

The Course Design Intensive - Teaching and Learning Professional Development Team

The Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology's [Course Design Intensive](#) (CDI) is a 3-day workshop during which participants work, individually and collaboratively, to design or re-design a course they are (or will be) teaching. Participants are UBC instructors of all ranks, including graduate students. Occasionally, participants include instructors from other institutions.

The CDI workshop has been held since 2009. It is offered twice a year (in the spring and in the winter) to approximately 20 participants per Intensive. It is currently facilitated by a team of CTLT educational developers and has undergone a major redesign in the past 2 years.

CDI Learning Outcomes

By reflecting on their course and engaging with peers and course activities, participants have an opportunity to achieve the following outcomes:

1. Approach the design of their course from a learning-centered orientation.
2. Apply principles of alignment to develop learning outcomes and select assessment methods and learning activities.
3. Assess various learning activities and technologies for their value in supporting the learning outcomes they have developed and propose how these may be incorporated into their course design.
4. Engage in peer learning as a means of enhancing their teaching practice and student learning.

Goals of Evaluation

Our evaluation goals were:

- A. To examine whether the Course Design Intensive (CDI) is meeting its intended outcomes.
- B. To explore which concepts and approaches have been most valuable to participants.
- C. To explore shifts (pre- vs. post- CDI) in participants' assessments of their course design skills.
- D. To explore shifts (pre- vs. post- CDI) in participants' confidence about their course design skills.
- E. To find out how CDI graduates have applied what they learned in the CDI to their own teaching, 5-6 months post-CDI.

Methodology

Evaluation began in 2015. We approached our evaluation of the CDI with the intention of exploring what value, if any, the CDI offers (Bamber & Stefani, 2015); this, in contrast to an approach that attempts to 'measure impact'.

We engaged in various data collection methods, in addition to the formative feedback collected at the end of the first and second days of the workshop.



Data collection methods were:

Summative Feedback: This anonymous online survey included a range of questions about participants' experiences. It was completed on the last day of CDI.

Pre- and Post- Surveys: The pre- and post- survey questions aimed to detect how participants perceived their own changes in confidence levels and skills with respect to the learning outcomes. These were anonymous online surveys completed 1 week prior to and at the end of day 3 of the CDI.

Focus Group: In this face-to-face group meeting, past participants learned and shared if and how they had applied concepts from the CDI to their course design practice. These were held 4-6 months post CDI.

Findings

To date, and based on participants' self-reports, we have learned that:

1. The CDI learning outcomes are being met.
2. The course design concepts participants considered most important/valuable are: alignment, backward learning and taking a learner-centered orientation. Peer-to-peer feedback and facilitator feedback best enabled participants' learning.
3. Participants believed the CDI has been helpful in augmenting their course design skills. The majority of participants found the CDI particularly helpful in enhancing their skills to 1) approach the design of their course from a learning-centered orientation and 2) apply principles of alignment to develop learning outcomes and select aligned assessment methods and learning activities.
4. Overall, respondents felt more confident about their ability to apply course design principles to their own teaching.
5. Follow-up conversations with participants indicated that they applied their learning from the CDI in various ways, which included modifying learning outcomes, assessment activities, and teaching and learning activities.

Implications

According to participants' self-reports, the CDI is meeting its learning outcomes and helping augment participants' skills and confidence in course design. Participants indicate that they are applying the principles from the course to their teaching. Future evaluations should also include data collection methods that do not rely exclusively on participant self-reports; for example, we could analyze syllabi or course goals in light of the CDI learning outcomes.

Reference

Bamber, V., & Stefani, L. (2016). Taking up the challenge of evidencing value in educational development: from theory to practice. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 21(3), 242-254.

Contact

Isabeau Iqbal, PhD

Educational Developer, Teaching and Learning
Professional Development
Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology
Email: isabeau.iqbal@ubc.ca



Resources

Program Evaluation Pre-Survey:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B9A0dhBpdepFSEw4Vm5ZQU50bnM?ths=true>

Program Evaluation Post-Survey

https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B77x_hAuEbWgMi1leFltRINnSzA/view?usp=sharing

Summative Evaluation

https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B77x_hAuEbWgTV8yYmh5X0hKQVE/view?usp=sharing

Retrospective Pre-Survey and Post Survey

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1UOQNBoN5ZVMEqS62h3YbSQ_95nfdJntu4HeBzTxj98M/edit?usp=sharing

