Glen Buchanan
LDTC 605 9040, Instructional Design Models to Inform Learning Design
Unit 4, June 9, 2026

Course Learning Outcomes and Reflection

Course Learning Outcomes

The course is *Digital Foundations*, the device, account, and data module of the *Getting Ready to Work with AI* pathway. By the end of this course, learners will be able to:

1. **Identify** the device, account, and data risks that show up when a working adult uses a generative AI tool, using the prompt-as-egress frame (treating anything she types into a tool as data that can leave her control).
2. **Configure** a password manager, two-factor authentication, full-disk encryption, and an automatic backup on a personal device, with each step verified.
3. **Apply** a redact-or-rephrase workflow to a real piece of sensitive content before sending it to an AI tool, and justify each redaction.
4. **Interpret** a consumer AI vendor's privacy and data-retention policy in 90 seconds, naming what the vendor sees, stores, and trains on.
5. **Construct** a one-page device, accounts, and data map that another adult can follow to reach the Digital Foundations security baseline.
6. **Evaluate** a new AI tool or workflow against the Digital Foundations baseline and decide whether it is safe enough to adopt.

Reflection

Integration with the minicourse and the learning gap. The six outcomes align with the minicourse idea in the IDD: working adults can use AI tools well only after they keep their device, accounts, and data safe. The IDD names the practitioner-readiness gap, citing the MIT

Project NANDA finding that 95 percent of enterprise generative-AI pilots deliver no measurable impact, mostly from the learning gap. The CLOs answer that gap by moving the learner from naming a risk (CLO 1) to doing the protective work (CLOs 2 and 3), reading the vendor stack (CLO 4), producing a portable artifact (CLO 5), and judging the next tool (CLO 6). The verbs run from Understand to Evaluate (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Outcome 5 is the Stage 2 capstone artifact of an Understanding by Design plan (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005), keeping the course on the IDD's hybrid UbD-inside-ADDIE model.

Differentiation for learner diversity. The course is self-paced and asynchronous, and learners work on their own personal or employer-issued devices. They enter with a wide range of prerequisite skills: all can send email and install an app, but some have never enabled a device setting or read a privacy policy, and a healthcare administrator on a hospital-issued device may lack the admin rights to install anything. Three moves address that range. First, each lesson opens with a one-screen placement check, so a learner who meets the outcome skips to an audit task and one who does not gets the prerequisite first. Second, every concept is introduced with a plain-language analogy, then the technical name, at Flesch-Kincaid Grade 8 to 10, with captions and transcripts (CAST, 2018). Third, CLO 5 is verified by demonstration on the learner's own device, and for the administrator who cannot install a tool, the task becomes naming which control her IT policy blocks rather than failing silently. Cognitive load is held down by chunking each outcome into one task (Sweller, 1988). The course meets WCAG 2.2 AA.

Feedback mechanisms and adaptability. Two layers drive iteration. In-course, each lesson ships with a mastery checkpoint mapped to one CLO, plus an optional two-question survey (confidence and one improvement). Lesson opens, completions, and mastery results feed an xAPI set, so I see where learners drop or score low before a survey reaches me. Post-course, the aggregate data (drop rates, mastery scores, time on lesson, free text) is reviewed against each CLO, and one improvement per module ships next. This is the iterative rhythm of Allen's

SAM (Allen, 2012) and the continual-improvement tenet of UbD (Wiggins & McTighe, 2011). Adaptability matters because the surface the course teaches is moving: vendor policies change, tools deprecate, the threat surface shifts. Treating CLOs as provisional and revising on the data keeps them serving the learner, not the original document. I used a large language model to stress-test these outcomes, then wrote and verified the final text myself, the responsible-use discipline the course teaches.

References

Allen, M. W. (2012). *Leaving ADDIE for SAM.* ATD Press.

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives.* Longman.

CAST. (2018). *Universal Design for Learning guidelines* (Version 2.2). https://udlguidelines.cast.org

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, *12*(2), 257-285.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). ASCD.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2011). *The Understanding by Design guide to creating high-quality units.* ASCD.