



Research in Engineering Education Symposium (REES)
Regional Conference in Engineering Education (RCEE) &
Research in Higher Education (RHEd)
September 29 – October 3, 2025
Johor, Malaysia



Bridging Technology and Pedagogy: The Future of Engineering Education

Kalaivani Chellappan and Noor Fazila Kamal

Department of Electrical, Electronic System & Engineering, Faculty of Engineering Built Environment, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600, Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia
kckalai@ukm.edu.my

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND & CONTEXT

Engineering education faces growing pressure to adapt to rapid technological change and limited resources. Traditional methods depend heavily on physical infrastructure and significant manpower, making them increasingly unsustainable. Although digital tools and innovative pedagogies exist, their use in sustainable teaching remains limited. This paper examines how technology, pedagogy, and sustainability can be integrated to create more efficient and scalable engineering education solutions.

PURPOSE

The goal of this study is to propose a framework for sustainable engineering education that optimizes human resource utilization and infrastructure. By integrating tools such as virtual laboratories, self-adaptive exercise generators, and readiness-based adaptive assessments, the framework envisions a learning process that is both resource-efficient and impactful. This study focuses on how the framework can be implemented in a Digital Electronics course.

METHODS

The proposed framework is designed to leverage five tools and methods: life-books for foundational knowledge, virtual labs for self-guided practices, self-adaptive exercises for personalized learning, project-based learning facilitated by lecturers, and readiness-based adaptive assessments. The framework emphasizes practical implementation strategies, outlining how these tools can reduce dependency on physical resources, enhance flexibility, and improve educator efficiency.

OUTCOMES

The anticipated outcomes of this framework include a significant reduction in the reliance on physical infrastructure, enhanced student engagement, and optimized faculty workload. By fostering a sustainable learning process, the framework is expected to empower both students and educators while aligning with future-ready educational goals.

SUMMARY

This study proposes a scalable framework that integrates technology and pedagogy to promote sustainability in engineering education. It offers practical strategies for resource-efficient teaching and supports institutions in meeting evolving educational demands, providing insights for sustainable curriculum adoption across engineering disciplines.

KEYWORDS

Sustainable engineering education, virtual laboratories, pedagogical framework, adaptive learning

Introduction

Engineering education is undergoing a significant transformation as it confronts the sustainability demands of the 21st century. Traditional lecture-based models, heavily dependent on physical infrastructure and extensive human resources, are increasingly misaligned with global technological, environmental, and social shifts (Nelson & Brennan, 2018). These challenges are especially acute in developing economies, where limited resources hinder the scalability and adaptability required for contemporary engineering curricula. As expectations grow for engineers to demonstrate social responsibility and sustainable practice, curriculum reform must integrate environmental, economic, and social dimensions aligned with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Arefin et al., 2021). Without such reform, graduates may lack the competencies needed to address complex global challenges. Existing barriers, such as faculty shortages, outdated instructional strategies, and misalignment with industry needs further impede progress (Yuan et al., 2024). Innovative pedagogies including problem-based learning, flipped instruction, and simulation-based environments have shown promise in promoting engagement and sustainability-oriented thinking (Torre et al., 2024). These methods emphasize experiential, participatory learning that cultivates critical thinking, design thinking, and ethical decision-making. However, institutional inertia and resource constraints continue to limit widespread adoption (Jin et al., 2024).

This study proposes a practical, scalable framework for sustainable engineering education that reduces dependency on physical infrastructure while enhancing pedagogical effectiveness. Applied within a Digital Electronics course, the framework integrates five key components: life-books for foundational knowledge, virtual laboratories for self-guided practical learning, self-adaptive exercises for personalized progression, lecturer-facilitated project-based learning, and readiness-based adaptive assessments. Sustainability-oriented curriculum design also relies on a supportive educational ecosystem. Institutions shape norms and behaviours through both formal and informal learning environments (Singh, 2023). Complementary tools, including interactive technologies (Licorish et al., 2018), outdoor experiential learning (Dung, 2024), and community-based initiatives such as ecovillages (Papenfuss & Merritt, 2019) further reinforce student engagement with sustainability. By integrating technology, pedagogy, and sustainability principles, the proposed framework addresses current limitations and supports the development of autonomous, future-ready engineering graduates capable of navigating complex, interconnected global challenges.

