disagreement statements for three cases.

Learning Outcomes

- Use disagreement families: soul, method, social, affective, and mixed explanations.
- Distinguish unfamiliarity, confusion, competing interpretation, rebellion, and trauma.
- Practice charitable diagnosis that still permits serious moral critique.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-10	Opening rule: no diagnosing classmates.
10-30	Mini-lesson on explaining disagreement responsibly.
30-50	Disagreement court: teams argue for different diagnoses of the same dissent.
50-70	Charity pass: students rewrite the harshest diagnosis into a fairer possible account.
70-84	Tool practice: add disagreement ratings for two mapped cases.
84-90	Exit card: the diagnosis I reach for too quickly.

High-Yield Questions

- What evidence would justify a spiritual diagnosis rather than a methodological one?
- Could someone know the same texts and still disagree because they interpret differently?
- When is charity honest, and when is it avoidance?

Between-session assignment

Write the strongest non-rebellious explanation for someone disagreeing with one of your strong stances.

Session 7. Difficult Cases and Moral Safety

Students learn to inspect severe moral propositions without dramatizing, advocating, or dehumanizing.

Core objective

Students learn to inspect severe moral propositions without dramatizing, advocating, or dehumanizing.

Teacher preparation

Mark the most volatile cases. Prepare a calm opt-out procedure that preserves participation through written reflection.

Learning Outcomes

- Use slow reading and safety pauses for violent or identity-targeting claims.
- Distinguish analysis of a proposition from permission to enact it.
- Name moral risks in speech, humor, certainty, and group pressure.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-12	Safety covenant review and consent to serious inquiry.
12-28	Mini-lesson on analytical distance and moral responsibility.
28-45	Case triage: students identify what makes a case ethically dangerous to discuss poorly.
45-68	Slow map: one difficult case is read, paraphrased, bounded, and mapped.
68-82	Debrief: what helped maintain seriousness?
82-90	Exit card: one guardrail I need for honest work.

High-Yield Questions

- What harm could come from treating this case casually?
- What does the proposition actually permit, forbid, or require?
- Which grounders would need overwhelming force before coercion or violence could be justified?

Between-session assignment

Write a safety memo: how should a sincere group handle one volatile case without evasion or cruelty?

Session 8. Cross-Case Consistency

Students learn to compare cases for pattern drift, special pleading, and unstable disagreement explanations.

Core objective

Students learn to compare cases for pattern drift, special pleading, and unstable disagreement explanations.

Teacher preparation

Choose three case clusters: violence, sexuality, social belonging, civic obedience, generosity.

Learning Outcomes

- Identify nearby cases that should probably receive similar treatment.
- Notice when the grounder changes because the conclusion is desired.
- Use pattern checks as prompts for revision rather than accusations.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-10	Warm-up: one consistency test I find threatening.
10-30	Mini-lesson on case adjacency and moral analogies.
30-52	Cluster map: students group cases by moral feature rather than by topic label.
52-70	Drift hunt: compare grounders and disagreement diagnoses across a cluster.
70-84	Revision round: students adjust one stance, slider, or qualifier.
84-90	Exit card: one pattern I did not expect to see.

High-Yield Questions

- Which two cases are more structurally similar than they first appeared?
- Where did your disagreement diagnosis become harsher when the topic changed?
- What stable principle would explain both judgments?

Between-session assignment

Write a pattern-drift memo comparing two cases and identifying the most honest explanation for the difference.

Session 9. The Grounder Concentration Map

Students learn to read the graph as a dependency map rather than as decoration.

Core objective

Students learn to read the graph as a dependency map rather than as decoration.

Teacher preparation

Prepare one sample map with a broad grounder and one with a concentrated grounder.

Learning Outcomes

- Explain total weight, average weight, coverage, concentration, and unused lanes.
- Recognize the difference between broad dependence and narrow dependence.
- Use the map to ask what would happen if a lead grounder were disputed.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-10	Warm-up: what would make a moral map fragile?
10-28	Mini-lesson on concentration and effective spread.
28-48	Graph reading drill: students interpret lane height, weight, and coverage.
48-68	Stress question: if this grounder failed, how many judgments remain supported?
68-84	Tool practice: students read their own concentration map.
84-90	Exit card: the lane my map leans on most.

High-Yield Questions

- Is this grounder used often, or is it powerful in only one case?
- Does high average weight mean broad support or concentrated dependence?
- Which unused lanes might represent genuine absence, and which might represent under-reflection?

Between-session assignment

Write a graph interpretation paragraph: where the ledger leans and what that reveals.

Session 10. Report, AI Critique, and Intellectual Honesty

Students learn to export, critique, and revise their maps without outsourcing judgment.

Core objective

Students learn to export, critique, and revise their maps without outsourcing judgment.

Teacher preparation

Prepare a sample structured stress-test prompt and two different AI-style critiques of it.

