Course Title/Name: Online Teaching Strategies

Course Modality: Online (potentially blended with interactive discussions and synchronous components)

Course Description:
The *Online Teaching Strategies* course introduces participants to research-based best practices and instructional strategies designed to enhance teaching effectiveness in virtual environments. The course explores h educators can use technology tools to promote engagement, improve student learning, and increase retention. Participants will hear from experienced online instructors and educational experts who share lessons learned and practical approaches for success. Whether new or experienced, educators will leave the course with enhanced confidence and actionable strategies for designing meaningful, technology-enhanced learning experiences across various modalities including fully asynchronous, synchronous, and hybrid formats.

Why I Selected This Course:
I selected this course because it aligns directly with my work as a corporate Instructional Designer focused on the responsible and creative integration of artificial intelligence into an IDers workflow. My background involves designing learning ecosystems and I really want to become more proficient at some of the nuances I am unfamiliar with. Evaluating this course allows me to reflect on how emerging AI tools can empower instructors to be more responsive, data-informed, and human-centered.

My professional experience leading learning initiatives has shown me that instructors often struggle not with technology itself, but with how to use it meaningfully. Online teaching should be about presence, empathy, and guided exploration. These are qualities that can be augmented rather than replaced by AI. Thus, I chose this course to explore how best to balance innovation with authenticity in digital classrooms.

Through the lens of wanting to become an AI Learning Manager, *Online Teaching Strategies* becomes more than an introduction to remote teaching, it becomes a foundation for AI-empowered instructional design that redefines what it means to teach online. The key insight is that effective online instruction in the AI era will depend on cultivating human-AI partnerships, where educators remain the empathetic center of learning while intelligent systems amplify their reach, insight, and creativity. Hoping to learn a lot to take into my current and future roles!

Part 1: Initial Review of the Course

My initial thoughts on this course are that it is very well organized and easy to navigate. I appreciate the attention to detail in the General section of the course including the overview and welcome videos, syllabus, checklist and “about this course” section which gave me a background of the parties involved in designing this

course. From the first section I felt like I was to be part of a “collaborative/constructivist learning experience within a community of inquiry” (Simonson, et al., 2015, p.68), rather than simply part of an independent study program.

I can clearly navigate to the learning objectives for each week in the Overview section where it’s clearly stated, “After completing this week you should be able to:” and then the objectives are explicitly written out, so there’s no confusion on the learner’s end. I like that there are polls to get me involved and feel part of the process. One thing I noticed is the transcripts for each of the available videos which are extremely helpful, even more so than the videos themselves (which weren’t working probably because they were on an old system). I was able to get through the transcripts in a way that met my needs and could take those quotes into the activities within each web page.

However, in the week one activity I was unable to access the webpage about Ambrose's 7 research-based principles so the discussion activity would be difficult as a user, but I imagine this is because it’s an old course and some things just aren't working properly.

One thing I noticed was that there are mostly discussion activities and not a final assignment or project so there’s not really an artifact that I would be able to take with me after the course or work towards completing each week in addition to the discussion activities. Moore (2018) argues that there “must be a plan” and includes projects and exercises that lessen the amount of Transactional distance in the educational environment, so perhaps this portion of the online class could be improved as it relates to including a final project. I do see that there are Case Study assignments that include video reflections, and I appreciate the use of interactive videos using H5P that are professionally recorded and edited. The assignments are clearly written and even have contacts for a help desk if the student has trouble uploading a video or other questions.

Part 2: Application of Frameworks from the Readings

In evaluating this online course, three key criteria from this week’s readings stand out as especially important:

1. **Encouraging Active Learning** (Sorensen & Baylen),
2. **Social Presence** from the Community of Inquiry framework (Cleveland-Innes, Garrison, & Vaughan, 2018), and
3. **Online Knowledge Activity Alignment** (Dennen, 2018).

1. Encourage Active Learning (Sorensen & Baylen)

Sorensen & Baylen emphasize the importance of engaging students in learning through participation, exploration, and interaction rather than passive consumption. “Active learning incorporates past experiences, requires application, and allows students to talk about and write about what they are learning” (Sorensen & Baylen, 2009, p. 72) The weekly checklist demonstrates active learning strategies across multiple weeks, and this includes case studies, reflection journals, video activities, discussion forums, and synchronous sessions.

For example:

- *Week 2 – "Case Study: My Students Are Going to Love This – not!"*
- *Week 3 – Journal Reflection + Discussion Forum: Making Discussions Work*

These activities require learners to apply knowledge, reflect, and collaborate, and this demonstrates strong alignment with the active learning principle.

2. Supports Social and Teaching Presence (Community of Inquiry)

The Community of Inquiry framework highlights social presence as essential to help learners "project themselves socially and emotionally" and build a real sense of connection in the online classroom. This course integrates multiple touchpoints for social interaction and relationship-building, such as:

- Getting Acquainted activity (Week 1)
- Coffee Break forums (Weeks 2 & 4)
- Synchronous Virtual Meet-Up (Week 3)
- Video Reflection Activity (Week 1)

These elements foster belonging, communication, and identity within the learning community, and these are key components of CoI social presence.

The teaching presence is also high in this course and corresponds with the CoI framework that exposes the importance of an instructor who guides discourse, diagnoses misconceptions, and interjects where needed.

I love there is a facilitators guide that has information like this to help other instructors foster this teaching presence:

"Getting it Started, Keeping it Going, & Wrapping it Up

- Post reminders of discussion participation periods.
- Remind them to review the discussion rubric.
- Model what you expect from the students.
- Require they cite readings or outside resources in support of positions.
- Be willing to relinquish some control and let students guide their own learning.
- Use articles or a current event for relevance.
- Post new information about the topic.
- Prompt students to pull from their own experiences.
- Use question prompts that encourage extension of the discussion.
- Complicate the scenario, problem, or case study by adding a twist or new element to the discussion.
- Diagnose misconceptions and post to clarify."

3. Alignment with Online Knowledge Activity Framework (Dennen, 2018)

Dennen's Online Knowledge Activity Framework stresses that online activities should be structured, so students create, share, organize, and refine knowledge rather than simply receive information.