Rethinking Sustainability in Learning

Sustainability in education must encompass not only environmental stewardship but also the efficient use of human resources and infrastructure, enabling inclusive and future-oriented learning ecosystems. This broader perspective is essential in engineering education, where demands for scalability, resource efficiency, and societal relevance continue to grow. A sustainable learning environment requires institutional commitment that embeds sustainability across operations, culture, and curriculum. Wolff and Ehrström argue that socially sustainable educational settings depend on visionary leadership and integrated, inclusive structures grounded in shared responsibility (Wolff & Ehrström, 2020). Yet structural inefficiencies and pedagogical inertia often undermine progress. Resource-intensive laboratories remain costly to maintain, limiting sustainable practices, especially in under-resourced institutions (France et al., 2022). Sustainability content is frequently fragmented, appearing as peripheral rather than core curriculum components (Leifler & Dahlin, 2020), and sustainable design concepts are rarely embedded meaningfully in engineering programs (Kattwinkel et al., 2018). Without systemic reform, students may not develop the mindset needed to address complex sustainability challenges (Sigahi et al., 2022).

Traditional lecture-based models further restrict the development of interdisciplinary problem-solving and critical thinking skills required for sustainable development (Li et al., 2023). Heavy content delivery reduces engagement and limits reflective learning opportunities (Wilson,

2019). Technology-enabled approaches offer solutions: digital platforms, virtual laboratories, and MOOCs provide scalable, low-resource alternatives that widen access (Martín et al., 2019), while Construction 4.0 tools foster immersive, collaborative learning (Ramadhan et al., 2024). Pedagogical innovations such as blended learning, PBL, and interdisciplinary methods enhance sustainability competencies. Integrating ICT strengthens critical thinking and learning outcomes (Wang et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2022), while systems thinking and community-engaged teacher training further support sustainable practice (Eppinga et al., 2020; Yan & Qi, 2021). Addressing adoption barriers—including educator resistance and technical skill gaps—requires professional development and institutional support (Islam et al., 2019). Ultimately, sustainable engineering education depends on technology-enabled, resource-efficient, student-centered ecosystems supported by systemic collaboration to prepare future engineers for a rapidly evolving world (Parry & Metzger, 2023).

Tools and Methods for Sustainable Engineering Education

This study introduces a sustainable engineering education framework that integrates five tools—Life-Books, Virtual Laboratories, Self-Adaptive Exercise Generators, Project-Based Learning (PBL) facilitation, and Readiness-Based Adaptive Assessment. PBL is incorporated to create a real-world, interdisciplinary learning context that activates the use of the four technology-driven tools, ensuring that digital solutions enhance rather than replace critical thinking, collaboration, and problem-solving skills essential for sustainable engineering education. The methodology synthesizes these tools into a unified pedagogical model designed to reduce resource dependency and increase scalability, with particular emphasis on Digital Electronics courses. Integration was guided by each tool's strengths and its alignment with sustainability principles, such as efficient use of human, material, and instructional resources. Their roles in addressing long-standing challenges, resource-intensive laboratories, limited scalability, and high instructor workload were evaluated through retrospective analysis of prior implementations, user feedback, and engagement metrics. The resulting model offers a cohesive, resource-efficient ecosystem that combines technology and innovative teaching methods to support scalable and sustainable learning environments.

Life-Books for Fundamental Knowledge Gain

Within the framework, Life-Books function as dynamic digital replacements for traditional printed engineering textbooks. By consolidating multimedia content, self-paced theory modules, and contextualized learning aids, they reduce dependence on physical materials and support continuous content updates without the need for reprints. In Digital Electronics, Life-Books deliver foundational topics such as logic gates, Boolean algebra, Karnaugh maps, combinational logic, and sequential circuits. Instead of static diagrams, students engage with animations, embedded simulations, and interactive widgets that allow them to manipulate inputs and immediately observe circuit behaviour, reinforcing conceptual understanding. A key feature of Life-Books is personalized learning. Embedded formative checks redirect students who struggle for example, with logic expression simplification to supplementary micro-lessons or tutorials, while advanced learners proceed to application tasks. This adaptive structure supports differentiated learning and reduces lecturer workload by serving as a reusable, self-contained learning resource. Its asynchronous accessibility further promotes inclusion for students in remote or resource-limited settings.

Virtual Laboratories for Self-Guided Laboratory Practices

Virtual laboratories offer sustainable alternatives to equipment-intensive physical labs by enabling hands-on exploration through browser-based or locally hosted simulators. In Digital Electronics, students design and test circuits such as adders, multiplexers, flip-flops, and finite state machines—without breadboards, ICs, or oscilloscopes. These platforms replicate essential laboratory experiences while minimizing infrastructure costs. A notable example is the Intelligent Tutoring Tool for Digital Logic Design (ITDiL), developed by M. Ayob,

Chellappan, and Ali, which demonstrated the effectiveness of simulation-based learning with built-in feedback (M. Ayob et al., 2001). In the proposed framework, virtual labs are linked to Life-Book content and followed by auto-assessed exercises, ensuring continuity between theory and practice. By eliminating physical and geographic constraints, virtual labs reduce the carbon footprint of practical instruction and broaden access to core technical skill development.

