

## CURRICULUM

# Moral System Threshold

A full-fledged small-group curriculum for young, honest seekers who want to learn how to examine alleged moral systems with charity, rigor, and intellectual courage.

**This curriculum trains students to distinguish a moral source from a moral system, to identify the eight threshold components of coherence, and to revise weak claims without panic or performance.**

12 sessions

90 minutes each

Discussion-heavy

Threshold -> Stress Test  
-> Particulars

### Program promise

By the end, participants should be able to name a live moral claim, identify its route, assess all eight threshold components, explain the collapse risks, repair weak components, and judge whether the claim is ready to move into the advanced morality tools.

### Best for

Older teens, university-age students, and early adult seekers who are sincere, thoughtful, and ready to be challenged without being shamed.

### Teacher profile

A dynamic and creative teacher who likes live demos, role-play, whiteboard thinking, and public revision will make this curriculum come alive.

AT A GLANCE

# Course outcomes and teaching guardrails

Use this page before launch so the teacher remembers both what the curriculum is trying to build and what it must refuse to become.

## The six course-level outcomes

- Distinguish a moral source, a moral conclusion, and a coherent moral system without blurring them together.
- Identify the primary grounding route of a moral claim and explain the route-specific weaknesses it must answer.
- Evaluate all eight threshold components using the tool's real categories: Missing, Asserted, and Substantiated.
- Use collapse labels as diagnostic translation labels rather than as insults or debate shortcuts.
- Revise a live moral claim honestly when a hidden assumption is exposed, instead of protecting it with rhetoric.
- Decide whether a claim is ready for the Moral System Stress Test and, later, for Moral Particulars.

## Teaching guardrails

- Do not use the curriculum as a shortcut to proving a worldview true before the structure is even clear.
- Do not let students weaponize collapse labels against people rather than against weak architecture.
- Do not reward polished rhetoric over honest downgrades and repairs.
- Do not let the later tools replace the threshold question they presuppose.

## Signs the room is healthy

- Students begin asking route and component questions without prompting from the teacher.
- Participants revise their own ratings in public without embarrassment or theatrics.
- Disagreement becomes calmer because the underlying structure is clearer.
- The same live claim improves across multiple weeks instead of being abandoned for a fresher slogan.

OVERVIEW

# How the curriculum is meant to move

The sequence moves from distinctions, to architecture, to diagnosis, to transfer. The teacher should keep that arc visible every week rather than letting the group treat each session as a disconnected topic.

**PHASE 1**

**Distinctions and trust**

**Sessions 1-3**

Teach students to slow down, define the task, and separate source, route, and system.

**PHASE 2**

**Architecture**

**Sessions 4-8**

Work through the eight threshold components until students can name the real structural gaps.

**PHASE 3**

**Diagnosis and repair**

**Sessions 9-10**

Interpret the tool's outputs and turn collapse labels into repair plans rather than scorekeeping.

**PHASE 4**

**Transfer and capstone**

**Sessions 11-12**

Hand claims forward into the rest of the morality sequence and let learners defend revisions publicly.

## How to use the sequence

- Teach the tool as a discipline of moral clarity, not as a shortcut to winning arguments.
- Keep the same live claim visible across multiple weeks so students feel the difference between naming a route, repairing a component, and surviving later pressure.
- Return often to the distinction between a sincere source of conviction and a publicly coherent moral system.
- Use the tool live whenever possible so learners see architecture, not just hear vocabulary.

SEQUENCE MAP

# Twelve sessions in one view

Use this table for early planning, mid-course recalibration, and final capstone review.

Session	Core focus	Concrete output
1. Orientation: why this tool exists	What is the difference between sincerity, truth, coherence, and persuasion?	Write one sentence explaining what this curriculum tests before it tests whether a view is true.
2. Source versus system	When does a trusted source stop being only a source and start functioning as a full moral system?	List two things a source can provide and two things only a system can provide.
3. Grounding routes and route-specific pressure	What kind of route is carrying this claim, and what must that route especially answer?	Name one route family and the specific weakness it most needs to answer.
4. The rating system: Missing, Asserted, Substantiated	What justifies rating a component as substantiated rather than merely asserted?	Why does the tool treat an unsupported substantiated answer as asserted?
5. Moral Meaning and Truth Maker	What do moral words mean, and what in reality makes a moral claim true?	Name one way a claim can sound moral while still functioning as preference or power.
6. Authority Check and Moral Access	Why trust this authority, and how could ordinary people know when the standard has been handled well or badly?	What is the difference between having an authority and having a morally testable authority?
7. Binding Force and Case Guidance	Why ought anyone obey this claim, and how would the system decide a hard case under pressure?	What is one sign that a view offers values but not yet an action-guiding system?
8. Consistent Scope and Correction Method	Who is bound by this standard, and how would the system recognize and repair its own mistakes?	Why is a correction method necessary if a system claims to be guided by truth already?
9. Diagnosis profiles and collapse labels	What kind of structure is really present on the page right now, and what does the weakness currently collapse into?	Choose one collapse label and explain what concrete weakness it is naming.
10. Readiness map, revision discipline, and repair plans	How do we turn a threshold result into a concrete repair plan?	Write the next best repair question for one missing or asserted component.
11. Threshold to Stress Test and Particulars	When should a claim stay at Threshold, and when should it move into the next audits?	What remains to be tested after a claim clears threshold?
12. Capstone clinic and public revision	Can I present a live moral claim, receive architectural criticism, and repair it with intellectual honesty?	What threshold habit do I most want to keep using after this course ends?

