Significant, Backwards, and Systematic:
An Integrated Approach to Course Design

Laura Lohman
Queens University of Charlotte
1900 Selwyn Ave MSC 1383
Charlotte, NC 28274

Descriptors: instructional design, course design

Queens' Course Design Institute is an innovative course design program for faculty teaching face-to-face, hybrid, and online courses at Queens University of Charlotte. Offering three major innovations in comparison with course design institutes at other universities, Queens' Course Design Institute synthesizes complementary aspects of the design approaches of Fink, Wiggins and McTighe, and Dick and Carey to empower faculty members to identify the key skills for which learners need particularly well-designed instruction. Faculty participants are guided through a backwards course design process focused on providing significant learning experiences through targeted application of a systematic design process. The implementation of the institute combines principles of project management, andragogy, social learning, and Bersin's notion of "learning in the flow of work" to deliver innovative, inspiring workplace learning consistent with the 70-20-10 model of learning and development.

Institutional Context, Needs Assessment, and Delivery Mode

Queens University of Charlotte is a small, private, co-educational, master's-level university in Charlotte. Queens' mission is to provide transformative educational experiences that nurture intellectual curiosity, promote global understanding, encourage ethical living, and prepare individuals for purposeful and fulfilling lives. In carrying out this mission, Queens enrolls 2536 students and employs 131 full-time faculty, 173 adjunct faculty, 293 staff members, and 286 student employees. As of 2018, Queens has as 9:1 student-faculty ratio and an average class size of 14. Its degree programs span liberal arts and professional programs in the humanities, social sciences, education, communication, health professions, and business. Its undergraduate programs include robust global learning and internship programs and a nationally distinctive general education curriculum that uses a series of learning communities to develop students' ability to solve problems and address complex questions by drawing on multiple disciplinary perspectives (Queens University of Charlotte).

Responding to the ramifications of this institutional scale, the Course Design Institute was designed to stress basic principles relevant to courses of various modalities and levels. The process used to design and develop the institute included needs assessment conducted through dialogue with various campus stakeholders, including faculty, staff, and administrators over seven months and review of pre-existing support in course design for all course modalities. As a result, the institute was created to support faculty in designing and redesigning courses taught in face-to-face, hybrid, and online modalities at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Faculty participate in the institute on a voluntary basis.

Participants in the institute work on the design or redesign of one course that they will be teaching in the next fall and/or spring semester. The institute consists of four, day-long, in-person sessions held weekly in summer supported by an online learning platform used to share materials with faculty participants, support collaborative learning, and review and give feedback on faculty work. Holding the institute in June enables participants to continue applying design principles and concepts gradually during the remainder of the summer prior to fall or spring implementation of a new course design or redesign. Participants' target courses illustrate variety in level, topic, modality, and discipline. Targeted courses include lower-division courses for majors, undergraduate research methods courses, and general education courses. They span face-to-face, hybrid, and online modalities. They address methodologies and topics in the humanities, arts, social sciences, natural sciences, and health professions.

An Integrated Approach to Course Design

Queens' Course Design Institute integrates strong elements of three approaches to course design. The first key ingredient is the general concept of backwards design as illustrated in many instructional design models (Allen & Sites, 2012; Dick, Carey, & Carey, 2015; Cennamo & Kalk, 2019). Among K-12 and university teachers, the

phrase "backward design" or "backwards design" is most often associated with Wiggins and McTighe's *Understanding by Design*. In particular, Wiggins and McTighe's (2005, p. 18) three-stage version of backward design—1) identify desired results, 2) determine acceptable evidence, and 3) plan learning experiences and instruction—represents widespread principles of instructional design in a simple format that can be readily understood by instructors with no instructional design training. For the purpose of the Course Design Institute, however, a more elaborate representation of backwards design is used that reflects the institute's integration of two of other approaches to course design.