This course supports knowledge-building through:

- Structured discussions that require sharing and responding
- Reflection journals to organize and refine thinking
- Case studies tied to real-world scenarios
- Mid-Course and Summative Assessments that require synthesis

For example:

- *Week 3 – "Case Study: Shouldn't They Know This by Now?" + Debrief Forum*
- *Week 4 – Summative Case Study Assignment*

These assignments demonstrate intentional design to guide learners through knowledge application and reflection, consistent with Dennen's model.

References:

Moore, M.G., & Diehl, W.C. (Eds.). (2018). Handbook of Distance Education (4th ed.). Routledge. https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/10.4324/9781315296135

Moore, M.G. (2018). The Theory of Transactional Distance. Handbook of Distance Education (4th ed., pp. 32-46). Routledge. https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/10.4324/9781315296135-4

Sorensen, C. K.,& Baylen, D. M. (2009). Learning online: Adapting the seven principles of good practices to a web-based instructional environment. In A. Orellana, T. L. Hudgin, & M. Simonson (Eds). The perfect online course: Best practices for designing and teaching (pp. 69-86). Charlotte, NO; Information Age Publishing.

Simonson, et al., (2015). Teaching and Learning at a Distance : Foundations of Distance Education, 6th Edition. Emerald Publishing. ProQuest Ebook Central, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/purdue/detail.action?docID=3316064.

Week 3 Framework Criteria Checklist

My framework criteria are grounded in the belief that learning is a social, reflective, and adaptive process. Learners build understanding through interaction with peers, instructors, and intelligent systems that scaffold inquiry and feedback. As an AI Learning Manager, I see learning ecosystems as co-created spaces where human and AI presences work in tandem to personalize instruction, sustain engagement, and maintain a strong sense of community. The following checklist integrates insights from the Community of Inquiry Framework (CoI), Moore's Theory of Transactional Distance, and Sorensen & Baylen's Seven Principles for Good Online Learning, applied to improve the *Online Teaching Strategies* course.

#	Criteria and Reference	Evidence from Course	Recommendations for Course and Reasoning
1	**Course Organization and Consistency** (Martin et al., 2019)	Weekly modules exist but lack consistent structure across weeks.	Develop a unified module template with predictable flow and embedded overview videos to enhance structure and reduce cognitive load.
2	**Active Learning and Application** (Sorensen & Baylen, 2009)	Case studies and discussions promote interaction but lack applied synthesis tasks.	Add scenario-based simulations or AI-driven roleplays where learners apply strategies in authentic contexts to strengthen active learning.
3	**Student–Teacher Contact** (Sorensen & Baylen, 2009)	Instructor feedback is available but infrequent; limited visibility between modules.	Introduce AI-facilitated feedback dashboards that alert instructors when to intervene, maintaining strong teaching presence and immediacy.
4	**Cooperation Among Students** (Sorensen & Baylen, 2009)	Peer discussions occur weekly, but collaboration is limited to asynchronous posts.	Create micro-group projects supported by collaborative tools (e.g., Miro or H5P) to enhance peer connection and knowledge construction.
5	**Prompt Feedback** (Sorensen & Baylen, 2009)	Discussion replies are often delayed; limited formative feedback opportunities.	Implement AI auto-feedback tools for initial drafts, allowing instructors to focus on higher-order analysis and personalized comments.

6	**Respect Diverse Talents and Ways of Learning** (Sorensen & Baylen, 2009)	Course relies primarily on text-based materials.	Incorporate multimodal learning options—podcasts, infographics, and adaptive media—to support diverse learning preferences.
7	**Social Presence Development** (Fiock, 2020; Stavredes, 2011)	Includes introductory activities but lacks sustained relational presence.	Add ongoing community prompts, such as reflective journals or optional meetups, to promote belonging and authentic connection.
8	**Teaching Presence and Facilitation** (Garrison et al., 2000)	Instructor visibility is limited after Week 1; unclear facilitation cues.	Embed weekly instructor videos and reflective commentary summarizing discussions to strengthen teaching presence.
9	**Reducing Transactional Distance** (Roach & Attardi, 2022)	Learner–instructor communication is asynchronous and rigidly structured.	Integrate AI co-pilot chat assistants for real-time clarifications and scaffolding, increasing dialogue and learner autonomy.
10	**Learner Autonomy and Self-Regulation** (Moore, 1993; Patall et al., 2008)	Limited opportunities for learner choice or self-direction.	Enable choice-based pathways where learners select topics or media formats for assignments, building ownership and autonomy.
11	**Cognitive Presence and Reflection** (Fiock, 2020)	Reflection is present but unstructured.	Add guided AI journaling prompts to scaffold the four phases of inquiry (triggering, exploration, integration, resolution).
12	**High Expectations and Motivation** (Sorensen & Baylen, 2009)	Expectations are clear but motivation is not sustained across the course.	Establish gamified milestones and AI-driven goal trackers to maintain engagement and reinforce accountability.
13	**Triggering Event Activities** (Fiock, 2020)	The course begins with an orientation but lacks an intentional reflection activity designed to identify prior knowledge or learning challenges.	Introduce a Week 1 activity that presents a common financial problem or misconception as a **triggering event** to spark curiosity and discussion. Ask students to share initial reactions and predictions, preparing them for deeper exploration.

14	**Structured Exploration Opportunities** (Fiock, 2020)	Students engage with readings and discussions but do not have explicit exploration stages tied to inquiry.	Incorporate guided exploration prompts that encourage students to question, analyze, and debate financial strategies or ethical dilemmas before receiving direct instruction, reinforcing the inquiry-based learning process.
15	**Integration and Reflection** (Fiock, 2020)	Reflection occurs informally through discussions but lacks structured prompts for synthesis.	Add a reflective journal at the end of each module prompting students to integrate what they've learned with their personal experiences or professional goals. Provide AI-assisted feedback to deepen connections between theory and application.
16	**Resolution and Real-World Application** (Fiock, 2020)	Assignments measure knowledge but don't explicitly tie to real-world applications in a structured way.	Conclude each module with a short scenario-based task where students apply learned concepts to realistic financial problems, reinforcing resolution and knowledge transfer.
17	**Fostering Cognitive Presence through AI Feedback** (Fiock, 2020; Roach & Attardi, 2021)	The course uses instructor grading and peer feedback but lacks continuous formative AI support.	Implement AI-generated feedback within discussion or journal activities to prompt deeper reflection and metacognition. For example, use an AI assistant to ask follow-up questions aligned with the four stages of the Practical Inquiry Model.
18	**Multi-Dimensional Scaffolding Design** (Richardson et al., 2022)	The course provides clear weekly checklists, activity descriptions, and a detailed facilitator guide, but most instructions focus on *what* to do (read, post, reflect) rather than explicitly scaffolding *how* to plan, monitor, and deepen thinking across tasks.	Map major activities (discussions, case studies, video reflections, summative case) to at least one type of scaffolding from Richardson et al. (conceptual, metacognitive, procedural, strategic, motivational). For example, add concept maps or guided notes for core readings (conceptual), self-check prompts before/after activities (metacognitive), short "how to complete this task" screencasts (procedural), suggested problem-solving strategies for case analysis (strategic), and encouraging messages that normalize struggle (motivational). This makes the existing structure more supportive and intentional, especially for instructors new to online teaching.
19	**Balance of Hard and Soft Scaffolds**	The design includes strong hard scaffolds	Maintain the existing hard scaffolds while layering in soft scaffolds, like instructor check-ins based on