**TEACHER SETUP**

# The posture, room, and rhythm matter

This curriculum is rigorous, but it should not feel combative. The environment must reward honesty, slowed-down thinking, and public repair.

### Discussion covenant

- Clarity before confidence.
- Structure before conclusion.
- Repair before rhetoric.
- Charity without vagueness.
- Public reasons over private intensity.
- Revision is a strength, not an embarrassment.

### Recommended room setup

- Circle or horseshoe seating so students can see each other think.
- One visible board or projected screen running the tool.
- Physical space for corners, continuums, or wall maps.
- Printed cards and markers available every week.

### Teacher mantras

- What is doing the work here?
- What still has to be supplied?
- Can an accountable outsider test this?
- Are we repairing the system or protecting the answer?

### Creative options to keep energy high

- Floor continuums and room corners
- Whiteboard architecture maps
- Role-play between sincere interpreters
- Claim clinics and public revisions

Time	Move	Why it matters
0-10 min	Warm opening	A provocative question, short case, or claim card surfaces the day's tension.
10-25 min	Mini-teaching	The teacher names the concept cleanly and shows where it appears in the tool.
25-45 min	Live model	The group watches one claim move through the threshold framework in real time.
45-65 min	Pair or triad work	Students test claims themselves with prompts, cards, or the actual tool.
65-80 min	Repair round	The group improves the weakest component rather than simply criticizing it.
80-90 min	Reflection and exit	Students name what is still thin, what improved, and what should happen next.

**ASSESSMENT**

# Assessment, delivery, and materials

The best evidence of growth is not louder certainty. It is cleaner distinctions, better grounding notes, calmer revision, and stronger transfer judgment.

Assessment	What it reveals
Pre-course diagnostic	Each participant writes one moral claim and answers: what makes it true, why it binds, and how someone else could know it.
Weekly exit tickets	One sharp prompt each week checks whether the student can name the weak component, the collapse risk, and the next repair question.
Mid-course oral check	Pairs explain a route family and two threshold components aloud, without notes, while another pair listens for hidden assumptions.
Component memos	Short written defenses force the student to substantiate selected components instead of merely gesturing toward them.
Capstone presentation	Each participant presents a live moral claim, receives threshold questions, revises one weak component, and explains readiness for the Stress Test.

### What to listen for

- Does the student confuse a source with a system?
- Does the student rate too generously?
- Can the student explain why a collapse label appears?
- Can the student propose a repair path instead of stopping at criticism?

### Capstone standard

A successful capstone presentation is not the one with the fewest weaknesses. It is the one that names the route clearly, rates the components honestly, welcomes pressure, and revises at least one weak lane in public.

### How to interpret growth in this room

- Students make cleaner distinctions between source, route, conclusion, and system.
- Grounding notes get shorter, sharper, and more public rather than more decorative.
- Students become more willing to downgrade weak components honestly before trying to repair them.
- Transfer judgments become calmer: participants can say why a claim should stay at Threshold or move forward.

IMPLEMENTATION

# Delivery formats, launch prep, and materials

This page turns the curriculum from a good document into a teachable event. Use it to choose a format, prepare the room, and keep the weekly work cumulative.

## Twelve-week standard path

Best for churches, campus groups, and study cohorts that want paced reflection, repeated practice, and enough time for students to revise claims between meetings.

## Six-week intensive path

Combine Sessions 1-2, 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, 9-10, and 11-12. Keep the same capstone expectations, but require more between-session writing and quicker claim revision.

## Retreat or weekend path

Use the route, component, and diagnosis material in larger blocks, then make the capstone a live clinic on the final afternoon. This works best for mature groups that can handle sustained concentration.

## Material kit to prepare before launch

- Printed route cards and threshold component cards
- Large readiness-map poster or wall-lane kit
- Claim clinic worksheets and capstone feedback forms
- Markers, sticky notes, floor tape, and a visible writing surface
- A short pre-course teacher note that explains why revision is a course virtue

## Launch checklist before session 1

- Send a short pre-course note explaining that public revision will be treated as a strength.
- Choose two or three live claims that can recur throughout the course instead of resetting every week.
- Print route cards, component cards, diagnosis labels, and capstone feedback sheets before the first meeting.
- Test the threshold tool, stress-test handoff, and any projector or browser setup in advance.