The second key ingredient is the emphasis on significant learning as elaborated and popularized at the university level through Dee Fink's *Creating Significant Learning Experiences*. Significant learning can bring about lasting change that is important in learners' lives after the course. Significant learning experiences in a university-level course can support learners in living enhanced individual lives, engaging in positive social interactions, pursuing informed and thoughtful participation in civic activities, and being prepared for work. In Fink's taxonomy, significant learning is supported by a combination of foundational knowledge, application, integration, the human dimension, caring, and learning how to learn. Fink's taxonomy assists instructors in shifting from a content-centered paradigm of college teaching to a learning-centered paradigm of college teaching.

The third design approach integrated in the institute is from Dick and Carey's instructional design model. While this model has been supplanted in various circles by constructivist, rapid, and agile approaches to instructional design during the past quarter-century, key components of Dick and Carey's approach hold great value in a university setting. In particular, subordinate skills analysis as presented by Dick and Carey is a powerful tool for identifying a root cause for why past instruction has not produced the results desired. Subordinate skills analysis can expose challenging skills that novices lack and need instruction on but that instructors may have assumed, as experts, come naturally to learners. Additionally, Dick and Carey's presentation integrates other useful techniques. These include Mager's tripartite model for writing instructional objectives (conditions-behavior-criteria) and a five-part instructional strategy that blends the nine events of learning detailed in Gagne's (1985) *Conditions of Learning* with Keller's (2010) ARCS model of student motivation by addressing attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction. This synthesis supports the types of deep learning valued at Queens and similar institutions while ensuring that faculty members identify and address the subordinate skills that students need the most support in developing.

Structure of Queens' Course Design Institute

The integration of strong elements from these three approaches to course design is carried out through a distribution of learning objectives across the four, weekly, in-person sessions in an order that largely mirrors the sequence of steps used in a backwards design process itself. As detailed in Figure 1, each weekly in-person session focuses on four to six learning objectives. This distribution of learning objectives reflects both an initial plan and adjustment of that plan during delivery in response to learners' needs and their shaping of in-person instruction. The intended sequencing of the learning objectives was retained, but in practice, the first and third sessions addressed fewer learning objectives than planned. This resulted in delaying some objectives to the subsequent session, as reflected in Figure 1.

The first session establishes a clear contrast between a common faculty approach to creating courses and a backwards design process as articulated through many instructional design models. After highlighting this contrast, the first session focuses on essential initial analytical steps found in many instructional design models: analyzing the context in which learning will occur and analyzing learner characteristics. The session then turns to Fink's taxonomy of significant learning. Fink's taxonomy is related to Wiggins and McTighe's six facets of understanding and Bloom's and Krathwohl's taxonomies of the cognitive and affective domains. The session then prompts participants to clarify how their course will foster significant learning and articulate a major "end of course" performance that can be used to assess that significant learning (e.g., an individual research paper or poster presentation). Shifting to concepts drawn from the Dick and Carey text, participants then conduct a goal analysis by identifying the steps executed and key decision points addressed when carrying out that performance.

The second session gives participants tools to dive deeper into their analysis and begin the process of articulating sound instructional strategies to help learners navigate the gap between their current performance ability and the level of performance they should have at the end of the course. Drawing on concepts from the Dick and Carey text, participants are guided in conducting a subordinate skills analysis (called "component skills analysis" in the institute) for one or two key steps in their goal analysis. After highlighting the differences between how novices and experts approach performing the same task, the session next guides participants in writing three-part learning objectives for some critical subordinate skills. Continuing to draw on relevant content from Dick and Carey's

approach, the session highlights effective use of four types of tests: entry skills tests, pretests, practice tests, and posttests. The session guides participants in writing a five-part instructional strategy for a subordinate skill objective using Keller's ARCS model of motivation. The session concludes with a prompt to pause and check for alignment between the subordinate skill, objective, and instructional strategy. Homework prompts participants to outline a five-part instructional strategy for two other subordinate skills that tend to be challenging for learners. In this process, participants revisit the learner analysis and context analysis to take into account learner motivation, goals, attitudes towards the subject, and previous relevant experience so that they can address relevance, confidence, and satisfaction from a learner perspective.

