




STAGE OF LESSON		PLAN: What is your plan?	
I	INTRODUCE LESSON GOAL 1-2 minutes	To further our understanding of ethical reasoning	
M	MOTIVATE with a HOOK	Warm up Games – Scenarios - You are in a hot air balloon above of the ocean when it stops working and starts to descend. You are with 5 of your friends and me (your teacher). You are all slowly descending to the ocean where there are hundreds of sharks ready to rip you apart. You could continue to stay in the air if there wasn't so much weight in the balloon. You've already thrown all the items out, and it seems you need to lose about the same amount of weight as I (your teacher) weigh. You can throw me out into the ocean and I will be eaten by sharks, meaning you will be able to continue hovering in the air and not get eaten by the sharks. Or you can do nothing and the balloon will slowly descend, meaning we will all be eaten by sharks. What is your decision? Why? What ethical reason is it based on (utilitarian or deontological)?	Students are introduced to another scenario where complex ethical decision making is required. Students are required to act according to their intuition, then recall and understand which approach they used based on the previous lesson.
P	PRIME with PRIOR KNOWLEDGE -activate it 3-5 minutes		
A	ADD NEW TEACHER INPUT – Explicitly teach the CONCEPT. 10-15 minutes 	<p>“The ends justify the means” - <i>Machiavelli</i></p> <p>A utilitarian perspective means that we are essentially saying that the ends justify the means. Any action (means) you take (such as pushing me out of a hot air balloon) is justified by the outcome (end) of that action (you and your 5 friends live). So overarching rules (such as “don't kill”) don't matter because they can be broken if the ends justify it.</p> <p>For example, you might set yourself a rule not to kill any innocent people. However, you might decide to break that rule in order to save ten of your friends because the end (of saving lives) justifies the means (killing an innocent person).</p> <p>So, really, if rules can be broken in certain situations, then they don't really matter. Is this a good policy?</p> <p>What is the other option? If we follow rules all the time and they cannot be broken under any circumstances (the ends <i>never</i> justify the means). Is that a better policy?</p> <p>Immanuel Kant is a deontologist and wanted a single 'rule' which everyone could follow in order to act ethically in all situations. He thought that this rule could never be broken. He called this the <i>Categorical Imperative</i>. In its first formulation, it states; you should only act in a way if you could wish that your action becomes universal law. Which means you should only act, only if it would be possible for every single person in the world to do the same thing. So if you're going to steal from someone, you should think; 'what would happen if every single person in the world stole from everyone else all the time'. The result would be disastrous. And for this reason, stealing is bad.</p> <p>If you're going to study hard at school. You should think 'what would happen if every single person in the world did the same'. The result would be positive. Therefore, you should study hard at school.</p>	<p>Students begin to develop a deeper understanding of the difference between these two ethical models.</p> <p>Students understand that following a utilitarian model means that rules become irrelevant, and all decisions are made based on the (expected) outcomes of any particular situation.</p> <p>Students understand that the deontology is the opposite approach, where overarching ethical rules are set and adhered to strictly.</p> <p>Students understand some of the intricacies of the deontological approach and the principle overarching rules (Categorical Imperative) which Kant posits as the ultimate 'rule'.</p>
	ADD NEW TEACHER INPUT – Explicitly teach and model the SKILL.	Can you think of situations where the following of this kind of rule would not work?	The students must apply utilitarian reasoning to develop an imaginative situation where breaking a rule may be acceptable.
C	CHALLENGE with APPLICATION & DEVELOPMENT 10-15 minutes 	<p>Kant was famously challenged by Benjamin Constant. Kant used the example of lying. He said if everyone in the world lied, then the world would fall apart. Therefore, no one should lie.</p> <p>Constant proposed a situation where your friend was hiding in your house and a murderer came to the door and asked you where your friend was. Is it acceptable to lie in this situation?</p> <p>What do you think? What are some of the positives and negatives of each choice? How would you justify each choice?</p> <p>Kant replied defending the categorical imperative and said that no, you still should not lie, even in this situation. He said that if you told the truth and your friend was killed, you would not be responsible because you acted ethically by following the categorical imperative in not lying. However, if you lied, and then your friend died anyway, you would be responsible for his death because you did not act ethically.</p> <p>Do you think Kant's reply is justified?</p>	<p>A famous challenge to the deontological approach is investigated here, showing the extremeness of following this model as closely as Kant did, as, presumably, students will want to lie in order to hide their friend from the murderer.</p> <p>Students are asked to analyse both sides of the argument and justify each. This gives them a rounded idea of both options.</p> <p>Kant's response is usually seen as very extreme, and students will have the option to argue against his view (or with it), in order to understand this own views in relation to Kant and the deontological approach.</p>

	<p>CHECK FOR UNDERSTANDING, FEEDBACK & INDIVIDUAL SUPPORT (Throughout the lesson) 3-5 minutes</p>	<p>Make sure all students recall the difference between the two principles learned in the previous lesson.</p> <p>Make sure students take all aspects of each scenario into consideration.</p>	
	<p>CULTIVATE INDEPENDENT PRACTICE 5 minutes</p>	<p>Develop your own law that you think will work for everyone in every situation like Kant did. Test your law in some of the situations we have gone through so far and see if it brings about the result you desire in each situation.</p>	<p>Students attempt to develop a new 'rule', like the categorical imperative, which they believe may work better in a wider variety of situations.</p>
<p>T</p>	<p>TIME for GOAL REVIEW</p>  <p>3-5 minutes</p>	<p>Do you think we should follow a law unequivocally like the categorical imperative? Or do you think that we should be able to break the ethical rules we follow in certain extreme situations?</p>	<p>Students provide their own opinion on the dichotomy between utilitarianism and deontology.</p>