Learning Outcomes

- Use the report as an audit trail of reasoning, not as a verdict.
- Prompt an LLM for critique while retaining responsibility for final judgment.
- Separate valid criticism from noise, flattening, or misunderstanding.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-10	Opening question: what would I want a fair critic to notice?
10-25	Mini-lesson on report reading and critique prompts.
25-45	Critique triage: mark comments as relevant, mistaken, too vague, or revision-worthy.
45-65	Revision lab: students make two changes and write why.
65-82	Pair share: defend one revision and one non-revision.
82-90	Exit card: a criticism I resisted but should consider.

High-Yield Questions

- Did the critic challenge your reasoning or merely your conclusion?
- What criticism would change a slider rather than a stance?
- When is refusing to revise an act of integrity rather than stubbornness?

Between-session assignment

Generate or simulate a critique of your map and write a revision log with at least three entries.

Session 11. Final Dossier Workshop

Students assemble a disciplined account of what their moral map reveals.

Core objective

Students assemble a disciplined account of what their moral map reveals.

Teacher preparation

Print the dossier template and assessment rubric.

Learning Outcomes

- Produce a coherent personal moral-particulars dossier.
- Explain one strengthened conviction, one softened stance, and one unresolved question.
- Use evidence from the tool rather than vague self-description.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-12	Review final dossier components.
12-32	Silent assembly: map summary, lead grounders, disagreement profile, concentration insight.
32-55	Peer protocol: one clarifying question, one charitable challenge, one suggested revision.
55-75	Writing sprint: students revise the final reflection.
75-88	Voluntary read-aloud of one insight.
88-90	Closing line: what honesty now asks of me.

High-Yield Questions

- What did your map reveal that your first reactions hid?
- Which change represents growth rather than social pressure?
- What remains unresolved in a way that deserves respect?

Between-session assignment

Finish the final dossier and prepare a three-minute presentation.

Session 12. Presentation and Sending

Students present mature, bounded reflections and leave with practices for future moral inquiry.

Core objective

Students present mature, bounded reflections and leave with practices for future moral inquiry.

Teacher preparation

Arrange the room for short presentations. Prepare certificates or letters if appropriate.

Learning Outcomes

- Communicate a moral map without weaponizing it.
- Receive critique with composure and answer without defensiveness.
- Name next practices for Scripture, dialogue, research, and self-examination.

90-Minute Flow

Time	Move
0-10	Opening reminder: presentation is testimony to inquiry, not courtroom victory.
10-62	Three-minute presentations with two-minute response windows.
62-76	Group synthesis: common grounders, common drift points, and hardest disagreements.
76-86	Next-practice planning: each student chooses a 30-day inquiry habit.
86-90	Closing blessing or secular equivalent: courage, humility, and care.

High-Yield Questions

- What did you learn about your own moral machinery?
- Where did your charity become more disciplined?
- What question will you continue carrying responsibly?

Between-session assignment

Optional: revisit the map after 30 days and write a one-page follow-up.

Appendix A. Tool Literacy

Students need enough technical literacy to understand the moral ledger without turning numbers into false certainty.

Element	Meaning	Teacher prompt
Mapped case	A case with stance, at least one grounder, and disagreement input.	Is this case complete enough to compare?
Lead grounder	The grounder with the strongest current weight.	Would the judgment remain if this grounder weakened?
Coverage	How many mapped cases use a lane with nonzero weight.	Is this broad dependence or a one-case spike?
Average weight	Total weight divided by mapped cases.	Does the lane shape the whole ledger or only one judgment?
Concentration	Visible weight carried by few cases.	Is the map fragile at this point?
Pattern drift	Grounders or diagnoses changing across similar cases.	Is the difference principled or convenient?

Numerical humility

The sliders are disciplined estimates. They help students compare their own judgments; they do not turn moral reasoning into measurement science.

Interpreting the Grounder Concentration Map

- Lane position identifies the grounder family.
- Height shows average or visible weight.
- Point or line thickness shows how many mapped cases depend on that grounder.
- A high lane with low coverage can mean fragile concentration.
- A moderate lane with broad coverage can mean a stable background dependency.
- Unused lanes may reveal genuine non-dependence or simply under-reflection.

Appendix B. Grounder Field Guide

These definitions should be taught as inspectable lanes, not as boxes students must fill to sound complete.

Grounder	What to ask
Scripture	Canonical texts and their apparent force in the case.
God's nature	Claims about divine character, holiness, justice, mercy, or goodness.
Divine command	A perceived divine requirement or prohibition.
Holy Spirit	Inner guidance, conviction, illumination, or spiritual prompting.
Conscience	Inward moral awareness, recoil, guilt, or felt obligation.
Church tradition	Inherited doctrine, practice, councils, teachers, or denominational memory.
Pastoral authority	Trust in pastors, elders, priests, mentors, or ecclesial guides.
Reason	Logical coherence, analogy, consistency, and public argument.
Love of neighbor	Neighbor-directed care, mercy, protection, and respect.
Human flourishing	Well-being, formation, vocation, community, and long-term good.
Social norms	Community expectations, inherited propriety, and familiar moral boundaries.
Consequences	Expected outcomes, harms, benefits, incentives, and practical effects.