Day 1 (Week 1)	Day 2 (Week 2)	Day 3 (Week 3)	Day 4 (Week 4)
. Understand how a backwards design process differs from a common faculty process for creating a course . Analyze the context in which learning will occur . Analyze learner characteristics . Clarify how your course will foster significant learning . Articulate a major "end of course" performance to assess that learning . Conduct a goal analysis based on that performance	. Conduct a component (subordinate) skills analysis . Identify differences in how novices and experts perform the same task . Write component skills objectives . Distinguish the uses of four types of "tests" . Outline a five-part instructional strategy for component skill objectives using the ARCS model of motivation . Check for alignment between skills, objectives, and instructional strategy	. Design-in enhancement of learner motivation . Design-in support for student metacognition . Identify any major disconnect you may have introduced . Remedy the disconnect(s)	. Sequence instruction effectively . Map instructional strategy to the context . Select suitable instructional materials and deliver them effectively . Schedule instruction into semester structure, consistent with course modality . Create syllabus . Develop plan for completing re/design project

Figure 1. Learning objectives as distributed through the four in-person sessions of Queens' Course Design Institute.

The third session delves deeper into student metacognition and learner motivation, as stressed in Fink's and Dick and Carey's approaches, respectively. This session responds to both a pervasive discourse on metacognition at Queens as established in the general education program and discourse on student motivation stemming from ample experiences supporting a diverse population of traditional undergraduates and working adult learners at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The session showcases three related models of motivation and practical ways to support students in developing metacognitive skills and engaging in self-regulated learning. The session then prompts participants to identify any major disconnect or misalignment between objectives, assessments, and learning activities that they may have introduced in their course design work to date.

The fourth and final session focuses on planning the effective implementation of the decisions made in previous sessions. This includes sequencing instruction effectively, mapping an instructional strategy to a particular instructional context including course modality, awareness of key considerations when selecting and delivering suitable instructional materials from a wide range of options, scheduling instruction within a semester structure consistent with the course modality, and creating a syllabus. Essential to this process is developing a plan for completing the course design or redesign project in relation to the timeline for delivering the course the following fall or spring semester. Accordingly, the homework includes a project completion timeline and a progress report due in the first half of August.

Guiding Design Principles

The design and development of the Course Design Institute were guided by both practical and theoretical principles. One set of principles was nine practically oriented grounding principles developed from sustained study of adult and organizational learning and tailored to the needs, structure, and organizational culture at Queens:

1. Give learners choices and autonomy
2. Use images and interaction for memorable learning
3. Leverage colleagues' knowledge and experience
4. Ask questions to promote reflection and shared responsibility for learning
5. Deliver good design elastically
6. Model sound practices
7. Foster mutual respect and trust
8. Promote learning opportunities in relationships as much as "training"
9. Advocate the connection of learning to performance management

These grounding principles state in concise and practical terms guidance developed from adult learning, including andragogy, social learning, and Josh Bersin's (2018, 2019) notion of "learning in the flow of work."

Of these, andragogy most significantly influenced the design of the institute. Approaching the participants as self-directed learners with strong internal motivation oriented towards applying concepts to solve specific problems in the immediate future shaped learner activities and instructional materials. Knowles' (2005) assumptions of andragogy influenced the institute's design through the emphasis placed on relating information to participants' abilities to solve real problems in their immediate work. Responding to participants' likely orientation to problems, abstract or theoretical information was chunked into manageable segments and followed promptly by application activities. Responding to adult participants' likely internal motivation and desire for self-direction, the institute included ample opportunity for participants to make choices among curated activities, instructional materials, and homework prompts. For example, homework after the third session included three options. Participants could 1) remedy a major misalignment between learning objectives, assessments and instructional activities by using techniques and concepts from the first three sessions, 2) continue applying goal analysis, subordinate skills analysis, the five-part instructional strategy, and models of motivation to other subordinate skills that students have struggled with in the past, or 3) formulate reasonable plans to support the development of self-regulated learning by identifying a specific metacognitive skill, writing a three-part learning objective for it, and sketching a five-part instructional strategy that supports the development of the metacognitive skill.

