Engineering Educators Bringing the World Together
2025 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition
Palais des congrès de Montréal, Montréal, QC • June 22–25, 2025
Paper ID #46857

Shared Learning Objectives in Human-Centered Design Engineering Across Project-Based Courses in a Mechanical Engineering Program

Dr. Micah Lande, South Dakota School of Mines & Technology

Micah Lande, PhD is an Assistant Professor and E.R. Stensaas Chair for Engineering Education in the Leslie A. Rose Department of Mechanical Engineering at the South Dakota School of Mines & Technology. Dr. Lande directs the Holistic Engineering Lab and Observatory. He teaches human-centered engineering design, design thinking, and design innovation courses. Dr. Lande researches how technical and non-technical people learn and apply design thinking and making processes to their work. He is interested in the intersection of designerly epistemic identities and vocational pathways. Dr. Lande received his B.S. in Engineering (Product Design), M.A. in Education (Learning, Design and Technology) and Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering (Design Education) from Stanford University.

Mr. Aaron Lalley P.E., Southeast Technical College

Sharing Learning Objectives in Human-Centered Design Engineering Across Design-Based Courses in a Mechanical Engineering Program

1. Introduction

This *academic practice/design intervention* paper explores an innovative initiative to integrate shared learning objectives in human-centered design (HCD) across project-based courses within a Mechanical Engineering program. Engineering design education plays a vital role in preparing students for the increasingly complex, interdisciplinary, and user-centered challenges of modern engineering practice [1]. To address these evolving demands, this initiative focuses on uniting faculty around shared pedagogical goals and enhancing the student learning experience through a cohesive "design spine" [2,3]. At the heart of this effort is the recognition that engineering problems rarely have singular solutions, requiring a balance between technical rigor and human-centered approaches. This paper details the development and implementation of shared learning objectives designed to cultivate students' ability to navigate ambiguity and complexity [4]. By emphasizing empathy, creativity, and contextual awareness in project-based learning, the initiative seeks to prepare graduates who are not only technically proficient but also equipped to address societal, environmental, and ethical considerations.

A cornerstone of the initiative is the creation of a Faculty Learning Circle, aimed at enhancing both Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) [5] and Technical Content Knowledge (TCK) [6]. Through collaborative discussions, case studies, and reflective teaching provocations, faculty have aligned their instructional strategies with a unified set of HCD principles. This approach ensures consistency across courses while fostering faculty engagement and building a supportive community of practice. The paper is based on design education and curricular innovation, building upon the "design spine" framework, which integrates design principles throughout an academic program, underscoring the importance of hands-on, open-ended projects in fostering both technical and human-centered competencies [7]. This initiative addresses critical gaps in traditional engineering curricula, which often prioritize technical problem-solving at the expense of creativity and user-centered thinking. By adopting a holistic approach to engineering education, the program aims to advance academic innovation and best practices in the classroom. This paper documents the strategies, outcomes, and lessons learned, providing a scalable framework for other institutions to enhance their engineering programs and better prepare students for the challenges of the 21st century.

2. Background and Context

The integration of human-centered design (HCD) into engineering education has gained increasing importance as the field continues to evolve, tackling complex, interdisciplinary, and socially impactful challenges [8]. Traditional engineering curricula often prioritize technical problem-solving and quantitative analysis, leaving limited room for students to explore the broader social, ethical, and environmental implications of their work. To bridge this gap, educational initiatives are placing greater emphasis on project-based learning and human-centered design as frameworks for preparing students to meet the demands of modern engineering practice [1].

Curricula that combine technical expertise with creativity, empathy, and practical problem-solving is necessary. The “design spine” approach, which integrates design principles throughout a program’s curriculum, exemplifies an effective method for achieving this balance. At institutions like the South Dakota School of Mines & Technology, this approach has been systematically implemented to ensure students engage with design processes, such as brainstorming, user evaluation, iterative prototyping, and testing, at every stage of their education. This integration not only connects theoretical knowledge to real-world applications but also reinforces the core principles of human-centered design.