Grounder integrity test

For each high slider ask: If this grounder were disputed, would my judgment weaken, change, or remain basically intact? The answer reveals whether the slider is carrying real load.

Appendix C. Disagreement Diagnosis Field Guide

The course should make students slower and fairer when explaining why someone disagrees.

Diagnosis	Responsible use
Spiritual rebellion	The dissenter is resisting God, authority, or moral truth.
Unredeemed soul	Disagreement is attributed to lacking regeneration or spiritual transformation.
Scripture unfamiliarity	The dissenter does not know relevant texts or teachings.
Interpretive confusion	The dissenter uses mistaken hermeneutics or misreads context.
Intellectual confusion	The dissenter is reasoning poorly, inconsistently, or incompletely.
Different facts	The disagreement turns on empirical claims, not only moral principles.
Social formation	Community, family, media, or culture shaped the person's reaction.
Affective resistance	Fear, disgust, pain, loyalty, trauma, or desire shapes the response.
Moral intuition conflict	The dissenter has a different ordering of mercy, justice, liberty, purity, and harm.
Reasoned alternative	The dissenter may have coherent grounds even if one rejects them.

The soul-reading boundary

Students may study spiritual explanations as part of Christian moral reasoning, but they may not assign those explanations to classmates. The classroom trains categories, not accusations.

Appendix D. Activity Bank

Use these activities whenever a session needs more movement, creativity, or pressure testing.

Activity	How it works	Best use
Human slider line	Students stand from 0 to 10 for a grounder, then explain why they stood there.	Slider calibration
Grounder cards	Students draw one grounder and must argue how it could carry or fail to carry a case.	Grounder literacy
Disagreement court	Teams argue different disagreement diagnoses, then the class evaluates evidence.	Charity and precision
Moral X-ray	Students label visible claim, hidden assumptions, emotional force, authority source, and imagined dissenter.	Hard cases
Case transplant	Move one principle into a different topic area and test whether it survives.	Pattern drift
One-grounder removal	Erase the strongest grounder and ask what remains.	Dependency testing
Silent map first	Students map privately before group discussion.	Reducing conformity pressure
Revision witness	A partner records what changed and why.	Revision integrity

Appendix E. Assignments in Full

These assignments produce the evidence for the final dossier.

Assignment	Instructions
Initial moral inventory	List every case as support, oppose, unsure, or qualifier-required. Add one sentence on emotional intensity and one sentence on needed information.
Grounder autopsy	Choose one strong judgment. Identify the top three grounders, explain why each has its weight, and name one grounder that sounds relevant but is not actually doing much work.
Disagreement charity memo	Choose one person who might sincerely disagree. Explain that disagreement without contempt, without evasion, and without assuming stupidity.
Pattern-drift memo	Compare two cases. Describe the relevant similarity, the difference in stance or grounders, and whether the difference is principled.
Critique and revision log	Use a peer, teacher, or LLM critique. Record at least three criticisms, your response, and any resulting map change.
Final dossier	Submit the map, report, concentration interpretation, strongest judgment, revised judgment, unresolved question, and final reflection.

Feedback rule

Respond to the quality of reasoning. A teacher can challenge a conclusion, but the formal feedback should reward clarity, honesty, charity, and responsible revision.

Appendix F. Assessment Rubric

Use this rubric for written work, presentations, and teacher conferences.

Dimension	Excellent	Developing	Needs attention
Claim precision	Answers the stated case and names scope limits.	Mostly answers the case but drifts under pressure.	Substitutes a neighboring claim or slogan.
Grounder honesty	Weights match the actual dependence of the judgment.	Grounders are plausible but sometimes decorative.	Invokes respectable sources without showing load.
Disagreement charity	Can explain sincere dissent without contempt or evasion.	Shows charity but still overuses one diagnosis.	Defaults to soul-reading, mockery, or dismissal.
Cross-case reasoning	Identifies pattern drift and revises responsibly.	Notices some drift but explains it thinly.	Treats each case in isolation to avoid pressure.
Revision quality	Changes are principled and documented.	Some changes are defensible but under-explained.	Changes are absent, reactive, or socially driven.

Suggested Weights

Category	Weight
Participation and preparation	15 percent
Short assignments	30 percent
Revision log	15 percent
Final dossier	30 percent
Final presentation	10 percent

Alternate non-grade model

For church, home, or informal cohorts, replace grades with three marks: clear, honest, and revisable. Students pass when their work displays all three.