	(Richardson et al., 2022; Brush & Saye, 2002)	like checklists, transcripts, facilitator guide, example rubrics, and clearly written instructions. There is limited evidence of soft scaffolds, such as adaptive prompts, timely instructor nudges, or other dynamic supports.	discussion participation patterns, optional small-group office hours, or AI-assisted prompts that appear when learners struggle with case studies. Richardson et al. note that combining fixed and adaptive supports helps avoid both over-structuring and leaves learners to fend for themselves. This is especially important in a course like this where participants have varied prior experience with online teaching.
20	**Culturally Responsive Orientation & Technology Comfort** (Woodley et al., 2017)	The General section includes an overview, welcome videos, syllabus, checklist, and "about this course" information, but there is no explicit diagnostic of participants' technology comfort, prior experience with online teaching, or institutional context.	Add a short Week 1 survey or H5P activity that asks instructors about their LMS experience, access to tools, comfort with video and discussion tools, time zone, and typical student population. Then, use this data to tailor examples, recommend on-ramping resources for less experienced participants, and even group learners strategically so they can support one another (pair a proficient with non-proficient). Woodley et al. argue that culturally responsive design begins with understanding learners and their contexts, and this move will help the course meet diverse instructors where they are instead of assuming a single baseline.
21	**Validating Professional Identities and Teaching Contexts** (Woodley et al., 2017; Gay, 2010)	The "Getting Acquainted" activity supports introductions, but subsequent activities focus more on generic online teaching scenarios than on participants' own institutions, disciplines, and student communities.	Redesign at least one early activity so participants explicitly connect course concepts (social presence, active learning, transactional distance) to their own teaching realities. For example, ask them to describe a current online or hybrid course, key student characteristics, and one equity or engagement challenge they face. Then revisit this course throughout modules as a kind of testbed for applying strategies. Woodley et al. and Gay emphasize that culturally responsive learning environments validate learners' identities and contexts, so this means treating

			instructors' local constraints, unique ideas and expertise as assets for collective problem-solving.
22	**Structured Online Collaboration: Purpose–People–Process–Pride** (Herrmann, 2020)	Collaboration happens mainly through discussion forums, case debriefs, and occasional synchronous meet-ups. Group work is present in spirit, but roles, goals, and collaboration processes are not consistently made explicit, which may limit deeper team-based learning.	For any intentional group activity (analyzing a case, co-designing an online discussion, or critiquing a course element), use Herrmann's four guiding questions: • **Purpose:** Clearly state the practical outcome ("Redesign a discussion prompt to increase social presence in your own course"). • **People:** Define or co-create roles such as facilitator, scribe, equity monitor, and timekeeper. • **Process:** Specify communication tools, timelines, and decision-making steps, especially for remote collaboration. • **Pride:** Build in a showcase (brief video share-out, gallery walk, or class vote on "most implementable design") to celebrate group products. This shifts collaboration from "post and reply" to purposeful, well-supported team design work. This way, instructors will be able to transfer Online Teaching Strategies into their own contexts currently and in the future.

These twenty-two-criteria blend human-centered pedagogy with AI-augmented facilitation. The redesign emphasizes structured engagement, multimodal interaction, and adaptive support systems that align with CoI, Transactional Distance Theory, and the Seven Principles. In the end, I want the *Online Teaching Strategies* course to remain responsive, connected, and deeply social, and anchored in presence, reflection, and autonomy.

TLSS Blended Learning Course Quality Review Report

Online Teaching Strategies Course

Introduction and Rationale for Rubric Selection

For this review I selected the Teaching and Learning Support Service (TLSS) Blended Learning Course Quality Rubric. I chose this rubric for three reasons. First, it was developed specifically to evaluate blended and technology-enhanced courses, which matches the design of the Online Teaching Strategies course. Second, it is organized around practical, instructor-friendly criteria such as course design, learner support, technology use, and course organization. These are the same areas I pay attention to when I design or evaluate training in my own practice. Third, the TLSS rubric is grounded in well-known teaching principles, including active learning, feedback, and respect for diverse learners. Because this course is meant to model good online teaching, it made sense to use a rubric that emphasizes pedagogy as much as technology.

To keep this report clear and readable, I use the TLSS criteria as headings and assign simple ratings of Strong, Adequate, or Needs Improvement, based on how closely the course matches the descriptive "best practice" statements in the rubric.

1. **Course Design**

1.1 Learning Outcomes – Rating: Strong

The course learning outcomes and weekly objectives are clearly stated and written in student-friendly language. Each week has a short "After completing this week, you should be able to…" section that helps learners see what they are working toward. The sequence of topics—learning and the online environment (Week 1), establishing presence and feedback strategies (Week 2), facilitating discussions and monitoring learning (Week 3), and managing the online classroom (Week 4) builds logically from foundational concepts to more complex facilitation and management issues.

The outcomes are also reflected in the activity checklist. For example, Week 1 includes a Community of Inquiry (COI) activity, video reflection, and a "Share Your Assignment" discussion, which all support the goal of understanding the online learning environment and student experience. Overall, the alignment between outcomes and weekly themes is clear and consistent.