## Between-session teacher disciplines

- Review exit tickets and note which threshold components still bottleneck the room.
- Carry at least one live claim forward so students can see what real revision looks like over time.
- Track recurring route confusions and name them explicitly at the start of the next meeting.
- Invite short written repairs between sessions instead of letting weak answers simply disappear.

SESSION 1 · PHASE 1 · DISTINCTIONS AND TRUST

# Orientation: why this tool exists

Open the course by defining the task cleanly: this curriculum tests whether a moral claim has enough visible architecture to count as a system at all.

### Essential question

What is the difference between sincerity, truth, coherence, and persuasion?

### Learning outcomes

- Explain why the threshold tool is preliminary rather than final.
- Name the course covenant and why revision is treated as a strength.
- Spot the difference between a forceful moral claim and a structured one.

## Session setup

### Before you teach

- Print the discussion covenant and the opening claim cards.
- Choose three sample moral statements: one thin, one middling, one strong.
- Set the room in a circle with a visible board or shared screen.

### Materials

- Threshold tool on screen
- Claim cards
- Index cards and markers
- Whiteboard or paper pad

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-12	Opening sort	Students sort example statements into sincere, persuasive, true-sounding, and structurally coherent.
12-25	Mini-teaching	Teacher defines the four categories and names the course covenant.
25-42	Live demo	Run one thin claim through the opening screen of the threshold tool.
42-62	Triad talk	Students share where they usually confuse confidence with coherence.
62-80	Repair round	As a group, rewrite one thin claim so it becomes more structurally serious.
80-90	Exit ticket	Students answer: what would count as visible moral architecture?

SESSION 1 NOTES

# Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

## Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** Use four room corners labeled Sincerity, Truth, Coherence, and Persuasion. Read a moral sentence aloud and ask students to stand where they think the sentence is strongest and weakest.

- Keep repeating: the tool is not punishing conviction; it is clarifying architecture.
- Reward the first student who changes their mind publicly after hearing a better distinction.
- Translate emotionally loaded claims into quieter architectural questions.

## Watch-fors and close

### Common confusions:

- Students may think coherence means certainty.
- Some may assume the tool is an anti-Christian trap instead of an honesty device.
- Others may think weak structure already means false belief; slow that down immediately.

**Exit ticket:** Write one sentence explaining what this curriculum tests before it tests whether a view is true.

**Assignment:** Bring one moral claim you really believe and one you hear often in church, school, or online discourse.

## Threshold payoff for this week

Students should leave able to explain why this curriculum tests coherence before it tests final truth.

SESSION 2 · PHASE 1 · DISTINCTIONS AND TRUST

# Source versus system

Most seekers can name a source of moral confidence long before they can describe a full system. This session turns that confusion into a teachable distinction.

### Essential question

When does a trusted source stop being only a source and start functioning as a full moral system?

### Learning outcomes

- Distinguish source, conclusion, rulebook, intuition set, and moral system.
- Explain why scripture, conscience, or flourishing can be real starting points without yet being a complete architecture.
- Use the phrase 'rule source with hidden assumptions' accurately.

### Session setup

#### Before you teach

- Prepare a card deck labeled source, system, conclusion, intuition, and rulebook.
- Choose a scripture-centered sample claim and a flourishing-centered sample claim.
- Mark one claim that feels persuasive but lacks clear architecture.

#### Materials

- Classification cards
- Sticky notes
- Large poster labeled Source / System / Conclusion

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-10	Warm-up	Students place their homework claims on the poster and explain why.
10-24	Teaching	Teacher distinguishes a moral source from a public moral architecture.
24-45	Card lab	Pairs classify statements and defend why each belongs where it does.
45-65	Tool connection	Run one authority claim and one practical claim through the threshold opening.
65-82	Repair round	Take one 'source only' claim and list what must be added for system-level coherence.
82-90	Exit	Students name the most common confusion they now notice.

SESSION 2 NOTES

## Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

### Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** Use a giant floor continuum from 'mere source' to 'candidate moral system' and have participants physically place sample claims on it.

- Do not let students hide behind the prestige of sacred language.
- Whenever someone says 'because the Bible says so,' ask what still has to be supplied for that to become a full public system.
- Celebrate careful distinctions more than quick answers.

### Watch-fors and close

**Common confusions:**

- Students may assume calling something a source is dismissive.
- Some will think a system means cold rationalism rather than structured clarity.
- Others may confuse one correct conclusion with a stable architecture.

**Exit ticket:** List two things a source can provide and two things only a system can provide.

**Assignment:** Interview a friend or parent informally: ask what makes a moral belief count as more than personal conviction.

### Threshold payoff for this week

Students should now be able to say when a view is still functioning as a source, intuition set, or rulebook rather than a full moral architecture.