Social learning also influenced the design of the institute. Application activities were often followed by sharing and group discussion as one outlet for social learning (Horton, 2012). Allowing time for participants to share anecdotes of relevant experiences with each other and respond to each other rather than having exchanges with the primary session facilitator turned group discussion into peer learning. Due to aspects of organizational culture, peer learning readily extended into peer mentoring as participants shared additional strategies and advice based on teaching experiences at Queens. As a result, for segments of several sessions, one or more participants became a dominant voice rather than the institute's primary facilitator. This chain of events flowed from grounding principles 3 and 8.

While the institute was carefully designed it was also flexibly run, as encapsulated in guiding principle 5. Participants' interest in social learning and peer mentoring was so strong during the first and third sessions that planned content and activities had to be pushed into the second and fourth session. Homework planned to follow the first session had to be scrapped entirely.

The result was a form of workplace learning more consistent with a 70-20-10 model for learning and development. This widely promoted model asserts that 70% of learning in the workplace occurs informally during job-related experiences, 20% occurs through developmental relationships with others, and only 10% occurs through formal training. While the source of the percentages foregrounded in this familiar model has been questioned and the model's positioning as fact has been debunked (Jefferson & Pollock, 2014; Clardy, 2018), the general idea encapsulated in this model remains a valuable counterweight to the traditional emphasis on training in human resources and instructional design arenas. It reminds us that peer learning and curated just-in-time resources available for learners to pull on demand, along with many other forms of learning support, are valuable ingredients in a larger learning environment that supports both individual and organizational learning (Lombardozzi, 2015). The flexible delivery of the institute and accommodation of participants' habitual transformation of training or

conversation into peer learning and peer mentoring responded to situational factors at the root of Bersin's (2018, 2019) notion of learning in the flow of work and at the point of need.

Finally, essential to the design of the institute was attention to project management principles and the need to equip participants with the project management resources and skills to ensure completion of sound course design after the institute and before faculty implementation of a new course design or redesign (Rothwell, Benscoter, King, & King, 2015). For this reason, a significant portion of the fourth session and the subsequent homework was dedicated to basic aspects of project management, including chunking work into manageable units, specifying resources needed for project completion, and constructing a feasible timeline with relevant milestones. Such timelines typically included the construction of a course schedule and syllabus after the institute's final session but by August.

Key Innovations

The innovation of Queens' Course Design Institute stems in large part from how it differs from course design institutes offered at other universities. Most course design institutes focus on the design of face-to-face courses, draw on one design text, and are completed in three to five consecutive days within one week. Queens' Course Design Institute innovates in each of these respects.

First, Queens' institute is structured as a series of four day-long sessions occurring weekly throughout one month. This enables faculty participants to apply and deepen their understanding of key concepts and techniques as they work on their design projects between weekly sessions. Additional time between in-person sessions can be used to receive and provide feedback. It also provides time to work as needed with relevant campus resources and partners and make connections with relevant programs, such as the General Education program and the Hayworth Center for Online Learning. This contrasts with the compressed schedules commonly used in course design institutes (see Figure 2). While offering course design content over three to five successive days may be convenient for facilitators and participants, it does not provide ample time for incorporating, reflecting on, and applying concepts. This time is especially important given that instructional design concepts are interrelated and build on each other.

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday
Main Topic: Student Learning Objectives	**Main Topic: Assessments**	**Main Topic: Teaching and Learning Activities**
Course constraints and challenges	Aligning learning objectives and assessments	Passive vs. active learning
Syllabus template	Student-centered assessments	Active learning strategies and tools
Draft and revise learning objectives	Types of feedback	Getting students to success on an assignment
Draft a course description	Draft and revise draft an assessment	Refine learning activities
Begin organizing course schedule	Add to course schedule	Refine course schedule
		Begin to assemble full syllabus

Figure 2. Three-day Course Design Institute schedule summary (derived from Duke University, 2019).