Human-centered design education extends beyond the classroom, benefiting significantly from informal learning experiences such as participation in engineering competition teams. These extracurricular activities provide students with opportunities to collaborate on open-ended problems, fostering creativity and teamwork in ways traditional settings cannot. Despite these advantages, many programs struggle to consistently provide meaningful opportunities for students to engage in HCD throughout the curriculum, leaving gaps in their preparedness to navigate real-world challenges. Implementing a cohesive, impactful project-based learning curriculum presents unique challenges. Engineering design problems are inherently ambiguous, requiring students to balance technical precision with contextual understanding. Faculty must guide students through this complexity, helping them frame and reframe problems effectively. Additionally, faculty expertise in HCD methodologies varies widely, which can lead to inconsistent application of design principles across courses and hinder the creation of cohesive learning outcomes. Furthermore, traditional engineering education often emphasizes analytical problem-solving at the expense of creativity and empathy, leaving many students feeling unprepared to address user-centered design tasks or to approach problems from multiple perspectives.

The Leslie A. Rose Mechanical Engineering program at South Dakota Mines serves as a case study for addressing these challenges. The program integrates a robust “design spine” that spans the entirety of the undergraduate experience. This spine includes project-based courses that progressively develop students’ skills in design thinking, empathy, and technical analysis. Early courses, such as introductory design and manufacturing, provide foundational exposure to HCD principles, while senior capstone projects emphasize tackling comprehensive, real-world design challenges. These capstone projects not only demand technical proficiency but also require students to engage deeply with user needs, environmental considerations, and societal impacts.

Extracurricular and informal learning environments are another hallmark of the program. Engineering competition teams, such as those participating in Baja SAE and Formula SAE, offer students practical opportunities to apply classroom knowledge to real-world problems. These activities encourage collaboration, foster creativity, and enhance iterative design processes. Participation in such teams strengthen problem-solving abilities, build leadership skills, and instill a greater understanding of teamwork and communication, critical competencies for engineers.

Through the integration of HCD principles into the design spine and the promotion of faculty collaboration via a learning circle, the program addresses critical gaps in engineering education. This approach aligns with calls from ABET [9] and the National Academy of Engineering’s

“Engineer of 2020” report [10], which emphasize the importance of creativity, teamwork, and societal impact in engineering curricula. By uniting technical and human-centered competencies, the program offers a promising model for adapting engineering education to meet the evolving needs of students and the profession. The program’s efforts to embed human-centered design across project-based courses represent a forward-thinking approach to engineering education. By building on established best practices and addressing persistent challenges, the initiative provides a framework for equipping future engineers with the technical expertise, empathy, and problem-solving skills required to navigate and influence an increasingly complex world.

3. Faculty Development Initiative

The success of a cohesive, human-centered design (HCD) curriculum depends on the active participation and alignment of faculty. Instructors must not only understand the principles of HCD but also feel confident in integrating these concepts into their courses in a manner that builds on students’ cumulative learning experiences. To address this need, the Faculty Learning Circle was introduced as a central mechanism to enhance Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) and Technical Content Knowledge (TCK) among faculty. This initiative created a collaborative environment where faculty could reflect on their teaching practices, share expertise, and align their approaches with shared learning objectives across the curriculum.
The Faculty Learning Circle [11] was designed as a structured yet adaptable forum for professional development, a *community of practice* [12]. Faculty members from across the design spine met bi-weekly to discuss challenges, share insights, and strategize methods for incorporating HCD principles into their teaching. These sessions encouraged collaboration and included reflective discussions on teaching practices, analysis of student work, and brainstorming for course improvements. Real-world examples of HCD from industry, academia, and research were explored through case studies and provocations, helping faculty contextualize and adapt these principles to their classrooms.

The learning circle aimed to establish a shared understanding of HCD principles and their relevance to engineering education, align course objectives and teaching strategies across the design spine, and enhance faculty skills in guiding students through the ambiguity and complexity of open-ended design problems. To meet these objectives, faculty engaged in reflective discussions to share their teaching experiences, both successful and challenging, in integrating HCD. Teaching provocations encouraged critical evaluation of their approaches, while workshops and hands-on sessions focused on iterative prototyping, empathy-driven design, and contextual problem framing, mirroring the experiential learning students were expected to undertake. A repository of teaching materials, case studies, and research articles was also curated to provide resources for incorporating HCD principles into courses. The Faculty Learning Circle achieved specific outcomes. Faculty collaboration improved, resulting in the development of a shared vocabulary and consistent strategies for teaching HCD. This alignment ensured that students experienced cohesive learning objectives throughout the curriculum. Faculty reported enhanced confidence in guiding students through iterative design processes, managing ambiguity, and integrating user feedback into projects. Additionally, the collaborative efforts facilitated cross-course integration of HCD principles, enabling a coherent progression of skills from introductory courses to capstone projects. Despite these successes, the initiative highlighted challenges and opportunities for further refinement. Engaging reluctant faculty proved to be an initial hurdle, as some instructors hesitated to adopt new approaches due to time and resource constraints. Sustaining momentum and ensuring the long-term impact of the learning circle required ongoing effort and institutional support. Expanding the initiative to other disciplines and adapting it beyond the Mechanical Engineering program presented an additional challenge but also an opportunity for broader application.