SESSION 3 • PHASE 1 • DISTINCTIONS AND TRUST

# Grounding routes and route-specific pressure

The route selector is not a verdict. It identifies which path is supposed to carry the claim so that the right weakness can be tested first.

### Essential question

What kind of route is carrying this claim, and what must that route especially answer?

### Learning outcomes

- Identify authority, inner, practical, and hybrid routes.
- Name the route-specific pressure each family must answer.
- Avoid swapping routes opportunistically when one path becomes difficult.

## Session setup

### Before you teach

- Prepare route cards with short example claims.
- Choose one hybrid claim that quietly changes routes when challenged.
- Have the route selector open on screen.

### Materials

- Route family cards
- Projector or shared screen
- Tape for a four-zone floor map

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-12	Route map	Students stand in one of four route zones after hearing sample claims.
12-28	Teaching	Teacher explains why each route family faces a particular structural pressure.
28-50	Live audit	Run three sample claims and discuss which route is actually doing the work.
50-70	Pair drill	Students rewrite a claim if its route is unclear or hidden.
70-84	Hybrid lab	Examine what makes a hybrid claim coherent rather than evasive.
84-90	Exit	Students answer: which route do I instinctively trust, and why?

SESSION 3 NOTES

## Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

### Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** Give the same moral sentence to four groups and ask each group to defend it from a different route. Then compare what changes.

- Ask 'Which route is load-bearing?' whenever a claim sounds blended.
- Model charitable suspicion: maybe the student is not confused, but the route may still be unclear.
- Use the tool's own route labels so the curriculum stays synchronized with the app.

### Watch-fors and close

**Common confusions:**

- Students may mistake a supporting reason for the primary route.
- Some may think hybrid always means stronger; show that it can also conceal contradiction.
- Others may think route choice already decides truth; it does not.

**Exit ticket:** Name one route family and the specific weakness it most needs to answer.

**Assignment:** Bring a moral claim whose route is difficult to identify and be ready to defend your guess.

### Threshold payoff for this week

Students should be able to identify the load-bearing route of a claim and name the pressure that route must especially answer.

SESSION 4 · PHASE 2 · ARCHITECTURE

# The rating system: Missing, Asserted, Substantiated

This session trains honesty. Learners must stop awarding themselves strength they have not yet shown on the page.

### Essential question

What justifies rating a component as substantiated rather than merely asserted?

### Learning outcomes

- Use all three ratings without inflating weak answers.
- Explain why an unsupported substantiated click still counts as asserted in the tool.
- Practice grounding-note discipline as part of serious moral reasoning.

## Session setup

### Before you teach

- Prepare three versions of the same component answer: missing, asserted, substantiated.
- Open the tool to a component card with an empty support box.
- Print the warning language about empty grounding notes.

### Materials

- Rating cards
- Sample grounding notes
- Threshold tool with warning state visible

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-10	Warm-up	Students rank three anonymous answers from strongest to weakest and defend their order.
10-26	Teaching	Teacher explains the rating logic and the numerical rule for empty support boxes.
26-48	Live calibration	Group rates multiple sample answers and then compares against the tool's own standard.
48-68	Pair repair	Students rewrite one asserted answer until it becomes honestly substantiated.
68-84	Warning drill	Click substantiated with no note and discuss why the tool refuses to trust the label alone.
84-90	Exit	Students define the difference between an answer that sounds complete and one that actually carries weight.

SESSION 4 NOTES

## Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

### Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** Project three anonymous grounding notes and let the room vote by holding up Missing, Asserted, or Substantiated cards before discussing.

- Treat the empty-note warning as a moral virtue lesson about intellectual honesty.
- Press for actual support: not 'Jesus' or 'love,' but what role that answer is supposed to play.
- Praise students who downgrade their own earlier ratings after hearing better standards.

### Watch-fors and close

**Common confusions:**

- Students may think long wording automatically counts as substantiation.
- Some may confuse emotional resonance with explanatory support.
- Others may think asserted is a failure; teach that it is often a healthy honest midpoint.

**Exit ticket:** Why does the tool treat an unsupported substantiated answer as asserted?

**Assignment:** Write one asserted answer and one substantiated answer for the same component so we can compare them next week.

### Threshold payoff for this week

Students should now rate components more honestly and explain why empty support cannot count as full substantiation.

SESSION 5 • PHASE 2 • ARCHITECTURE

# Moral Meaning and Truth Maker

These first components govern whether moral language has stable content and whether moral claims can be true rather than merely affirmed.

### Essential question

What do moral words mean, and what in reality makes a moral claim true?

### Learning outcomes

- Explain the difference between using moral vocabulary and defining its content.
- Identify when a claim collapses into preference, pressure, or slogan-level rhetoric.
- Practice building stronger answers for Moral Meaning and Truth Maker together.