1.2 Learning Activities – Rating: Strong

The course offers a rich mix of learning activities spread across the four weeks:

- Polls ("Teaching Challenges," "Factors Affecting Success," and "Managing an Online Course") to surface beliefs and experiences.
- Discussion forums ("Getting Acquainted," "Share Your Assignment," "Feedback Activity," "Making Discussions Work," "Case Study Debrief") to promote social and cognitive presence.
- Case studies ("My Students Are Going to Love This – not!" and "Shouldn't They Know This by Now?") to connect theory to realistic scenarios.

- Reflective tasks (journal reflections, video reflection activity, coffee-break forums) to encourage personal sense-making and community.
- A summative case study assignment in Week 4 that pulls together many of the course ideas.

These activities are clearly connected to the key topics of each week and require learners to apply ideas rather than just read or watch. They encourage active participation, peer interaction, and reflection, which fits well with TLSS expectations for learning activities.

1.3 Assessment Activities – Rating: Adequate

Assessment is present throughout the course, but not always made visible as assessment. The primary assessment tools include:

- Ongoing graded or participation-based discussions.
- Case study responses and debrief discussions.
- Journal and video reflection activities.
- A summative case study assignment in Week 4.
- Pre-assessment and mid-course feedback surveys.

These give learners multiple opportunities to demonstrate understanding and connect course ideas to their own teaching. However, from a TLSS perspective, the assessment system could be more transparent. Rubrics are referenced and examples are mentioned, but they are not always front-and-center for every activity. There is also no clearly identified final project or portfolio artifact that participants could carry forward as evidence of growth. For these reasons I rate assessment as Adequate rather than Strong.

1.4 Copyright and Citation – Rating: Adequate

The course uses a variety of videos, readings, and web resources. In general, sources are named and linked, and examples of rubrics and resources appear to be properly cited. However, the course site does not consistently highlight licensing or permissions (such as Creative Commons labels) and does not explicitly bring copyright issues to the learner's attention. From a TLSS perspective, this area appears functional but not exemplary.

2. Learner Support and Resources

2.1 Diversity in Learning and Accessibility – Rating: Strong

The course makes a clear effort to support diverse learners. Many videos are accompanied by transcripts, and key instructions are also provided in written form. Content is chunked into manageable sections and organized by week, which helps learners pace themselves. Activities include polls, discussions, written reflections, and video-based tasks, offering multiple ways to participate.

Accessibility could always be improved—for example by consistently checking color contrast and ensuring every external resource meets accessibility standards—but based on the information available, the course demonstrates good attention to different learning needs.

2.2 Course Basics – Rating: Strong

The Getting Started section provides the essential course basics: syllabus, welcome video, orientation to the course structure, and instructions for completing the pre-assessment and initial discussion. Expectations for participation in discussions and activities are clearly laid out. There is information about where to get help with technology and how to contact the instructor.

Common questions are addressed through introductory materials, and the weekly checklists make the workload and expectations visible. This aligns well with TLSS guidance on course basics.

2.3 Communication and Interaction – Rating: Strong

The course models strong communication practices. Two-way interaction is built into every week through polls, discussions, case studies, coffee-break forums, and a synchronous virtual meet-up in Week 3. The "Getting Acquainted" activity, coffee-break forums, and informal spaces help build social presence and a sense of community.

Protocols for interaction (expectations for discussion participation and netiquette) are either stated or modeled through the structure of the activities. The variety of interaction types—formal discussion, informal coffee-break conversations, synchronous sessions—meets the TLSS expectation that courses provide multiple channels for student–student and student–instructor communication.

2.4 Student and Instructor Feedback – Rating: Strong

Feedback processes are embedded in several parts of the course. Learners complete a mid-course feedback survey and a pre-assessment, which allows the instructor to adjust instruction and shows that student voice is valued. Discussion and case study activities give participants feedback from both peers and instructor.

The explicit focus on "Feedback Strategies" in Week 2 reinforces the importance of constructive, timely feedback, and the activities in this unit model good feedback practices that instructors can bring back to their own classes.

3. Use of Technology

3.1 Purposeful Integration of Technologies – Rating: Strong

Technology is used in ways that clearly support the learning outcomes. Examples include:

- Polling tools to quickly gather input and stimulate discussion.
- Video for welcome messages and content demonstrations.
- Discussion forums for community building and structured dialogue.
- Synchronous web-conferencing for the Week 3 virtual meet-up.

These tools are not used as “add-ons”; they are integrated into the weekly sequence in ways that promote engagement and reflection, which aligns well with the TLSS description of purposeful technology use.

3.2 Ease of Use – Rating: Adequate

For the most part, the course provides clear instructions for using tools and submitting assignments. The weekly checklists guide learners to the correct spaces in the learning management system, and support contacts are provided.

However, there are some broken links and references to older tools. These issues can cause frustration and may be a barrier for less confident technology users. Because of this, I rate ease of use as Adequate rather than Strong.

3.3 Pilot Testing of Technology – Rating: Needs Improvement

The presence of broken links suggests that not all technology and web resources have been fully tested or updated before the course runs. From the TLSS standpoint, pilot testing and regular quality checks are essential so that learners do not encounter dead links or inaccessible resources. This is one of the clearest areas for improvement.

4. Course Organization and Content Presentation

4.1 Course Orientation – Rating: Strong

The course begins with a clear orientation: syllabus, welcome video, Getting Acquainted activity, and a pre-assessment survey. These elements help learners understand the purpose of the course, how it is organized, and what will be expected of them in the online environment. This aligns closely with the TLSS expectations for a strong course orientation.

4.2 Navigation and Content Presentation – Rating: Strong

Course content is organized by week with a checklist of activities for each unit. The sequence of topics is logical, and the to-do lists make it clear what to complete, in what order, and by when. Content is chunked into manageable units and presented in a predictable structure, which matches TLSS guidance on navigation and content presentation.

4.3 Appearance and Design – Rating: Adequate

The overall appearance of the course is clean and functional, and elements such as videos, readings, and activities are visually separated in a way that supports scanning. At the same time, there is room to refine the visual design for even greater consistency and to ensure that all graphics and media are directly tied to the content. I therefore rate this area as Adequate.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Using the TLSS Blended Learning Course Quality Rubric, the Online Teaching Strategies course scores mostly Strong across the core criteria of course design, learner support, communication, and purposeful technology use. The course does an especially good job modeling active learning, social presence, and feedback strategies through its weekly structure and activity mix.