Appendix G. Final Dossier Template

The final dossier is the durable product of the course.

Section	Student response
Map summary	How many cases were mapped, and which cases received the most attention?
Top grounders	Which lanes carried the most weight, and why?
Disagreement profile	Which diagnosis families appeared most often?
Concentration insight	Where does the grounder ledger lean? Is that dependence broad or narrow?
Strengthened conviction	What judgment became more stable after inspection?
Softened or revised judgment	What changed, and why was the change principled?
Unresolved question	What remains genuinely open?
Next practice	What will the student study, discuss, or remap within 30 days?

Three-Minute Presentation Frame

- 1 Name one hard case you handled with more precision than before.
- 2 Name the grounder your map leaned on most.
- 3 Name one fair criticism you received.
- 4 Name one change, non-change, or unresolved question you can defend.
- 5 End with one sentence: honesty now asks me to...

Appendix H. Facilitation Scripts

Use these scripts to keep the room disciplined without killing its energy.

When students rush

Slow down. We have not yet answered the written proposition. Before we defend or attack, restate the exact claim.

When someone soul-reads

That may be a category in the tool, but we are not assigning it to a person in this room. What public evidence would support that diagnosis?

When debate turns performative

The goal is not to win the room. The goal is to make the reasoning inspectable enough that a fair critic could understand it.

When uncertainty appears

Uncertainty is allowed. Now make it precise: what information, grounder, or principle would move you?

When a student feels exposed

You may move this answer to private writing. The inquiry continues, but performance is optional.

When a map looks inconsistent

Good. The tool is doing its job. We now ask whether the difference is principled, accidental, or protective.

Appendix I. Troubleshooting

Dynamic groups need contingencies. Use this page when the room gets stuck.

Problem	Likely cause	Teacher move
Students give only slogans	They are protecting identity or avoiding precision.	Ask for the exact grounder and what would weaken it.
One student dominates	Status competition or anxiety.	Use silent writing, timed turns, and role rotation.
Students refuse hard cases	Fear of conflict or moral contamination.	Use safety pause, private mapping, and slower case triage.
Students overuse spiritual rebellion	They are collapsing disagreement into loyalty.	Require two non-spiritual explanations before using a spiritual one.
Students overuse uncertainty	They may be hiding or genuinely under-informed.	Ask what information would move the stance and assign research.
Numbers feel fake	They are treating sliders as measurement.	Reframe weights as comparative dependence estimates.
The group polarizes	Students are arguing conclusions before mapping reasons.	Return to stance, grounders, and disagreement diagnosis separately.

Appendix J. Adaptations

The same core can serve different contexts if the teacher preserves stance, grounders, disagreement, patterns, and revision.

Context	Adaptation
Youth group	Use fewer cases, more movement, and stronger safety scripts. Keep private writing central.
College seminar	Add readings from moral philosophy, hermeneutics, epistemology, and moral psychology.
Mixed-belief group	Let students map from inside or outside Christian commitments; do not require confessional language.
Homeschool cohort	Extend assignments into family interviews and comparative tradition research.
Retreat	Use Sessions 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12 as an intensive arc.
Advanced apologetics class	Pair this curriculum with the Moral System Stress Test and ask whether system-level claims survive case-level mapping.

Do not adapt away the pressure

The course loses its purpose if students never map concrete cases, never explain disagreement, or never compare patterns across cases.

Appendix K. Printable One-Page Templates

These compact prompts can be copied into handouts or slides.

Template	Prompts
Case map	Stance. Qualifier. Top three grounders. Top disagreement diagnosis. What would change my answer?
Grounder autopsy	What carries the judgment? What sounds relevant but is weak? What would happen if the lead grounder failed?
Disagreement charity	What is the strongest non-contemptuous reason someone might disagree? What evidence would justify a harsher diagnosis?
Pattern drift	Which two cases are similar? Where did my reasoning change? Is the change principled?
Revision log	Original input. Criticism received. Revision made or refused. Reason.
Final reflection	My map revealed. My strongest grounder was. I revised. I still wonder. Honesty now asks me to.

Closing Counsel for the Teacher

The best version of this course is rigorous and humane at the same time.

- Do not rush to resolution. Young seekers often need permission to see complexity before they can responsibly own conviction.
- Do not make neutrality the hidden virtue. A student may become more confident after inspection, and that can be genuine growth.
- Do not make certainty the hidden virtue. A student may become less confident after inspection, and that can also be genuine growth.
- Keep returning to the map: stance, grounders, disagreement, patterns, critique, revision.
- End with agency. The student owns the next inquiry step.

Final line

A sincere seeker does not need a classroom that flatters certainty or flatters doubt. A sincere seeker needs a disciplined space where moral judgment can become visible, answerable, and more honest.