### Session setup

#### Before you teach

- Prepare statements that use words like good, wrong, sacred, or duty without definition.
- Choose one flourishing claim and one scripture claim for comparison.
- Place 'vocabulary without content' and 'preference or power' visibly in the room.

#### Materials

- Word-definition cards
- Sample claims
- Board space for definition trees

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-10	Warm-up	Students define wrong, good, and obligation in one sentence each.
10-28	Teaching	Teacher explains why undefined moral language and thin truth claims collapse quickly.
28-50	Word tree exercise	Group builds a map showing how a route gives moral words content.
50-68	Truth-maker lab	Students test whether a claim sounds true because of preference, command, or actual explanation.
68-84	Repair round	Rewrite one weak meaning answer and one weak truth-maker answer.
84-90	Exit	Students state one question they should now ask whenever someone says 'that's just wrong.'

SESSION 5 NOTES

## Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

### Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** Put the word 'wrong' at the center of a board and force the group to trace what the route thinks that word actually refers to.

- Keep asking whether the claim has content or only intensity.
- Push students to separate a truth source from a truth maker.
- Invite analogies, but make sure they cash out into precise meaning.

### Watch-fors and close

**Common confusions:**

- Students may think a familiar moral word needs no definition.
- Some may offer a source where a truth maker is required.
- Others may assume disagreement proves there is no truth maker; slow that inference down.

**Exit ticket:** Name one way a claim can sound moral while still functioning as preference or power.

**Assignment:** Write a one-paragraph answer to either Moral Meaning or Truth Maker using a claim you personally care about.

### Threshold payoff for this week

Students should be able to distinguish moral language from moral content and say what would make a claim true rather than merely admired.

SESSION 6 • PHASE 2 • ARCHITECTURE

# Authority Check and Moral Access

A system needs more than authority; it needs a morally testable authority and a public way for accountable people to know the standard.

### Essential question

Why trust this authority, and how could ordinary people know when the standard has been handled well or badly?

### Learning outcomes

- Explain the difference between invoking authority and justifying authority.
- Identify when a claim leaves seekers with a hidden standard they cannot test.
- Practice giving public access routes without collapsing into subjectivism.

## Session setup

### Before you teach

- Prepare one authority claim and one conscience claim with dispute built into them.
- Collect two examples of Christians disagreeing over application.
- Set up a short role-play of interpretation conflict.

### Materials

- Role-play cards
- Interpretation dispute prompt
- Threshold component cards

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-12	Role-play	Two volunteers give different confident interpretations of the same moral claim.
12-28	Teaching	Teacher distinguishes authority itself from an Authority Check and then public access from private conviction.
28-48	Interpretation lab	Small groups answer: how would an outsider test who is reading the standard better?
48-70	Access drill	Groups map the route by which a seeker is supposed to know, apply, and contest the standard.
70-84	Repair round	Add one missing public test or interpretive rule to a weak authority claim.
84-90	Exit	Students state why hidden standards feel morally serious but remain structurally weak.

SESSION 6 NOTES

## Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

### Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** Run a 'two sincere interpreters' scene and ask the room what, if anything, would count as a responsible moral test between them.

- Be gentle with students who fear public tests will dishonor faith; show that faith and accountability are not enemies.
- Ask whether the route leaves ordinary accountable people responsible for a standard they cannot reliably access.
- When students say 'the Spirit will guide,' ask how misguidance would be detected.

### Watch-fors and close

#### Common confusions:

- Students may think asking for authority checks is rebellion.
- Some may offer personal confidence where public access is required.
- Others may assume public access means no mystery at all; clarify that it means usable accountability.

**Exit ticket:** What is the difference between having an authority and having a morally testable authority?

**Assignment:** Write one paragraph describing how an ordinary person could know whether your chosen route was being interpreted well.

### Threshold payoff for this week

Students should now ask how a moral standard is publicly known and why its authority counts as morally trustworthy before obedience begins.

SESSION 7 · PHASE 2 · ARCHITECTURE

# Binding Force and Case Guidance

A system must explain obligation itself and show how real decisions are made before the preferred answer is assumed.

### Essential question

Why ought anyone obey this claim, and how would the system decide a hard case under pressure?

### Learning outcomes

- Distinguish obligation from threat, reward, prudence, and usefulness.
- Identify when a view has ideals but lacks decision rules.
- Practice using hard cases to expose whether the system guides action or only approves outcomes after the fact.

## Session setup

### Before you teach

- Choose one costly obedience scenario and one conflict-of-duties scenario.
- Prepare a case where two virtues point in different directions.
- Bring sticky notes labeled ought, fear, benefit, and loyalty.

### Materials

- Hard-case sheets
- Duty-conflict cards
- Sticky notes

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-10	Warm-up	Students identify whether sample motivations express obligation, reward, fear, or convenience.
10-26	Teaching	Teacher explains why obligation and case-guidance are separate but connected components.
26-48	Hard-case round	Groups work through a dilemma before they are allowed to announce the answer they like.
48-68	Guidance map	Students list the rules, priorities, or interpretive moves the system would need in order to decide.
68-84	Repair round	Strengthen one thin explanation of why the claim binds and one weak decision procedure.
84-90	Exit	Students finish the sentence: a framework is not yet a moral system if it cannot ...