Self-Adaptive Exercise Generators for Tutorials

Self-adaptive exercise generators personalize tutorial practices and reduce lecturer workload by adjusting problem difficulty based on learner progress. Rule-based models, including those informed by cognitive style frameworks such as the Felder-Silverman model (Barbosa et al., 2023), remain common, while newer systems integrate clustering, fuzzy logic, and collaborative filtering to refine learner modelling. Adaptive sequencing and micro-scaffolding support progression from basic logic operations to complex sequential circuit tasks, with hints or partial templates assisting students who encounter difficulties (Heck & Meurers, 2023). Although adaptive systems enhance personalization, engagement challenges persist, prompting the integration of gamification or motivational feedback (Barbosa et al., 2023). Despite these limitations, they remain an effective method for continuous assessment and scalable tutorial support.

Lecturers as Facilitators in Project-Based Learning

PBL shifts lecturers into facilitation roles, guiding students through authentic, problem-oriented engineering projects. In Digital Electronics, facilitators mentor students in designing efficient logic circuits or sustainability-oriented prototypes such as solar-powered sensors (Samah et al., 2016; Harianto & Karjadi, 2024). Digital platforms for circuit simulation and project management (e.g., Logisim, Trello, Miro) support iterative design and feedback. PBL cultivates technical proficiency alongside teamwork, communication, and project management skills (Fan et al., 2023), aligning educational outcomes with industry expectations.

Readiness-Based Adaptive Assessment and Evaluation

Readiness-based adaptive assessment (RBAA) is pivotal in enhancing digital transformation, especially in fields like digital electronics, where rapid innovation demands continuous skill alignment. Unlike traditional assessments, RBAA focuses on *personalized, adaptive testing strategies* that dynamically respond to each learner's competency level, ensuring fairness while targeting learning gaps (Kumar & Sharma, 2025). Multiple frameworks drive readiness evaluation. Maturity models measure progression across dimensions such as *technology, human capability, processes, leadership, and culture* (Table 1). These have been contextualized across sectors such as education (Pirola et al., 2019), healthcare (Michelotto & Joia, 2024), and manufacturing (Lassnig et al., 2021).

Table 1: Key Dimensions in Readiness-Based Assessment Models

Factor	Description
Technological Resources	Infrastructure, digital tools
Human Capability	Digital literacy, training, skills
Business Processes	Workflow digitization, decision-making integration
Strategy & Leadership	Vision, adaptability, strategic planning
Organizational Culture	Change receptivity, innovation climate

Theoretical and Change Management Underpinnings

The FLEX-PED framework is anchored in established pedagogical theory and change management. Pedagogically, the FLEX-PED cycle (Explore–Simulate–Practice–Create–Evaluate) aligns with Bloom's revised taxonomy, progressing from Remember to Create

(Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), and is informed by constructive alignment principles that promote active engagement and higher-order thinking. Life-Books target foundational cognition, virtual labs and adaptive exercises support application and analysis, and project-based learning fosters synthesis and creation. The Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) model (Mishra & Koehler, 2006) frames the integration of technological affordances with pedagogical intent and content knowledge, ensuring tools are applied pedagogically rather than as standalone add-ons. For institutional adoption, FLEX-PED draws on Kotter's 8-step change model (Kotter, 2012) to secure leadership buy-in, build faculty capacity, and sustain implementation. Sustainability principles (Jones, P., et al 2010); Tilbury, 2011) underpin the design, embedding resource efficiency and scalability into both pedagogy and operations.

This integration ensures that FLEX-PED is not merely a collection of tools, but a coherent, evidence-informed framework for sustainable and scalable engineering education. By blending foundational theory, digital simulations, personalised practice, hands-on projects, and adaptive evaluation, FLEX-PED offers a blueprint for cultivating the knowledge, skills, sustainability awareness, and technological fluency required of a future-ready engineering workforce. Inclusion is central, these models must serve diverse learners by adjusting complexity, language, and pacing. Stakeholder involvement further enhances relevance, especially in educational ecosystems where teacher and learner perceptions influence effectiveness. FLEX-PED advances beyond existing blended and Education 4.0 models through its explicit sustainability focus, integration of five interoperable tools, readiness-based adaptive assessment, and operationalised scalability metric. Table 2 compares FLEX-PED with TPACK and Substitution–Augmentation–Modification–Redefinition (SAMR) frameworks, showing its unique combination of pedagogical coherence, sustainability metrics, and implementation roadmap. Unlike general models, FLEX-PED embeds resource-use efficiency as a design constraint, ensuring that scalability is achievable without disproportionate increases in cost or faculty workload.