The Faculty Learning Circle serves as a model for fostering pedagogical innovation and collaboration in engineering education. By focusing on shared goals and building a supportive community of practice, the initiative demonstrated its potential to enhance teaching practices and improve learning outcomes. The insights gained offer a scalable and adaptable framework for other institutions seeking to integrate human-centered design across their curricula, strengthening engineering education to meet the demands of a rapidly evolving profession.

4. Development and Implementation of Shared Learning Objectives

The creation of a cohesive, human-centered design (HCD) experience across a project-based curriculum required the development of shared learning objectives that aligned with the overarching goals of the Mechanical Engineering program. These objectives formed the foundation for ensuring consistency across courses while allowing students to progressively deepen their skills in design thinking, empathy, and technical problem-solving. The process of developing and implementing these objectives involved extensive collaboration among faculty, alignment with program and accreditation goals, and the adoption of innovative pedagogical strategies.

Rationale and Process for Creating Shared Objectives

Traditional engineering curricula have often prioritized technical problem-solving, leaving limited space for fostering creativity, empathy, and real-world application. This initiative aimed to bridge these gaps by embedding HCD principles into every stage of the program. The shared learning objectives ensured a consistent emphasis on design thinking across courses, regardless of the instructor.

The Faculty Learning Circle played a pivotal role in the development of these objectives. Faculty members collaborated to identify key HCD skills and concepts by examining case studies from academia and industry, benchmarking against other programs with similar "design spine" models, and reflecting on student feedback, including insights from informal learning environments such as engineering competition teams. The objectives were carefully aligned with ABET accreditation standards, emphasizing teamwork, ethical considerations, and the ability to address complex, real-world problems.

Key Shared Learning Objectives

The shared objectives were designed to ensure students developed a comprehensive understanding of HCD principles as they progressed through the curriculum [13]. A central objective focused on empathy and user-centered thinking, where students conducted user research, identified stakeholder needs, and incorporated feedback into the design process. Early courses introduced empathy exercises, while advanced courses required students to apply these skills to complex, real-world challenges.

Problem framing and iterative design formed another core objective, encouraging students to approach design problems within broader social, environmental, and economic contexts. Students were taught to iterate on their designs, viewing failure as an opportunity for learning and improvement. Collaborative teamwork was emphasized through team-based projects at every level, mirroring industry practices that required students to manage roles, meet deadlines, and resolve conflicts. Finally, the integration of technical and contextual knowledge ensured that students balanced technical rigor with a sensitivity to human needs, producing designs that were functional and responsive to real-world contexts.

Mapping Objectives Across the Design Spine

The shared learning objectives were systematically integrated into a sequence of project-based courses spanning the undergraduate experience. Introductory courses, such as Introduction to Mechanical Engineering (ME 110/L), focused on foundational skills like brainstorming and simple prototyping. Students engaged in projects that balanced creativity with manufacturability. In intermediate courses like Product Design and Development (ME 265), the focus shifted to customer needs and systems thinking. These courses introduced more complex design challenges, such as conceptualizing products for real-world users, with prototyping and user evaluation as central components. Senior-level courses, including Mechanical Engineering Design (ME 477/479), culminated in comprehensive, open-ended projects where students applied their cumulative skills. These capstone experiences integrated all shared objectives and required students to address technical, social, and environmental considerations in their designs.

Implementation Strategies

To support the adoption of shared learning objectives, faculty were provided with resources such as rubrics, case studies, and templates to help them integrate the objectives into their courses. Mentoring programs offered additional guidance to instructors new to HCD, ensuring their confidence in teaching these principles. Student engagement was prioritized through the early introduction of shared objectives in orientation and foundational courses, establishing a clear understanding of expectations and their progression through the design spine. Peer-to-peer mentorship programs further supported this effort, enabling senior students to guide junior cohorts in project-based learning environments. Continuous improvement was integral to the initiative. Feedback from students and faculty was collected through surveys, focus groups, and course evaluations, which informed refinements to the objectives and their implementation. Data on student performance and project outcomes provided insights to ensure the objectives achieved their intended impact.

