

Unit 5 Assignment: Learning Activities and Reflection

Student Name: Glen Buchanan

Course: LDTC 605, Instructional Design Models

Date: June 16, 2026

Minicourse and Learning Outcomes

My minicourse is Digital Foundations, the entry module of a "Getting Ready to Work with AI" pathway for working adults. The audience is mobile-first and time-constrained, often with low confidence around technology. Every outcome sits at Bloom's Apply level or above, because the point is for learners to do the thing, not read about it. The course learning outcomes (CLOs) are:

- **CLO 1.** Identify device, account, and data risks using the prompt-as-egress frame.
- **CLO 2.** Configure a password manager, two-factor authentication, full-disk encryption, and automatic backup.
- **CLO 3.** Apply a redact-or-rephrase workflow before sending content to an AI tool.
- **CLO 4.** Interpret an AI vendor's privacy and retention policy quickly.
- **CLO 5.** Construct a one-page device, accounts, and data map.
- **CLO 6.** Evaluate a new AI tool against the Digital Foundations baseline.

Part 1: Learning Activities Aligned to the Outcomes

I designed these activities using rapid instructional design principles (Piskurich, 2015): get a functional activity in front of learners quickly, build in a way to capture feedback, and refine on real performance rather than over-producing before anyone has tried it. That approach fits Digital Foundations, where every outcome is a concrete, observable behavior I can instrument and test early. Each activity below names the outcome it serves and shows how the activity produces evidence of that outcome.

Activity 1: Password Manager Setup Walkthrough (supports CLO 2).

Learners follow a short screencast to install a password manager on their own device, then create or import three credentials. An embedded check confirms the vault is active and auto-fill works. This supports CLO 2 because the outcome is to configure a tool, and the activity ends with a configured tool, not a quiz about one. The evidence is the working vault on the learner's own device.

Activity 2: Two-Factor Enrollment on Two Accounts (supports CLO 2 and CLO 1).

Learners turn on two-factor authentication for their email and one work account, using an authenticator app where possible. A short prompt asks what would happen if they lost the authenticator device. The configuration step is the CLO 2 evidence; the reflection prompt connects back to CLO 1 by making the learner reason about the risk the control addresses.

Activity 3: Prompt-as-Egress Scenario Sort (supports CLO 3).

Learners receive six sample prompts, some safe to send to an AI tool as written and some carrying sensitive data. They sort each into send as-is, redact first, or rephrase, then compare to a worked example. This supports CLO 3 directly: the outcome is to apply a redact-or-rephrase judgment, and the sort makes the learner perform that judgment on realistic cases rather than define it.

Activity 4: Privacy Policy Speed Read (supports CLO 4).

Learners get a real AI vendor's privacy and retention policy and a short timer, plus a three-question guide: what data is kept, for how long, and who can see it. They produce a structured annotation. This supports CLO 4 because the outcome is to interpret a policy under time pressure, and the timed annotation is exactly that performance, captured as a work product.

Activity 5: Device, Accounts, and Data Map Draft (supports CLO 5).

Learners begin the one-page map from a template, listing their primary devices, the accounts on each, and the data those accounts can reach. This is the scaffolded first pass at the capstone artifact. It supports CLO 5 because the outcome is to construct the map, and the activity produces a real draft of it that later lessons refine.

Activity 6: AI Tool Evaluation Checklist (supports CLO 6 and CLO 1).

Learners apply the Digital Foundations baseline to a new AI tool of their own choosing, rating it on five criteria drawn from CLOs 1 through 4 and writing two sentences on the highest-risk finding. This supports CLO 6 because the outcome is to evaluate a new tool against the baseline, and the activity is that evaluation on a tool the learner actually cares about, which also reinforces CLO 1.

Part 2: Reflection on Diverse Learning Preferences and Engagement

Differentiating for diverse learners

My audience is not uniform. Maria, an office manager in her late forties, is cautious and learns best with clear steps and reassurance. Devon, a warehouse lead in his twenties, is confident on a phone but has almost no time. Some learners use assistive technology; some are on low-bandwidth connections. I designed for that range using the three Universal Design for Learning principles (CAST, 2018).

- **Multiple means of representation.** Every procedural activity is offered three ways: a short captioned screencast, a written step list, and a one-page printable checklist. The same content reaches a learner who watches, a learner who reads, and a learner who needs a reference away from the screen. Transcripts and alt text are standard, which also serves screen-reader users.
- **Multiple means of action and expression.** Learners can complete a configuration by following the video, working from the printed steps, or using a guided split-screen that keeps the steps visible while they act. The evidence is the same configured tool regardless of path, so I differentiate the route without lowering the bar.
- **Multiple means of engagement.** Activities anchor in the learner's own device, accounts, and chosen AI tool, so the stakes are real and personal. In Activity 6, letting the learner pick the tool they are curious about turns a generic task into one they have a reason to finish.

One innovation I am most committed to is device-adaptive walkthroughs. The 2FA and password steps differ across iOS, Android, and Windows, so the activity branches by platform rather than showing one path and hoping it transfers. A learner never has to translate instructions written for a device they do not own. This is a small change that removes a large amount of the friction that makes beginners quit.

Engagement and interactivity strategies

I want learners doing, getting feedback, and seeing progress, because those are what move a procedural skill into a habit.

- **Do, do not watch.** Every lesson ends in performance on the learner's own account. Active practice with a real consequence is far stickier than a passive video, and it is the only honest evidence that the outcome was met.
- **Immediate, specific, non-shaming feedback.** The scenario sort and the confirmation checks respond right away, explain why an answer is right or wrong,

and route a wrong answer to a one-screen remediation before returning. Fast corrective feedback is one of the most reliable ways to improve retention.

- **Real-work anchoring.** Using the learner's own prompts, accounts, and tools raises relevance, and relevance is the strongest motivator I can design in for a time-constrained adult who is choosing to spend twenty minutes here instead of somewhere else.
- **Bite-sized checks for momentum.** Short embedded checks after each task give the learner a visible win and give me a performance signal before a full cohort finishes, so I can see early where people get stuck.
- **A together option.** The same lesson can be run as a guided group session as well as solo, so a learner who is energized by working alongside others has that path, and a workplace can run it as a team.

Each of these ties back to learning, not novelty. Practice builds the skill, feedback corrects it, relevance sustains the effort, and small wins keep a nervous beginner from bouncing. That is the chain I am designing for.

References

CAST. (2018). *Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.2*. <https://udlguidelines.cast.org>

Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2015). *The systematic design of instruction* (8th ed.). Pearson.

Mayer, R. E. (2021). *Multimedia learning* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Piskurich, G. M. (2015). *Rapid instructional design: Learning ID fast and right* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Note on AI use. I used an AI assistant as a thought partner to organize the activity-to-outcome alignment and to pressure-test my differentiation ideas. The activities, the design choices, and the wording are my own and come from my work on this minicourse. This follows the course policy on using AI to generate and refine ideas rather than to produce the work.