Second, Queens' Course Design Institute synthesizes strong, complementary elements of three approaches to course design, whereas most course design institutes emphasize one approach: Fink's *Creating Significant Learning Experiences* (see Figure 3). The ramifications of this difference become clear when reviewing Fink's text with a broader instructional design perspective. Fink's approach begins with familiar steps in a backward design process and a check for alignment or "integration" between learning goals, feedback and assessment procedures, and teaching and learning activities. However, his stepwise approach does not prompt instructors to identify the subordinate or component skills that learners must have to achieve the significant learning goals as displayed in the aligned assessments. This step is critical given the complexity of skills captured in several areas of Fink's taxonomy, including application, integration, and the human dimension, such as leadership and teamwork. It becomes more critical when the differences between novices and experts are taken into consideration (Ambrose, Bridges, DiPietro, Lovett, & Norman, 2010). When those following Fink's steps move into creating a thematic structure for the course (i.e., selecting and sequencing the most important concepts, issues, topics, or themes) and selecting or creating a teaching strategy (i.e., a combination of learning activities that have been arranged in a particular sequence), there is

a risk that instructors do not incorporate instructional modifications necessary to support novices in learning or synthesizing essential subordinate skills as needed to achieve the learning goals for the course. Moreover, the resulting thematic structure and teaching strategy may be overly driven by inaccurate estimates of time needed or by repetition of activities in particular patterns, as in the illustrations of problem-based learning.

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
CDI Overview	Design	Feedback and	Creating the	Exchange syllabi
Understanding	Principles of	assessing student	schedule	Implementing the
student motivation	gauging student	learning	Feedback and	design
Principles of course	learning	Principles of active	grading	Turn in paper copy
design	Exploring ways to	learning	Individual work and	of near-final or final
Backward designing	assess and gain	Exploring learning	consultations	syllabus
from learning goals	feedback on student	activities	Exchange syllabi	
and objectives	learning	Developing learning	Individual work and	
Defining what you	Developing learning	activities	consultations	
most want students	assessments	Individual work and	Refine learning	
to get out of your	Individual work and	consultations	activities	
class	consultations	Optional mini-	Define grading	
Individual work and	Optional mini-	workshop on	scheme	
consultations	workshop on	technology	Determine tentative	
Determining your	technology	Optional mini-	schedule	
learning goals and	Refine your	workshop on	Complete syllabus	
objectives	learning objectives	technology		
Create a new	Determine overall	Refine assessments		
learner-centered	assessment strategy	Determine overall		
course description	Develop 1-2	instructional		
	specific assessments	strategy		
		Develop 1-2		
		specific activities		

Figure 3. Schedule for a five-day Course Design Institute based on Fink's *Creating Significant Learning Experiences* (derived from George Washington University, 2016).

So rather than drilling down through the hierarchical layers of a subordinate skills analysis to expose and address essential skills that have gone (or are at risk to go) untaught or undeveloped, course design institutes often place emphasis on Fink's shift from a content-centered paradigm of college teaching to a learning-centered paradigm of college teaching. And participants' success in making this shift is often captured through an assessment of the syllabus using a coordinated syllabus rubric (Bromley, 2015; Palmer, Streifer, & Williams-Duncan, 2016; Palmer, Bach, & Streifer, 2017). The course design may even be equated with or reduced to the syllabus: as Steinhardt (2015) explained the impact of a course design institute on faculty at George Washington University, "By the end of the week, they've created a new or redesigned project: a new or redesigned course syllabus, one that Dr. [Michael] Palmer explains is "learning-focused" rather than "content-focused." Or as Bromley's (2015) title misleadingly suggests in contradiction of Fink's own text, "Building a better course starts with the syllabus."

A rush to create and measure a syllabus by the end of a three- or five-day institute may entail premature decision-making in other critical areas of the course design or redesign. One is the selection of instructional resources (e.g., readings, audio-visual materials). As these are normally specified in a syllabus, there may not have been enough time to select them with ample attention to learner analysis and motivation. Another is the relative duration allotted for instructional activities, practice, feedback, and assessment of learning aligned with various learning objectives. If given more time before the development of the syllabus and guidance in subordinate skills analysis, instructors would likely alter the amount of time allocated for the development and assessment of learning objectives that vary in complexity. Moreover, they would likely allow additional time for learners to have guidance, practice, and feedback in synthesizing subordinate skills as needed for various forms of significant learning.