Challenges and Lessons Learned

While the shared learning objectives proved transformative, their implementation revealed several challenges. Faculty buy-in was an initial hurdle, as some instructors expressed concerns about time constraints and aligning the objectives with their teaching styles. These concerns were mitigated through regular discussions and workshops that demonstrated the objectives' value and adaptability. Balancing consistency with flexibility also required careful attention; while the shared objectives offered a common framework, faculty needed the freedom to adapt their implementation to specific course contexts. Scalability posed an additional challenge, as extending the objectives to interdisciplinary programs and extracurricular activities required further resources and coordination. The development and implementation of shared learning objectives have established a unified framework for integrating human-centered design into the Mechanical Engineering curriculum. By aligning faculty efforts and ensuring consistency across courses, this initiative has enhanced student learning experiences and faculty collaboration, laying a strong foundation for continued innovation in engineering education.

5. Pedagogical Strategies and Course Integration

Integrating human-centered design principles throughout the curriculum required deliberate pedagogical strategies and thoughtful course design. The success of this initiative lies in its ability to provide students with a seamless, vertically integrated learning experience, emphasizing empathy, creativity, and real-world problem-solving. Through carefully designed project-based learning, extracurricular activities, and robust assessment mechanisms, the curriculum effectively embedded HCD principles to prepare students for modern engineering challenges. Project-based learning formed the backbone of the curriculum, offering students opportunities to apply theoretical knowledge to practical, real-world challenges. Early courses focused on tangible, open-ended projects that lacked a single correct solution, such as designing and testing small devices like 3D-printed boats or mechanical systems. These projects emphasized creativity and technical accuracy, providing a foundation for more complex design work. As students progressed, the curriculum introduced increasingly intricate design challenges, culminating in capstone courses where multidisciplinary projects required them to integrate technical, social, and environmental considerations into comprehensive solutions. Human-centered approaches were emphasized throughout, with students conducting user research and considering contextual constraints to inform their designs, reinforcing empathy and problem framing as critical skills.

Extracurricular and informal learning environments played a significant role in reinforcing classroom principles. Participation in engineering competition teams, such as Formula SAE and Baja SAE, exposed students to real-world constraints and open-ended challenges. These experiences mirrored the skills taught in formal coursework by requiring students to navigate budgeting, scheduling, and design trade-offs while developing prototypes. Beyond competitions, makerspaces and workshops provided opportunities for students to experiment with iterative design and prototyping, fostering creativity and technical skill development. Many of these projects involved multidisciplinary teams, encouraging collaboration with peers from diverse backgrounds and promoting the value of varied perspectives in addressing complex problems.

Teaching empathy and creativity was central to the curriculum, with a range of strategies employed to ensure students developed these competencies. Courses introduced techniques such as user interviews, surveys, and ethnographic observations to help students understand and address user needs. Faculty guided students in framing and reframing design problems to consider broader societal, environmental, and economic impacts, encouraging them to move beyond purely technical solutions. Creativity was further cultivated through brainstorming sessions, mind-mapping, and design sprints, which challenged students to generate multiple solutions and refine their ideas based on feedback.

Assessment and feedback mechanisms were critical for ensuring the effective integration of HCD principles. Formative assessments allowed faculty to provide ongoing feedback at key project milestones, emphasizing the iterative nature of design. Students received critiques on prototypes, user research, and problem framing, helping them refine their work. Peer assessments encouraged reflection and accountability, fostering collaboration and teamwork. Summative assessments evaluated final deliverables such as prototypes and design reports for technical quality, creativity, and user-centeredness, with rubrics aligned to ABET criteria ensuring consistent grading standards.

Faculty support was essential for successful course integration. Professional development opportunities, including workshops on iterative prototyping and incorporating user feedback, helped instructors build their capacity to teach HCD principles. A shared repository of case studies, teaching materials, and best practices enabled faculty to incorporate these principles seamlessly into their courses. Collaborative opportunities across the curriculum allowed faculty to align objectives and ensure a consistent progression of skills throughout the design spine.
The integration of HCD principles across the curriculum yielded notable outcomes. Students reported greater enthusiasm for courses featuring open-ended, human-centered projects and a deeper understanding of the societal impacts of their work. Faculty expressed increased confidence in teaching HCD and guiding students through complex design challenges. The program's focus on project-based and informal learning ensured that students were better prepared for professional roles requiring collaboration, creativity, and problem-solving. By combining formal coursework with extracurricular opportunities and thoughtful assessment practices, the program effectively integrated HCD principles, equipping students with the skills needed to design solutions that address real-world human needs.