SESSION 7 NOTES

## Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

### Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** Make the group answer a hard case in silence first, then force them to explain the path to the answer before they defend the answer itself.

- Do not let 'love' or 'be faithful' stand in for an actual ranking principle.
- Ask what the system would require if obedience became costly and invisible.
- When students offer a result, redirect them to the path that got there.

### Watch-fors and close

**Common confusions:**

- Students may confuse feeling strongly obligated with explaining obligation.
- Some will turn difficult cases into testimony instead of analysis.
- Others may think every hard case requires certainty rather than a disciplined path to judgment.

**Exit ticket:** What is one sign that a view offers values but not yet an action-guiding system?

**Assignment:** Bring one difficult case your tradition or community argues about and explain why it is hard.

### Threshold payoff for this week

Students should be able to explain why a system binds and how it decides hard cases before the preferred answer is assumed.

SESSION 8 • PHASE 2 • ARCHITECTURE

# Consistent Scope and Correction Method

A serious moral system must say who is bound, treat like cases alike, and admit when it has interpreted badly without turning every change into a victory lap.

### Essential question

Who is bound by this standard, and how would the system recognize and repair its own mistakes?

### Learning outcomes

- Identify special pleading when exceptions quietly protect favored people or institutions.
- Explain why correction cannot simply mean 'whatever we now say is right.'
- Practice naming concrete criteria for revision rather than ad hoc rescue moves.

### Session setup

#### Before you teach

- Prepare examples where a rule is applied differently to insiders and outsiders.
- Bring one case of moral revision in church or public life.
- Print two cards: special pleading and ad hoc revision.

#### Materials

- Case comparison sheets
- Revision examples
- Scope-mapping worksheet

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-10	Warm-up	Students compare two like cases and identify whether they are being treated alike.
10-26	Teaching	Teacher explains scope and correction as the components that protect a system from favoritism and improvisation.
26-48	Case comparison	Pairs analyze one insider/outsider discrepancy and one historical revision claim.
48-68	Repair lab	Groups define who is bound, what counts as a misreading, and what would trigger correction.
68-84	Whole-group challenge	Students test whether the repair path is principled or merely convenient.
84-90	Exit	Students answer: how could a system confess error without collapsing?

SESSION 8 NOTES

## Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

### Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** Place two apparently similar cases on opposite sides of the room and ask the group to justify every difference in treatment aloud.

- Keep insisting on like cases and stable criteria.
- Treat revision as potentially virtuous, but only when the correction method is visible and principled.
- Ask students what would count as a real failure for their view rather than only a misunderstood success.

### Watch-fors and close

**Common confusions:**

- Students may think scope only means who is saved rather than who is morally bound.
- Some may interpret every change as hypocrisy; others may interpret every change as growth. Show why method matters.
- Others may avoid naming criteria because doing so feels too final. Encourage responsible specificity.

**Exit ticket:** Why is a correction method necessary if a system claims to be guided by truth already?

**Assignment:** Write a short explanation of how your preferred route would distinguish faithful correction from ad hoc rescue.

### Threshold payoff for this week

Students should now see how scope and correction keep a system from favoritism, convenience, and after-the-fact rescue.

SESSION 9 • PHASE 3 • DIAGNOSIS AND REPAIR

# Diagnosis profiles and collapse labels

Students now need to interpret the tool's outputs without triumphalism. Diagnosis is translation, not ridicule.

### Essential question

What kind of structure is really present on the page right now, and what does the weakness currently collapse into?

### Learning outcomes

- Read the tool's main diagnosis profiles accurately.
- Explain why collapse labels are clarifying descriptions rather than insults.
- Use diagnosis language to direct repair instead of escalating conflict.

## Session setup

### Before you teach

- Prepare screenshots or printed outputs from several threshold results.
- Choose at least one example from each major diagnosis band.
- Write the diagnosis ladder where students can see it.

### Materials

- Diagnosis samples
- Collapse-label cards
- Highlighters

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-10	Warm-up	Students guess what kind of result produced a given diagnosis card.
10-26	Teaching	Teacher explains the ladder from conclusions without architecture to candidate moral system.
26-48	Diagnosis gallery	Small groups rotate through sample outputs and explain what each one means.
48-68	Collapse translation	Students pair a weak component with its collapse label and then state the repair question it implies.
68-84	Language discipline	Practice saying difficult things without insult or overclaiming.
84-90	Exit	Students define one diagnosis label in their own words.

SESSION 9 NOTES

## Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

### Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** Create a wall gallery of printed diagnosis panels and let students annotate them with 'what this means' and 'what should happen next.'