The main areas for improvement are: (1) making assessment structures more transparent, possibly by foregrounding rubrics and culminating projects; (2) tightening up technology quality assurance by checking all links and tools before the course opens; and (3) refining visual design and explicitly highlighting copyright and licensing information where appropriate.

Overall, the course provides a solid model of online teaching practices and aligns well with the TLSS emphasis on active, student-centered learning in technology-rich environments.

Change Matrix for Online Teaching Strategies

Original Component	Issue / Challenge (or N/A)	Proposed Revision (options)	Option Selected (detailed account)	Rationale
Course Organization (Weekly modules with checklists, Getting Started, Week 1 & 2 sections)	**Issue #1:** Weekly flow doesn't visibly build toward a culminating artifact; activities feel "one-off." **Issue #2:** Sequence is	**Option A:** Reorganize weekly modules so they clearly scaffold toward a final "Online Teaching Strategy Plan" that participants submit in Week 2. **Option B:** Add	**Option A selected.** Rebuild the module structure so Week 1 focuses on *analyzing and critiquing* online practices and Week 2 on *designing* an Online Teaching Strategy Plan for	Structuring the course around a product that emerges over time supports alignment and deepens cognitive presence by moving from exploration to integration and resolution (Fiock, 2020). A clearer end

	highly prescribed with minimal learner choice.	a persistent "Portfolio Corner" item in each week where learners add one artifact (e.g., revised discussion prompt, presence plan) that is compiled into a final playbook.	one of their own courses. Each weekly checklist will include an explicit "This week's contribution to your Strategy Plan" item to make the throughline visible.	product also responds to participants' need for a "take-with-you" resource that reduces transactional distance (Moore, 1993; Roach & Attardi, 2022). Designing and documenting this reorganization in a design document reflects Stefaniak's emphasis on using external representations and design documents to log decisions and ensure coherence over time.
Course Objectives (Objectives describe understanding and applying online strategies, but are not tightly tied to a culminating deliverable.)	**Issue #1:** Objectives don't explicitly reference creating a final, integrated artifact. **Issue #2:** Objectives don't highlight learner choice or self-direction.	**Option A:** Revise objectives to include creating an "implementable online teaching strategy plan" for a real course. **Option B:** Add an objective around self-regulation and choice ("Participants will select and justify tools/strategies	**Option A + B combined.** Update objectives to include: "Design an online teaching strategy plan for a current or future course, demonstrating intentional use of presence, interaction, and assessment strategies," and "Exercise professional judgment in	Revising objectives so they point to a concrete product helps ensure instructional alignment (Martin, 2011) and clarifies what "success" looks like. Including language about selecting and justifying strategies supports autonomy and self-regulation (Patall et al., 2008). Per Stefaniak, explicitly recording

		appropriate to their context").	selecting and justifying strategies aligned with their own teaching context."	these objective changes in the design record makes the underlying decision (to prioritize authentic, context-specific products) visible and revisitable in future iterations.
Alignment of course content, learning activities, and objectives	**Issue #1:** Many activities (polls, reflections, COI tasks) are valuable but not obviously feeding into a final artifact. **Issue #2:** Same tasks for all learners regardless of context or experience.	**Option A:** Map each activity to a specific section of the Online Teaching Strategy Plan (e.g., presence, assessment, interaction). **Option B:** Provide branching prompts for experienced vs novice online instructors when they complete key activities.	**Option A selected.** Create an alignment chart linking each week's activity to a corresponding section of the Strategy Plan (for example: Week 1 COI activity → "Presence section," Week 2 case study → "Assessment section"), and revise instructions so participants are prompted to bring insights directly into that section.	Fiock (2020) and Garrison et al. (2000) stress coherence between content, interaction, and assessed products in sustaining cognitive presence across triggering, exploration, integration, and resolution. Making these links explicit also mirrors Stefaniak's recommendation to use design documents and external representations (like alignment tables) to document how decisions about activities connect to outcomes.
Opportunities for learner–learner interaction	**Issue #1:** Interactions are mostly short forum	**Option A:** Introduce a small "design partner"	**Option A selected.** Create "design partner" pairs in Week 1; each	Peer feedback on authentic artifacts supports social and cognitive presence

(Discussions, some peer sharing)	posts with no shared product. **Issue #2:** Interaction structures are identical for all; no collaborative choice.	structure where pairs give feedback on each other's Strategy Plans. **Option B:** Create small design teams that choose one shared problem (e.g., low engagement) and co-design a solution.	partner reviews and comments on a section of the other's draft Strategy Plan at two checkpoints (after presence section and before final submission), using a brief rubric.	and knowledge construction (Garrison et al., 2000; Fiock, 2020). A simple pairing model avoids over-complicating the design while still addressing the lack of collaborative engagement. This is a choice-type decision (among many collaboration models) that we're documenting explicitly in the change matrix, as Stefaniak suggests, so that later iterations can evaluate whether pairing or team-based collaboration works better.
Opportunities for instructor–learner interaction (Announcements, feedback, occasional synchronous options)	**Issue #1:** Instructor feedback is mostly tied to isolated assignments, not to a growing artifact. **Issue #2:** Instructor interaction pattern is the same for everyone,	**Option A:** Add two "Strategy Plan Consults" where learners can choose either a brief 1:1 meeting or an asynchronous annotated review. **Option B:** Use an AI "question bank" assistant for basic Q&A and reserve	**Option A selected.** Embed two checkpoints in the course calendar where participants can sign up for either (a) a 15-minute consult or (b) an annotated review of their draft Strategy Plan. Instructions make explicit how these consults support	Sorensen & Baylen (2009) highlight the importance of student–faculty contact and prompt feedback for learning and motivation. Offering modality choice in consults also supports autonomy while keeping structure intact. From a decision-making perspective, this is a

	regardless of self-direction levels.	instructor time for deeper coaching.	refinement of their artifact.	rational choice balancing instructor time with learner needs; recording the rationale and planned checkpoints follows Stefaniak's guidance on logging decisions for later evaluation.
Instructional materials and resources are engaging (Readings, expert videos, checklists)	**Issue #1:** Materials are engaging in isolation but aren't clearly tied to creating a final product. **Issue #2:** Limited choice in which resources to use or how to use them.	**Option A:** Curate "core" vs "choice" resources for each module, with guidance on how each can inform sections of the Strategy Plan. **Option B:** Add short, scenario-based microcases that directly feed into the Plan.	**Option A selected.** Label readings/videos as **Required for All** and **Choose at Least One**, and add a note under each explaining which section of the Strategy Plan it most strongly supports (e.g., social presence, assessment, technology choices).	Differentiating core and optional materials supports respect for diverse talents and ways of learning and supports learner autonomy (Sorensen & Baylen, 2009). It also echoes Richardson et al.'s emphasis on strategic and motivational scaffolding, giving learners guidance on how to deploy resources toward a meaningful goal. Documenting these curation decisions (why one resource is "core" vs "choice") aligns with Stefaniak's call to record the reasoning behind selections, not just the selections themselves.
Opportunities for social presence	**Issue #1:** Community	**Option A:** Add an early "Tell the	**Option A + B combined.** In	Fiock (2020) notes that social presence