6. Results and Lessons Learned

The implementation of shared learning objectives in human-centered design (HCD) across project-based courses provided valuable insights into its impact on student engagement, faculty collaboration, and curricular development. The findings from this initiative demonstrate its potential to transform engineering education by embedding HCD principles throughout a program and fostering a culture of creativity, empathy, and real-world problem-solving.
Faculty involvement played a critical role in the initiative's success. Through the Faculty Learning Circle, instructors developed a deeper understanding of HCD principles and their application, leading to greater consistency in the delivery of learning objectives across courses. This collaborative effort created a vibrant community of practice, where faculty exchanged ideas, addressed challenges, and celebrated successes. The initiative also led to refinements in teaching strategies, as instructors adopted new approaches for guiding students through iterative prototyping, empathy-driven design, and problem framing. Many faculty members reported increased confidence in facilitating open-ended design challenges and aligning their teaching with the program's broader goals.

Students experienced significant benefits from the integration of HCD principles into the curriculum. Their engagement increased as project-based courses emphasized real-world applications and user-centered design. Hands-on projects requiring creativity and empathy were particularly well-received, inspiring enthusiasm and active participation. The curriculum also fostered improvements in students' design competencies, including iterative prototyping, problem framing, and contextual analysis. These skills were evident in the quality and complexity of their work, especially in advanced courses and capstone projects. Additionally, students developed strong interpersonal and communication skills through team-based activities, often citing these experiences as some of the most impactful aspects of their education. Participation in extracurricular activities, such as engineering competition teams, further prepared students for professional roles, as they applied classroom knowledge to practical challenges, navigating the constraints of real-world engineering.

Several projects illustrated the integration of HCD principles. In a sophomore design course, students developed security systems that combined technical functionality with user accessibility, incorporating real user feedback to refine their prototypes. Capstone projects included the development of a PLA plastic recycler and ergonomic tools for individuals with disabilities, emphasizing user-centered problem-solving and practical application. Participation in Formula SAE and Baja SAE teams also reinforced the importance of iterative design and collaboration, as students designed, built, and tested vehicles while addressing open-ended challenges.

The initiative provided important lessons about the integration of HCD into engineering education. Faculty buy-in was essential to success, as initial resistance from some instructors required ongoing dialogue, collaborative workshops, and shared evidence of the initiative's value. Iterative implementation proved critical, allowing for continuous refinement of teaching strategies and project designs based on feedback from students and faculty. Balancing HCD principles with traditional technical rigor required deliberate effort to ensure students maintained a strong foundation in engineering fundamentals while developing empathy and creativity. Institutional support was another key factor, as resources such as funding for workshops, access to makerspaces, and extracurricular support were essential for sustaining and scaling the initiative.

Despite its successes, the initiative faced challenges that revealed opportunities for further improvement. Both faculty and students noted the difficulty of balancing project-based learning with other responsibilities, highlighting the need for streamlined timelines and additional resources. Assessing the impact of HCD principles on student learning proved complex, pointing to a need for more robust tools to evaluate empathy, creativity, and problem-solving skills. Expanding the initiative to other disciplines and institutions required careful planning to adapt the framework to different contexts while preserving its core principles.

This initiative demonstrates the transformative potential of integrating HCD principles across engineering curricula. Students emerged with a holistic understanding of engineering design, equipped to address societal, environmental, and ethical challenges. Faculty collaboration was enhanced through the Faculty Learning Circle, which provided a model for fostering professional development and cross-disciplinary exchange. Finally, the initiative offers a replicable framework for other institutions seeking to incorporate HCD into their engineering programs, setting a strong foundation for continued innovation in engineering education.

7. Broader Implications and Future Work

The integration of human-centered design (HCD) principles into the design spine of a Mechanical Engineering curriculum offers valuable insights into how engineering education can evolve to prepare students for the complexities of modern challenges. This initiative demonstrates that fostering creativity, empathy, and interdisciplinary collaboration is not only achievable but also transformative for students, faculty, and curricula. Building on these outcomes, this section examines the broader implications of integrating HCD into engineering education and outlines potential directions for future development.