- Correct students who weaponize diagnosis labels too quickly.
- Push for calm translation: what is the view functioning like right now?
- Ask every group to pair a diagnosis with a repair path, not just a criticism.

### Watch-fors and close

**Common confusions:**

- Students may think a diagnosis label is a final verdict on the person.
- Some may treat collapse labels as debate ammunition rather than architectural shorthand.
- Others may overuse the strongest label when a milder one is more accurate.

**Exit ticket:** Choose one collapse label and explain what concrete weakness it is naming.

**Assignment:** Take one claim from your own life and predict what diagnosis it would likely receive before testing it.

### Threshold payoff for this week

Students should be able to read diagnosis labels as translation tools and immediately pair them with the next repair question.

SESSION 10 • PHASE 3 • DIAGNOSIS AND REPAIR

# Readiness map, revision discipline, and repair plans

The readiness map is a compact coaching instrument. Students must learn to use it to revise the weakest lane first instead of drifting into vague generalities.

### Essential question

How do we turn a threshold result into a concrete repair plan?

### Learning outcomes

- Read the readiness map as a bottleneck display rather than a prestige chart.
- Name the next repair question for each missing or asserted lane.
- Practice iterating a claim without losing track of its original route and goal.

## Session setup

### Before you teach

- Prepare large printed lanes for the eight components.
- Choose one sample claim with a mixed pattern of missing, asserted, and substantiated statuses.
- Open the threshold page to the diagnosis area.

### Materials

- Readiness map poster
- Component lane cards
- Markers and sticky dots

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-10	Warm-up	Students predict which component lanes usually bottleneck their own preferred route.
10-24	Teaching	Teacher explains the map, the counts, and why effective status matters more than the clicked button alone.
24-46	Map walk	Students physically place component cards at missing, asserted, or substantiated for a sample claim.
46-66	Repair planning	Groups choose the weakest lane and write the next serious clarifying question.
66-84	Iteration demo	Teacher revises a claim and shows how the map changes without changing the route opportunistically.

84-90	Exit	Students state what makes a repair plan concrete rather than motivational.
-------	------	--

SESSION 10 NOTES

## Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

### Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** Build the readiness map on the wall and let students move component cards after each new grounding note is added.

- Teach students to attack bottlenecks, not every weakness at once.
- Keep route fidelity in view: revision should strengthen the route, not quietly replace it.
- Whenever a student gets discouraged, point to the map as an architectural to-do list rather than a verdict.

### Watch-fors and close

**Common confusions:**

- Students may see the map as a score or badge rather than a revision guide.
- Some may revise by changing the route instead of repairing the component.
- Others may treat every asserted lane as equally urgent; help them prioritize load-bearing weaknesses.

**Exit ticket:** Write the next best repair question for one missing or asserted component.

**Assignment:** Revise one of your own earlier claims and bring the before/after versions.

### Threshold payoff for this week

Students should now use the readiness map as a bottleneck display that directs revision rather than as a prestige score.

SESSION 11 · PHASE 4 · TRANSFER AND CAPSTONE

# Threshold to Stress Test and Particulars

The threshold tool is the intake gate, not the whole sequence. Students must learn what clearing threshold does and does not establish.

### Essential question

When should a claim stay at Threshold, and when should it move into the next audits?

### Learning outcomes

- Explain what the threshold handoff preloads into the Stress Test.
- Distinguish readiness from victory.
- Show how later tools can send a claim back here for revision.

### Session setup

#### Before you teach

- Open the threshold and stress-test handoff links.
- Choose one claim that should move forward and one that should stay back.
- Prepare a short explanation of reverse handoff for revision.

#### Materials

- Threshold and Stress Test pages
- Handoff legend
- Comparison worksheet

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-10	Warm-up	Students decide which sample claim is ready to move on and defend the choice.
10-26	Teaching	Teacher explains the handoff legend and why missing, asserted, and substantiated transfer differently.
26-46	Live handoff	Carry a real threshold result into the Stress Test and inspect what preloads.
46-66	Return loop	Show how a hidden assumption discovered later should send the claim back for threshold repair.
66-82	Particulars bridge	Preview how coherent architecture must still survive concrete cases.
82-90	Exit	Students answer: what does threshold success still leave unanswered?

SESSION 11 NOTES

## Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

### Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** Run a visible two-way handoff: forward into Stress Test, then back again when a pressure point is exposed.

- Refuse the temptation to present threshold success as final proof.
- Model joy in revision by showing a claim return for strengthening rather than treating that return as failure.
- Keep the sequence visible: Threshold, Stress Test, Particulars.

### Watch-fors and close

#### Common confusions:

- Students may think threshold met means debate won.
- Some may think later pressure invalidates the threshold tool; show that it actually fulfills it.
- Others may think reverse handoff is regression rather than discipline.