(Introductions, some reflection)	building doesn't clearly connect to the culminating artifact. **Issue #2:** Social presence activities are uniform; little room to choose how to present oneself.	story of your current or future online course" activity that becomes the context for the Strategy Plan. **Option B:** Allow participants to choose between video, audio, or text formats for introductions and reflections.	Week 1, revise the introduction so participants briefly present the online/hybrid course they will focus on throughout and share this via their chosen medium (video/audio/text). Later prompts explicitly refer back to this course when developing Strategy Plan sections.	is strengthened when learners present themselves as "real people" with authentic contexts, and when activities tie into ongoing work. Giving modality choices respects different comfort levels and access while still connecting identity work to the core design task. These changes are context-sensitive design decisions (Tessmer, 1990) that Stefaniak argues should be explicitly tracked as part of the designer's reflective record.
Assessment of mastery (Discussions, reflections, case analysis; no explicit capstone product)	**Issue #1:** No explicit final assignment that demonstrates integrated mastery in a usable form. **Issue #2:** Assessment formats are largely fixed and text-based.	**Option A:** Create a final **Online Teaching Strategy Plan** assignment (3–5 pages or equivalent) aligned to all objectives. **Option B:** Same Plan assignment, but allow different formats (narrated slide deck, written	**Option B selected.** Introduce a capstone assignment where participants synthesize course concepts into a Strategy Plan for a real course, with the option to submit as (a) written narrative, (b) narrated slides, or (c) a short screencast	Authentic assessments that mirror real teaching tasks promote transfer and resolution in the Practical Inquiry Model (Fiock, 2020; Garrison et al., 2000). Providing multiple product formats supports diverse talents while still assessing the same criteria (Sorensen &

		document, or video walkthrough).	explaining key design choices. Rubric aligns with module objectives (presence, interaction, assessment, technology use).	Baylen, 2009). Designing the rubric and logging why these formats were chosen is an example of constructive decision-making (Stefaniak, drawing on Jonassen, 2012) and should be captured in the design documentation.
Choice #1: Culminating Artifact Threading	**Issue #1:** Artifact (if added) risks feeling "bolted on" rather than woven through. **Issue #2:** Risk of overwhelming learners if connections aren't clear.	**Option A:** Add a "Strategy Plan Check-In" item at the end of each weekly checklist. **Option B:** Embed explicit "Add this to your Plan" prompts inside key discussion and reflection instructions.	**Option B selected.** Revise select discussion and reflection prompts to end with a line like: "In 2–3 sentences, note how this insight might appear in your Online Teaching Strategy Plan and store it in your Plan document."	This is a micro-scaffolding move that turns otherwise isolated reflections into building blocks for the culminating artifact, supporting integration and reflection (Fiock, 2020). It also exemplifies Stefaniak's emphasis on small but intentional design decisions that contribute to overall efficiency and ease of learning; by documenting this pattern, the instructor can later evaluate whether it reduced cognitive load and redundancy.

Choice #2: Learner Autonomy & Choice Structures	**Issue #2 (primary):** Highly linear pathway; limited room for tailoring. **Issue #1 (secondary):** When learners don't see relevance, they may engage less with building an artifact.	**Option A:** Offer at least one "choose-one-of-three" task each week (e.g., redesign a discussion, an announcement, or an assessment element). **Option B:** Offer "core path" vs "stretch path" suggestions based on prior experience.	**Option A selected.** In Week 2, add an activity where participants choose one of three redesign tasks (discussion, announcement, or assessment plan) and then incorporate that redesign into their final Strategy Plan.	Research on autonomy and motivation suggests that structured choice (not unlimited freedom) promotes engagement and self-regulation (Patall et al., 2008). This design preserves the strong backbone of the course. In Stefaniak's terms, this is a choice-type decision among many possible autonomy structures; recording both the option selected and alternatives rejected helps build decision-making repertoire over time.
Choice #3: Documentation of Design Decisions (for instructor/designer use)	N/A for learner-facing issues; relates to your **designer practice** in revising the course.	**Option A:** Maintain a living design document that logs each change, the issue addressed, and data to collect. **Option B:** Use a reflection journal during and after delivery to capture emerging decisions and constraints.	**Option A selected.** Create a simple "Change Log & Rationale" table (essentially an expanded version of this matrix) stored with the course master shell. After each offering, add notes about how well the Strategy Plan, choice activities, and consults worked, and what	Stefaniak explicitly argues that instructional designers should document their decisions, rationales, and contextual constraints using tools like design documents, external representations, and reflection journals to support iterative improvement and to make decision-making visible. This

			constraints appeared.	meta-component doesn't change what learners see directly, but it increases the quality of future changes and aligns with the course's emphasis on reflective, evidence-based online teaching.

Facilitation Plan – Online Teaching Strategies (Revised Design)

1. Course Philosophy

In this course, I assume that instructors learn most effectively when they actively inquire into their own teaching contexts, apply ideas to authentic problems, and receive targeted scaffolding, feedback, and community support. The design draws on the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework, balancing teaching presence (clear structure, guidance, and modeling), social presence (learners presenting themselves as real people with real courses), and cognitive presence (moving through triggering events, exploration, integration, and resolution in relation to their own online courses). It is also informed by Transactional Distance Theory, which highlights the interplay of structure, dialogue, and autonomy in online learning. The course intentionally provides strong structure (weekly checklists and templates), high levels of facilitated dialogue (discussions, design partner feedback, consults), and growing learner autonomy (task and format choices). Scaffolding is gradually faded so participants end with a usable Online Teaching Strategy Plan tailored to their real course context.