Implications

This initiative highlights the potential of HCD to reshape engineering education by bridging technical and human-centered competencies. By integrating empathy, creativity, and real-world applications with technical rigor, students are better equipped to address complex, interdisciplinary problems. The emphasis on societal impact ensures that graduates are not only technically proficient but also socially responsible, prepared to consider ethical, environmental, and societal factors in their designs. Faculty collaboration, supported through professional development initiatives like the Faculty Learning Circle, plays a key role in fostering consistent, impactful learning experiences. This model can serve as a blueprint for other institutions seeking to align their curricula with evolving educational goals.

The program's focus on real-world readiness has also been transformative. Students reported increased confidence in tackling real-world challenges, often citing their ability to integrate user feedback, iterate on designs, and address contextual constraints as key strengths. Experiences with interdisciplinary collaboration, both in the classroom and through extracurricular activities, further prepared students for the demands of modern engineering roles, enhancing their communication and teamwork skills. Additionally, the initiative aligns with ABET standards, emphasizing competencies in engineering design, teamwork, and societal considerations. The shared learning objectives and pedagogical strategies developed here provide a scalable framework for other institutions to adopt HCD principles.

Future Work

Expanding the integration of HCD principles offers numerous opportunities for innovation. Broadening the initiative to interdisciplinary programs in civil, electrical, or biomedical engineering could foster a culture of human-centered problem-solving across engineering disciplines. Extending HCD integration to graduate-level courses and professional development programs would further reinforce these principles throughout the engineering education continuum.

Developing robust assessment tools is an important goal. Surveys, rubrics, and portfolio-based evaluations could better measure the development of empathy, creativity, and problem-solving skills in students. Longitudinal studies tracking graduates' career trajectories would provide valuable insights into the lasting impact of HCD-focused curricula, demonstrating how these principles influence professional practice.

Supporting faculty development is another critical area for future efforts. Expanding and institutionalizing professional learning opportunities, such as faculty learning circles, would create sustainable structures for collaboration and growth. Investigating how engagement in HCD-focused initiatives impacts teaching practices and faculty career satisfaction could further enhance program design and implementation. Institutional support will be essential for sustaining and scaling the initiative. Allocating resources for makerspaces, prototyping tools, and extracurricular opportunities is necessary to maintain program quality. Building partnerships and knowledge-sharing networks among institutions can facilitate the adaptation of HCD frameworks to diverse contexts, broadening their impact and scalability.

Leveraging emerging technologies presents additional opportunities for innovation. Integrating digital tools such as artificial intelligence, virtual reality, and simulation software into the curriculum could enhance students' ability to prototype and test designs effectively. Collaborative platforms could enable broader engagement in HCD projects, supporting remote or distributed teams and fostering global collaboration.

Call to Action

This initiative underscores the transformative potential of embedding human-centered design principles across engineering curricula. By aligning faculty efforts, engaging students in meaningful design challenges, and fostering a culture of creativity and empathy, the program offers a replicable model for other institutions. As engineering challenges grow in complexity, initiatives like this are essential for preparing a new generation of engineers who can design solutions that truly meet the needs of society. Future research and collaboration should focus on refining and expanding these efforts, ensuring that human-centered design becomes a cornerstone of engineering education. Institutions are encouraged to adopt similar approaches, leveraging the insights and frameworks developed here to create impactful and enduring changes in their programs, equipping students with the skills and mindsets necessary to thrive in an increasingly complex world.

8. Conclusion

The integration of shared learning objectives in human-centered design (HCD) across project-based courses in a Mechanical Engineering program marks a significant advancement in engineering education. This initiative has demonstrated the transformative potential of fostering empathy, creativity, and interdisciplinary collaboration, equipping students with the skills and mindsets needed to address complex, real-world challenges. The contributions of this initiative are both multifaceted and impactful. The development of a cohesive design spine framework has enabled the integration of HCD principles across the curriculum, ensuring a progressive and comprehensive development of skills from introductory courses to capstone projects. Enhanced collaboration among faculty has been a cornerstone of this effort, facilitated by the Faculty Learning Circle, which provided a model for professional development and alignment of teaching practices. The initiative's focus on human-centered principles has also profoundly influenced students, who have emerged with technical and empathetic competencies that prepare them to tackle ambiguous design problems, engage in iterative prototyping, and address societal impacts in their work.