**Exit ticket:** What remains to be tested after a claim clears threshold?

**Assignment:** Prepare your capstone claim with route, notes, likely weak lane, and a guess about readiness.

### Threshold payoff for this week

Students should be able to explain what clearing threshold still leaves to be tested in Stress Test and Particulars.

SESSION 12 · PHASE 4 · TRANSFER AND CAPSTONE

# Capstone clinic and public revision

The course culminates in live threshold work. Students must demonstrate route clarity, architectural honesty, and the courage to revise in public.

### Essential question

Can I present a live moral claim, receive architectural criticism, and repair it with intellectual honesty?

### Learning outcomes

- Present one live moral claim and identify its route and likely bottlenecks.
- Respond to peer questions without hiding behind slogans.
- Revise at least one weak component and explain whether the claim should now move forward.

### Session setup

#### Before you teach

- Collect capstone claims ahead of time and order them for pacing.
- Print the capstone rubric and feedback sheets.
- Decide whether each presentation will be live-tool or paper-based.

#### Materials

- Capstone rubric
- Peer feedback sheets
- Threshold tool or printed template

Time	Teacher move	Purpose
0-10	Opening covenant	Remind the room that the goal is serious clarity, not performance humiliation.
10-70	Presentations	Students present claims, receive threshold questions, and revise one weak component live.
70-82	Reflection	Each student explains what changed and what still needs work.
82-90	Commissioning	Teacher names the habits students should carry into real conversations.

SESSION 12 NOTES

## Facilitation notes and close

Use this page while the room is active: it holds the creative exercise, the teacher instincts to keep repeating, the likely confusions, and the final closing move.

### Facilitation notes

**Signature exercise:** End with a public 'I changed my mind here' moment from every participant, even if the change is small.

- Protect the atmosphere of courage; stop mockery immediately.
- Keep peer feedback tied to components, routes, and repair paths.
- Praise the best revision in the room, not the most polished starting position.

### Watch-fors and close

**Common confusions:**

- Students may present apologetic speeches instead of threshold analysis.
- Some may fear that revision means defeat; actively reframe that in front of the group.
- Others may overcorrect and collapse all confidence into uncertainty. Help them distinguish humility from confusion.

**Exit ticket:** What threshold habit do I most want to keep using after this course ends?

**Assignment:** Optional: move your revised claim into the Moral System Stress Test or Moral Particulars Audit and journal what changes.

### Threshold payoff for this week

Students should leave with one publicly revised claim and a stronger instinct to welcome pressure before borrowing moral certainty.

APPENDIX A

# Route and component cheat sheets

These tables let the teacher keep the whole logic of the tool visible while the weekly lessons zoom in on smaller questions.

Route family	What it includes	Main pressure
Authority routes	Divine command, Scripture, God's nature, Church tradition	These routes especially need Authority Check and public Moral Access to be strong.
Inner routes	Holy Spirit, Conscience	These routes especially need public access, testing, and dispute-resolution clarity.
Practical routes	Reason / natural law, Harm / flourishing	These routes especially need Truth Maker and Binding Force to be explicit.
Hybrid route	Hybrid / mixed route	This route must state which parts of the blend are truly load-bearing and how they fit together.

Component	What the student must supply	If weak or absent
Moral Meaning	Define moral terms before using them.	Vocabulary without content
Truth Maker	Explain what makes the claim true.	Preference or power
Authority Check	Show why the authority should be trusted as morally good.	Obedience without moral test
Moral Access	Explain how accountable people know and test the standard.	Hidden standard
Binding Force	Show why the view obligates rather than merely advises.	Practical advice
Case Guidance	Show how the system decides difficult cases.	Abstraction without decisions
Consistent Scope	Show who is bound and how like cases stay alike.	Special pleading
Correction Method	Show how error is identified and repaired.	Ad hoc revision

APPENDIX B

# Capstone rubric and question bank

The rubric should keep the final session honest, while the question bank keeps the teacher supplied with threshold-style prompts all term.

Criterion	What strong performance looks like
Route clarity	The student identifies which route is carrying the claim and does not swap routes mid-explanation.
Architectural honesty	The student rates components carefully and does not confuse strong language with strong support.
Substantiation quality	Grounding notes name what is actually doing the work rather than repeating the conclusion.
Collapse literacy	The student can explain what a missing component currently collapses into and why.
Repair capacity	The student can propose the next serious repair question instead of only criticizing the gap.
Transfer judgment	The student can justify whether the claim should remain at Threshold or move into Stress Test.

## Reusable threshold questions

• What is doing the work here?	• What makes that moral claim true rather than merely approved?
• Why should this authority count as morally trustworthy before obedience begins?	• How could an accountable outsider know whether your interpretation is right?
• What explains obligation here rather than utility, threat, or reward?	• How would this view decide the hard case before the preferred answer is known?
• Who is bound by this standard, and why are like cases treated alike?	• How would this system admit that it got something wrong and then repair it?