Finally, Queens' Course Design Institute stresses key design steps and principles relevant to all course modalities. In contrast, many course design institutes are designed to support faculty creating and teaching face-to-face courses. Others are geared primarily towards online or hybrid courses. Supporting faculty teaching in all modalities was critical given Queens' size and the mixture of modalities handled by any one faculty member. For example, a faculty member teaching exclusively face-to-face courses during fall and spring semesters will often

teach in an online modality in summer to support students who have returned to live elsewhere in the country. Moreover, faculty may be responsible for teaching the same course in more than one modality. This cross-modality approach to the institute is further supported by the fact that many of the same fundamental criteria are important when evaluating teaching or course design in online, hybrid, or face-to-face modalities. Examples of such criteria include clarity about learning outcomes or objectives, student engagement, and the alignment of assessments with learning objectives (Baldwin, Ching, & Hsu, 2018; Central Piedmont Community College 2019; Lohman, 2019). Therefore, while guiding participants to draw on modality-specific resources in their work, Queens' Course Design Institute helps raise faculty awareness of and capacity for strong course design across modalities, something that is especially important in institutional settings with an unfavorable ratio of instructional design staff to faculty or a modest headcount of instructional designers.

Designer Observations and Participant Feedback

Both my observations as the designer, developer, and primary facilitator of the institute and participants' feedback confirm the value of the innovations in the institute and the principles used in developing and delivering it. I had the unique opportunity to deliver Queens' Course Design Institute while also working with and observing graduate students in an instructional design course at another university. Learning instructional design techniques and processes—especially as a novice—can be challenging for faculty and other learners alike. The temptation when hitting an unfamiliar step or a roadblock is to use old habits and skip critical steps. For example, when first asked to write an instructional strategy (for oneself to later develop and implement), sheer habit and comfort may lead a faculty member to begin writing instructions for and to students instead. Similarly, when asked for the first time to write the learning objectives to be developed in each portion of an employee orientation program, a human resources professional experienced in running such programs may prematurely write a time-based agenda for the program out of familiarity, comfort, and habit.

One of the most significant takeaways from facilitating the institute came from seeing participants' reactions to component skills analysis (Dick and Carey's subordinate skills analysis). Despite having a strong belief in its value, based on approximately 13 years of experience implementing such principles in university instructional settings, I was concerned that faculty participants in the institute might perceive this step as overwhelming, tedious, or of unclear benefit. On the contrary, participants quickly saw its value and readily connected it to their own past experiences as instructors. They suddenly understood *why* students had not performed as they had hoped on key learning assessments in previous courses. Several participants' lightbulb moments came from applying component skills analysis to their own courses and realizing exactly where they had assumed students could just do something that they as experts could do and where they had not stopped to pause and provide needed instruction and practice (e.g., the skill of identifying effective keywords for a library or database search). This reaction came in large part from translating Dick and Carey's techniques into examples relevant to the learners.

Participants' feedback through an anonymous end-of-institute survey clarified the most valuable aspects of the institute. When asked "What are the top 3 things you learned in this institute?" participants most frequently highlighted component skills analysis, followed by backwards design and supporting students' development of metacognitive skills. Articulating the value of a component skills analysis for recognizing the needs of novice learners, one participant noted that a most important outcome was "Realizing there are skills so inherent in my process that I've never stopped to consider them as individual skills, let alone teachable moments." Another highlighted how this particular step played a key role in the backwards design process when identifying a major takeaway as "Focusing on skill components rather than jumping into instructional strategies." Such specific feedback confirms the value of integrating elements of Dick and Carey's instructional design approach with Fink's in university settings.