This effort underscores critical lessons for the field of engineering education. First, a holistic approach that incorporates empathy and creativity alongside technical skills is essential for preparing engineers to meet the multifaceted challenges of the modern world. Faculty collaboration is equally vital, as it ensures consistency and alignment in the delivery of shared learning objectives. Moreover, providing students with opportunities to engage in open-ended, hands-on projects fosters deeper learning and prepares them for professional practice.
The success of this initiative points to broader implications for the future of engineering education. The framework developed here offers scalability and adaptability, making it a replicable model for other institutions and disciplines. By equipping students to address ethical, environmental, and societal concerns, the program aligns with global efforts to prepare engineers for the challenges of the 21st century. However, sustaining such initiatives requires institutional support, including funding and access to resources that can maintain their momentum and ensure their long-term success.

As the engineering profession evolves, educational institutions must take proactive steps to prepare students for a rapidly changing world. This initiative highlights the importance of integrating HCD principles across curricula to cultivate graduates who are both technically proficient and socially responsible. Collaborative faculty development efforts, such as learning circles, play a crucial role in aligning teaching practices and fostering innovation. Continued research and reflection will be necessary to ensure these initiatives remain responsive to the needs of students, faculty, and the profession.

Looking to the future, there is considerable potential to expand and deepen the impact of this work. Integrating HCD principles into other engineering disciplines and interdisciplinary programs could address complex global challenges more effectively. Leveraging emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence and virtual reality, has the potential to enhance the teaching and learning of HCD concepts. Building networks of institutions dedicated to human-centered engineering education could amplify the reach and impact of these efforts, fostering opportunities for shared learning and collaboration on a global scale.

This initiative represents a meaningful step toward reimagining engineering education to meet the demands of a rapidly changing world. By emphasizing human-centered design, fostering collaboration, and supporting creativity, it equips students with the tools they need to make a positive impact. The lessons learned and frameworks developed here provide a roadmap for institutions seeking to cultivate a new generation of engineers who are capable, empathetic, and ready to address the challenges of the 21st century.

References

1. C. B. Zoltowski, W. C. Oakes, and M. E. Cardella, “Students' ways of experiencing human-centered design,” *Journal of Engineering Education*, vol. 101, no. 1, pp. 28-59, 2012.

2. B. Frank, D. S. Strong, and R. Sellens, “The professional spine: Creation of a four-year engineering design and practice sequence,” in *2011 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*, pp. 22-1489, June 2011.

3. K. Lulay, H. Dillon, T. A. Doughty, D. S. Munro, and S. Z. Vijlee, “Implementation of a design spine for a mechanical engineering curriculum,” in *2015 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*, pp. 26-903, June 2015.

4. M. Steinert and L. J. Leifer, “’Finding One's Way’: Re-Discovering a Hunter-Gatherer Model based on Wayfaring,” *International Journal of Engineering Education*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 251, 2012.

5. C. S. Chai, J. H. L. Koh, and C. C. Tsai, “A review of technological pedagogical content knowledge,” *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 31-51, 2013.

6. J. Voogt, P. Fisser, N. Pareja Roblin, J. Tondeur, and J. van Braak, “Technological pedagogical content knowledge–a review of the literature,” *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 109-121, 2013.

7. E. A. Sanders, M. H. Goldstein, and J. L. Hess, “Course experiences that promote and inhibit human-centered design,” *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 783-808, 2024.

8. G. A. Boy, “Human-centered design as an integrating discipline,” *Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2017.

9. L. J. Shuman, M. Besterfield-Sacre, and J. McGourty, “The ABET ‘professional skills’, Can they be taught? Can they be assessed?” *Journal of Engineering Education*, vol. 94, no. 1, pp. 41-55, 2005.

10. C. M. Vest, “Educating engineers for 2020 and beyond,” *National Academy of Engineering*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2005.

11. E. Lynd-Balta, M. Erklenz-Watts, C. Freeman, and T. D. Westbay, “Professional Development Using an Interdisciplinary Learning Circle,” *Journal of College Science Teaching*, vol. 35, no. 4, 2006.

12. R. Pimmel, A. F. McKenna, N. L. Fortenberry, B. Yoder, and R. C. C. Guerra, “Faculty development using virtual communities of practice,” in *2013 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*, pp. 23-594, June 2013.

13. C. L. Dym, A. M. Agogino, O. Eris, D. D. Frey, and L. J. Leifer, "Engineering design thinking, teaching, and learning," *Journal of Engineering Education*, vol. 94, no. 1, pp. 103-120, 2005.