

PF v2.0 Facilitation Guide (v1.0)

Brief worksheet for running a PF session without turning it into a scorecard.

Use posture: Remind participants that PF is a compass, not a scorecard. These examples can be adapted to available time and goals, not preferred or approved formats.

1. SESSION BOUNDARY

Session / case: _____	Date / period: _____
Facilitator / role(s): _____	Session type: short / working / review _____

2. CHOOSE ONE SESSION SHAPE

Short session (20-30 min)	Working session (45-60 min)	Review session (60-90 min)
3-minute orientation: PF is a compass, not a scorecard.	Brief orientation.	Read an existing record or case.
7-minute architecture drill on a compact case.	Compatibility checklist pass using Appendix B. Small-group decision-record draft using Appendix C.	Run responsibility-map and misuse-resistance drills. Add dissent and revisit entries.
10-minute three-lens scan or options-set drill. 5-minute reflection: what became more visible, and what still feels under-described?	Whole-group comparison: where did judgments diverge, and why? Closing note on what would trigger revisit.	End with one process change that would improve answerability next time.

3. KEEP LEARNING VISIBLE

Practice log A short record of cases used, what posture was being trained, and what drift patterns showed up.	Reflection note One page on "what I missed first" / "what changed my judgment" / "what I still do not know."	Drift-pattern tracker A recurring note on patterns such as sloganizing, one-lens capture, process substitution, committee fog, or blame theater.
Calibration set Two or three cases that are periodically re-read to notice whether interpretations are becoming more careful, narrower, or more ritualized.	Facilitator note What the exercise surfaced, what stayed suppressed, and what would make the next round safer or more honest.	Reminder These artifacts are optional supports for ethical memory and revisability, not tools for ranking people.

4. FACILITATOR CAUTIONS / WHEN NOT ENOUGH

Facilitator cautions	When these materials are not enough
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• a smooth workshop may still hide the absence of contestability• a polished answer may still be weak reasoning• repeated use of the same case type can narrow moral imagination• low-power participants may notice harms the training design itself makes hard to say• confidentiality and safest-useful-specificity matter more than completeness• a curriculum that cannot itself be revised may quietly train rigidity rather than judgment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• dignity-of-awareness risks are plausibly severe• reversibility is low• empirical or technical assumptions are carrying most of the conclusion• many affected parties have limited voice, exit, or recourse• the organization is under incentives likely to turn training into performance

Closing note: In some settings, one well-chosen exercise may be the better fit. Even well-run exercises do not replace governance, technical assurance, contestation, or repair.