Participants' clear plans for applying knowledge gained in the institute confirm the value of integrating backwards, significant learning, and systematic approaches to course design as outlined in the texts of Wiggins and McTighe, Fink, and Dick and Carey. Participants' plans included resequencing the target course, creating a different timeline or schedule for the course, and redesigning instructional materials, such as PowerPoint presentations, lectures, and in-class activities. Both the component skills analysis and five-part instructional strategies taught by drawing from the Dick and Carey text fueled these participants' plans for how they would spend instructional time in their courses. When asked "What are some specific ways that you will apply what you learned in this institute?" one participant explained, "I will go back and really structure instructional time in the classroom focusing on the specific skill components I need to prioritize. Think through the 5 step process that will help me be more intentional and planful :) rather than simply implementing an instructional strategy because I learned about it. The 5 step process allows me to be more aware of why I am doing something and when (and how)."

This positive feedback was confirmed as participants began implementing their revised course designs. Participants continued to cite key design techniques from the institute during the semester and also used those techniques to shape their instruction in other courses. As a result, the learning begun in the institute was sustained and further developed in the course of faculty members' teaching activities and in ordinary interactions with colleagues. This continuation of learning begun in the institute aligns with the basic premises of Bersin's "learning in the flow of work" and the 70-20-10 model of learning.

The success of the institute stems from many factors, including the self-selection of the participants, the timing of the institute, the collegiality and mutual respect fostered among all involved, and the commitment to teaching that pervades daily interactions at Queens. However, beyond these factors is the institute's unique mediation of faculty and instructional design perspectives. This mediation is achieved by showcasing key instructional design techniques through specific examples created and chosen for their relevance for a faculty audience. It is also achieved by modifying terminology for the audience at hand. Thus "subordinate skills analysis" is presented as "component skills analysis," to stress the ultimate goal of building up learners' skills towards a desired performance, which is aligned with faculty experience in a class setting, rather than the intermediate goal of decomposing skills by working downwards through a hierarchical diagram, aligned with experience in an instructional design role. And despite the comprehensiveness of the golf examples diagrammed in Dick and Carey's text and their utility for showing how to address verbal, intellectual, motor, and attitudinal skills, the concept of subordinate skills analysis is illustrated in the institute through an example more immediately understood and more likely to be seen as relevant by the learners in the institute: creating a research paper.

Conclusion

Reflecting on Queens' Course Design Institute highlights additional opportunities for the integration of perspectives on course design common among faculty and faculty developers on the one hand, and instructional designers on the other hand. The heavy reliance on Fink's approach in many course design institutes is readily explained by the predominant role of faculty developers in creating, designing, and delivering course design institutes, rather than individuals with significant instructional design background. In the case of Queens' Course Design Institute, both faculty and instructional design perspectives could be integrated and mediated by one person who has applied instructional design techniques in university-level instruction while serving as a faculty member for over a decade. At larger institutions, a collaborative approach to the design of such institutes can enrich the range of skills developed in faculty, foster greater mutual awareness of the complementarity of these perspectives, and assist instructional designers in being prepared to collaborate efficiently with faculty in both individual and group settings. Such a collaborative approach to a course design institute may be particularly valuable at institutions in which individual faculty-instructional designer partnerships are not sustainable or scalable.

Unfavorable instructional designer-faculty ratios and differences in experience, vocabulary, and priorities can contribute to obstacles and frustration felt by instructional designers and faculty alike. These factors can hinder communication and collaboration between instructional designers and faculty. Queens' Course Design Institute is an effective and innovative model for overcoming these obstacles and bridging these gaps. For instructional designers, the institute highlights the importance of using terminology in a way that others can readily understand, which may involve selecting carefully from or modifying existing terminology. Moreover, it demonstrates the importance of adapting or expanding fundamental concepts, such as learning objectives, in alignment with the values of a particular institution. It also underscores the need to be aware that some texts and basic concepts may not be widely understood among faculty. For faculty, the institute demonstrates the importance of being open to learning new techniques and adding them to one's toolbox of techniques for use in designing and delivering learning experiences. For faculty developers, the institute offers an invitation to explore course design resources beyond Fink's widely used text. In particular, the institute makes clear that elements of Dick and Carey's approach still hold relevance and value in university settings, despite the rise of other valuable models and approaches to instructional design. Queens' Course Design Institute highlights important elements that can be selected from other instructional design and course design texts beyond Fink's and integrated into extended learning opportunities for faculty. In doing so, it offers a helpful and inspiring example to instructional designers and faculty that can be used to understand and address common obstacles hindering the feasible application of sound course design principles at the university level.