2. Facilitation Plans for Key Activities

Activity 1: Online Teaching Strategy Plan (Capstone Artifact)

Overview and Purpose

Participants synthesize course concepts into a practical Online Teaching Strategy Plan for one of their own current or future courses. This artifact is built across the term and serves as evidence of mastery and a resource they can immediately implement.

Instructor Setup (Before the Module Begins)

- Post a short overview video explaining the purpose of the Strategy Plan and how weekly activities feed into it.
- Provide a template with sections such as: Course Context, Teaching Presence, Social Presence, Learner–Learner and Learner–Instructor Interaction, Assessment & Feedback, and Technology & Accessibility.
- Share the grading rubric, emphasizing alignment with course objectives, and authentic applicability.

Facilitation Steps (During the Module)

1. **Week 1: Introduce and Anchor in Context**
    a. Ask participants to select one course they will focus on and briefly describe it in the Week 1 introduction activity.
    b. Prompt them to complete the "Course Context" section of the Strategy Plan early in Week 1.
    c. In discussions, regularly ask, "How might this idea show up in your Strategy Plan?"
2. **Week 1–2: Integrate Weekly Insights**
    a. At the end of key activities (for example: COI analysis, social presence tasks), include a line: "In 2–3 sentences, jot down how this influences your Strategy Plan."
    b. Encourage participants to treat the Strategy Plan as a living document, adding, revising, and annotating ideas during the week rather than waiting until the end.
3. **Checkpoints and Feedback**
    a. Set at least two draft checkpoints where participants submit portions of their Plan (for example, presence & interaction sections first, assessment & technology sections later).
    b. Provide focused feedback on clarity, alignment, and feasibility, pointing participants back to relevant course concepts when needed.

After the Activity

- Host a short debrief (announcement or brief video) highlighting strong examples (with permission) and common growth areas.
- Invite participants to reflect on how their Strategy Plan evolved from initial ideas to the final version.

Instructor Tips

- Normalize iteration and remind participants that early drafts are expected to be rough and that the plan will improve through feedback.

- Use probing questions in feedback ("What evidence will you look for to know this strategy worked?") to deepen cognitive presence.
- Encourage participants to capture their decision rationales within the Plan (examples include: short notes on why they chose a given discussion strategy or tool).

Activity 2: Choice-Based Redesign Task (Structured Autonomy)

Overview and Purpose

In Week 2, participants complete a choice-based redesign activity where they select one of three options: (a) redesign a discussion prompt, (b) redesign an announcement, or (c) redesign an assessment element from their own course. This introduces structured autonomy while keeping work aligned to course goals.

Instructor Setup

- Create a single assignment with three clearly described options, including examples of what a "before" and "after" might look like.
- Clarify that whichever option they choose must be integrated into their Online Teaching Strategy Plan.
- Prepare a concise rubric that focuses on clarity of purpose, alignment with objectives, and support for presence/interaction.

Facilitation Steps

1. **Introduce the Rationale for Choice**
    a. In an announcement or brief video, explain that the choice structure is meant to respect differences in teaching context and experience while keeping everyone focused on improving a real course.
    b. Encourage less experienced online instructors to choose the component that feels most straightforward (example: an announcement), and more experienced participants to choose the area where they see the greatest need for improvement.
2. **Guide the Redesign Process**
    a. Provide short prompts to guide their redesign (examples include: "Who is the audience?", "What do you want students to think/feel/do?", "How will you support interaction or motivation?").
    b. Invite participants to post their drafts in a small discussion group for informal peer input before submitting.
3. **Connect to the Strategy Plan**
    a. Require a brief section in the Strategy Plan where they explain how their chosen redesign fits into their broader approach to online teaching (for example: a subsection in the Teaching Presence or Assessment section).

After the Activity

- Share a synthesis note highlighting patterns and creative approaches that emerged across the three options.
- Encourage participants to save both their original and revised versions as examples of their professional growth.

Instructor Tips

- Watch for participants who appear overwhelmed by the options; offer a recommendation based on what you know about their context.
- Use the redesign submissions as a chance to model constructive, specific feedback in your comments.
- Remind participants that "good enough and implementable" is better than "perfect but unrealistic."

Activity 3: Design Partner Peer Feedback on Strategy Plans

Overview and Purpose

Participants are paired with a design partner who provides feedback on key sections of their Strategy Plan at two points during the course. This strengthens learner–learner interaction, builds social presence, and deepens reflective thinking through peer critique.

Instructor Setup

- Create partner pairs in the LMS based on time zones or program track when possible.
- Provide a short peer-feedback guide with 3–4 focused prompts (examples: clarity of context, alignment of strategies with goals, feasibility of implementation).
- Set deadlines: one feedback exchange mid-course (examples: after presence/interaction sections) and one near the end (full draft).

Facilitation Steps

1. **Introduce the Design Partner Model**
    a. Explain that design partners are intended to function like colleagues in a teaching center to offer a fresh perspective and to refine ideas.
    b. Emphasize that feedback should be kind, specific, and focused on helping the plan become more practical and coherent.
2. **Guide the First Feedback Exchange**
    a. Ask each partner to share a draft of specified sections (examples: Teaching Presence, Social Presence, Interaction).

   b. Have partners use the provided prompts to structure their feedback, and require at least one "I appreciate…" and one "Have you considered…?" comment.
3. **Guide the Second Feedback Exchange**
   a. For the near-final draft, prompt partners to focus on coherence and alignment across sections and on whether the plan feels implementable in a real course.
   b. Encourage partners to ask at least one question about how the other will evaluate the success of their strategies.

After the Activity

- Ask participants to include a short reflection paragraph in their final Strategy Plan describing one change they made based on partner feedback.
- Acknowledge the work of design partners in an announcement and highlight how peer collaboration mirrors real-world faculty development.

Instructor Tips

- Monitor a sample of partner exchanges to ensure feedback is substantive and respectful.
- If a pair falls behind or becomes unbalanced, step in with a brief instructor comment or, if needed, pair a participant with an alternate peer.
- Encourage participants to keep in touch with their design partner beyond the course if they find the collaboration valuable.