References

Allen, M. W., & Sites, R. (2012). *Leaving ADDIE for SAM: An agile model for developing the best learning experiences*. Alexandria: Association for Talent Development.

Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., & Norman, M. K. (2010). *How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baldwin, S., Ching, Y.-H., & Hsu, Y.-C. (2018). Online course design in higher education: A review of national and statewide evaluation instruments. *TechTrends*, *62*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-017-0215-z

Bersin, J. (2018, June 3). A new paradigm for corporate training: Learning in the flow of work. https://joshbersin.com/2018/06/a-new-paradigm-for-corporate-training-learning-in-the-flow-of-work/

Bersin, J., & Zao-Sanders, M. (2019, February 19). Making learning a part of everyday work. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2019/02/making-learning-a-part-of-everyday-work

Bromley, A. E. (2015, March 17). Building a better course starts with the syllabus. Phys.org. https://phys.org/news/2015-03-syllabus.html

Cennamo, K. & Kalk, D. (2019). *Real world instructional design: An iterative approach to designing learning experiences.* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Central Piedmont Community College (2019). Faculty Classroom Observation Form – Online and Hybrid Courses. https://www.cpcc.edu/sites/default/files/2019-07/form-classsroom-observation-online-hybrid.pdf

Central Piedmont Community College (2019). Faculty Classroom Observation Form – Seated Classes. https://www.cpcc.edu/sites/default/files/2019-07/form-classsroom-observation-seated.pdf

Clardy, A. (2018). 70-20-10 and the dominance of informal learning: A fact in search of evidence. *Human Resource Development Review, 17*(2), 153–178. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484318759399

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

Duke University. (2019). Sample CDI 2019 Schedule. https://learninginnovation.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/CDI-2019-schedule-sample.pdf

Fink, L. D. (2013). *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Gagné, R. M. (1985). *Conditions of learning.* (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

George Washington University, University Teaching and Learning Center. (2016). Course design institute block schedule. https://tlc.provost.gwu.edu/sites/tlc.provost.gwu.edu/files/downloads/CDI/CDI%20block%20schedule_1Feb2016.pdf

Horton, W. (2012). *E-learning by design* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

Jefferson, A., & Pollock, R. (2014, July 8). 70:20:10: Where is the evidence? https://www.td.org/insights/70-20-10-where-is-the-evidence

Keller, J. M. (2010). *Motivational design for learning and performance: The ARCS model approach*. New York: Springer.

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2005). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (6th ed.). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Lohman, L. (2019). Peer observation of instruction. Center for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence, Queens University of Charlotte. https://my.queens.edu/cafe/Best%20Practices%20Documents/Class%20Visitation%20Report.pdf

Lombardozzi, C. (2015). *Learning environments by design*. Alexandria: Association for Talent Development.

Mager, R. F. (1997). *Preparing instructional objectives*. (3rd ed.). Atlanta: Center for Effective Performance.

Palmer, M., Bach, D., & Streifer, A. (2017, February 13). Measuring the promise: A valid and reliable syllabus rubric. https://cte.virginia.edu/sites/cte.virginia.edu/files/Syllabus-Rubric-Guide-2-13-17.pdf

Palmer, M. S., Streifer, A. C., & Williams-Duncan, S. (2016). Systematic assessment of a high-impact course design institute. *To Improve the Academy, 35,* 339-361. doi:10.1002/tia2.20041

Queens University of Charlotte (2018). *Fact book 2018-2019*. https://www.queens.edu/about/docs/fact-book-2018-19.pdf

Rothwell, W. J., Benscoter, B., King, M., & King, S. B. (2015). *Mastering the instructional design process: A systematic approach* (5th ed.). Hoboken, New Jersey: Pfeiffer.

Steinhardt, R. (2015, June 1). Rethinking course design. *GWToday.* https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/rethinking-course-design

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.