Activity 4: Strategy Plan Consults (1:1 or Asynchronous Annotated Review)

Overview and Purpose

Participants have two opportunities to receive targeted instructor support on their Strategy Plan: early (focused on direction) and later (focused on refinement). They can choose between a short synchronous consult or an asynchronous annotated review, balancing structure with autonomy.

Instructor Setup

- Create a sign-up schedule with time slots for 15-minute consultations.
- Offer an alternative option: participants can submit a draft and receive annotated feedback via comments in the document.
- Provide guiding questions for participants to answer before the consult (e.g., "Which section are you most unsure about?").

Facilitation Steps

1. **Communicate Options and Expectations**
    a. Explain both options clearly in an announcement and invite participants to choose what works best for their schedule and learning style.
    b. Emphasize that these consults are designed to support and challenge them, not to "fix" the plan for them.
2. **Conducting Live Consults**
    a. Begin by asking participants to briefly summarize their course context and the current state of their Strategy Plan.
    b. Use probing questions to help them clarify goals, narrow focus, or make strategies more realistic.
    c. End with 2–3 concrete next steps for revision.
3. **Providing Asynchronous Annotated Feedback**
    a. Use comments to identify strengths and suggest targeted improvements.
    b. Prioritize feedback that helps participants clarify alignment, presence, and interaction strategies rather than copyediting.

After the Activity

- Encourage participants to note key takeaways from the consult in a short reflection box in their Strategy Plan template.
- Invite them to ask follow-up questions in the "Ask the Instructor" forum.

Instructor Tips

- Keep consults focused; avoid trying to address every issue in one session.
- Track common questions or challenges and address them in a course-wide announcement or mini-video.
- Use these consults as formative data about where the course design and instructions may need further clarification in future iterations.

3. Overall Course Facilitation Plan

3.1 Instructor Presence and Communication

- **Pre-course presence**: Open the course a few days early and send a welcome email that orients participants to the Getting Started section and introduces the Strategy Plan as the central throughline.
- **Announcements**: Post 2–3 announcements per week: (1) a preview of key tasks and connections to the Strategy Plan; (2) a mid-week nudge or highlight from discussions; and (3) an end-of-week debrief summarizing major insights and connecting them to the upcoming work.

- **Discussion role**: Model the kind of posts you want to see by asking open-ended questions, connecting participant comments, and gently redirecting threads that drift away from course objectives.
- **Visibility**: Aim to log in daily on weekdays to respond to questions, acknowledge contributions, and keep the course climate supportive and responsive.

3.2 Feedback and Grading

- **Turnaround time**: Provide feedback on graded work within one week of submission.
- **Depth of feedback**: For the Strategy Plan checkpoints and choice-based redesign tasks, focus comments on reasoning, alignment, and feasibility rather than only on formatting.
- **Use of rubrics**: Apply rubrics consistently and reference specific criteria in your narrative feedback so participants can see exactly how their work aligns with expectations.
- **Leveraging patterns**: Use common themes in feedback to inform whole-class announcements or short "mini-lessons" posted as videos or handouts.

3.3 Supporting Autonomy and Scaffolding

- **Early scaffolding**: Provide explicit instructions, examples, and guiding questions in Week 1 and early Week 2.
- **Fading supports**: Gradually remove some of the more detailed prompts as participants demonstrate more confidence and self-direction, for example, by moving from very structured reflections to more open-ended ones.
- **Choice points**: Make choice opportunities visible (examples include: choice of redesign task, consult format, and final product format) and help participants think aloud about which options will best serve their context.

3.4 Managing Diversity of Experience and Context

- Acknowledge that participants enter with varied backgrounds in online teaching.
- Encourage participants to share brief snapshots of their teaching contexts and to name their biggest current challenge in online or hybrid teaching.
- When giving examples, draw on a mix of disciplines and institution types so more participants can see themselves reflected.
- In feedback, suggest different "stretch goals" for novice and experienced online instructors.

3.5 Use of Technology and AI Tools

- Clearly state which tools are required and which are optional.
- Where AI tools are suggested (for idea generation or draft feedback), remind participants to critically review AI output and ensure it aligns with their teaching philosophy and institutional policies.

- Encourage participants to document any AI-assisted decisions they make in their Strategy Plan.

3.6 Evaluation and Continuous Improvement

- At mid-course, gather quick feedback (via a short survey or discussion) about workload, clarity of instructions, and usefulness of the Strategy Plan.
- After the course ends, review Strategy Plans (with identifying details removed) to identify patterns in strengths and gaps.
- Maintain a simple change log noting what worked, what didn't, and what you plan to adjust in the next offering.

References

Boettcher, J. V., & Conrad, R. (2016). The online teaching survival guide : Simple and practical pedagogical tips. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

Fiock, H. S. (2020). Designing a Community of Inquiry in Online Courses. International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 21(1).

Martin, F., Ritzhaupt, A., Kumar, S., & Budhrani, K. (2019). Award-winning faculty online teaching practices: Course design, assessment and evaluation, and facilitation. The Internet and Higher Education, 42, 34–43.

Roach, V. A., & Attardi, S. M. (2021). Twelve tips for applying Moore's Theory of Transactional Distance to optimize online teaching. Medical Teacher, 44(8), 859–865.

Sorensen, C. K., & Baylen, D. M. (2009). Learning online: Adapting the seven principles of good practice to a Web-based instructional environment. In A. Orellana, T. L. Hudgins, & M. Simonson (Eds.), The perfect online course: Best practices for designing and teaching (pp. 69–86). Information Age Publishing.

Stavredes, T. (2011). Establishing social presence through learner-to-learner collaborative strategies. In Effective Online Teaching: Foundations and Strategies for Student Success (pp. 131–149). Jossey-Bass.

Richardson, J.C., Caskurlu, S., Castellanos-Reyes, D. et al. Instructors' conceptualization and implementation of scaffolding in online higher education courses. J Comput High Educ 34, 242–279 (2022). https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/10.1007/s12528-021-09300-3

Herrmann, Z. (2020, April 17). 4 guiding questions for effective remote collaboration. Edutopia. https://www.edutopia.org/article/4-guiding-questions-effective-remote-collaboration

Woodley X, Hernandez C, Parra J, Negash B. Celebrating difference: Best practices in culturally responsive teaching online. TechTrends. 2017;61(5):470-478. https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/celebrating-difference-best-practices-culturally/docview/1932258940/se-2. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-017-0207-z.