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of FLEX-PED and Existing Pedagogical Frameworks

Focus Area	FLEX-PED	TPACK	SAMR
Pedagogical Coherence	Integrates five interoperable tools aligned with Bloom's taxonomy and constructivism	Emphasizes interaction of technology, pedagogy, and content	Focuses on stages of tech integration without pedagogical mapping
Sustainability Orientation	Includes sustainability metrics (e.g., Scalability Index, resource-use reduction)	Not addressed	Not addressed
Scalability Mechanism	Uses an operationalised Scalability Index for benchmarking	No scalability measure	No scalability measure
Assessment Approach	Readiness-Based Adaptive Assessment for personalised evaluation	Assessment depends on educator design	No structured assessment model
Tool Interoperability	Integrates Life-Books, Virtual Labs, Adaptive Exercises, PBL and readiness evaluation in one workflow	Does not specify tools	Does not specify tools

Flexible Learning Framework Model

Based on the tools and methods presented, here is a Strategic Pedagogical Framework for Sustainable Engineering Education titled "FLEX-PED: A Future-Ready, Learning-Experience Pedagogical Framework". This framework unifies the five tools into a cohesive, sustainable, and scalable model specifically designed for Digital Electronics education, but adaptable to other engineering disciplines. FLEX-PED is designed as a strategic pedagogy framework for sustainable engineering education. The initiative was to transform traditional, resource-

dependent engineering education into a scalable, inclusive, and technology-augmented learning ecosystem that prepares students for 21st-century challenges in digital and sustainable engineering as illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3: Framework Pillars

Pillar	Description	Aligned Tool(s)
F – Foundational Fluency	Develop fundamental engineering concepts using interactive, self-paced digital materials	Life-Books
L – Lab-Simulation Experience	Provide authentic, hands-on skills via scalable, virtual laboratory platforms	Virtual Labs
E – Evolving Personalization	Support adaptive learning paths and tailored practice via intelligent systems	Self-Adaptive Exercise Generators
X – Experiential Co-Creation	Foster student-led innovation through facilitated, real-world, project-based learning	PBL Facilitation
P – Progressive Evaluation	Continuously assess learner readiness and growth using adaptive, inclusive, and data-driven methods	Readiness-Based Adaptive Assessment

The framework was designed based on an integrated learning cycle (flex-ped process). This cyclical, modular learning approach supports continuous development, reflection, and application as stated below:

1. Explore (F)
 - Students interact with Life-Books to gain foundational concepts.
 - Embedded micro-assessments redirect learners through personalized content.
2. Simulate (L)
 - Students apply theory in virtual labs, mimicking hands-on experiments.
 - Auto-feedback loops support independent troubleshooting and iteration.
3. Practice (E)
 - Adaptive exercise generators assign personalized tasks based on performance.
 - Gamified elements enhance engagement and reduce dropout.
4. Create (X)
 - Students engage in project-based learning facilitated by lecturers.
 - Projects integrate sustainability themes and digital tools.
5. Evaluate (P)
 - Readiness-based assessments measure competencies dynamically.
 - Assessment data loops back into personalization engines.

Table 4,5 and 6 detail the FLEX-PED framework strategic outcomes, implementation strategies and monitoring and evaluation metrics in ensuring the sustainability and effectiveness of the proposed teaching strategy.

Table 4: FLEX-PED Framework Strategic Outcomes

Dimension	Outcome
Scalability	Minimized dependence on physical labs and textbooks enables deployment across diverse institutional settings
Sustainability	Digital-first tools reduce environmental and financial costs
Equity & Inclusion	Adaptive content and assessments cater to varied learner needs and geographies
Lecturer Efficiency	Automation of tutorials and assessments frees up time for mentorship and feedback

Future-Readiness	Project-based learning aligned with real-world and industry problems fosters entrepreneurial and engineering thinking
------------------	---

Table 5: FLEX-PED Framework Implementation Strategy

Stage	Action
1. Infrastructure Readiness	Establish digital learning management systems, simulation platforms, and assessment engines
2. Faculty Development	Train educators in adaptive tools, virtual facilitation, and project mentorship
3. Content Transformation	Convert syllabus into Life-Books, virtual labs, and adaptive exercises
4. Pilot Deployment	Test with small cohorts; monitor engagement and performance analytics
5. Scaling & Continuous Improvement	Roll out across broader programs; refine based on data insights and learner feedback

Table 6: Monitoring And Evaluation (M&E) Metrics

(M&E) Metric	Indicator
Knowledge Gains	Pre-/post-tests
	Completion rates of Life-Books
Skill Proficiency	Simulation performance metrics
	Project assessment rubrics
Adaptivity Effectiveness	Learner progress trajectory across adaptive exercise levels
Engagement	Time-on-task- Login frequency
	Feedback and reflection cycles
Sustainability Impact	Reduction in physical resource usage
	Scalability index across cohorts and campuses

Broader Implications for Future Classrooms

The innovations shaping digital electronics classrooms present scalable models for other engineering disciplines. Tools such as flipped classrooms, digital laboratories, and readiness-based adaptive systems show strong potential for cross-disciplinary adoption, offering benefits that include cost efficiency, increased student engagement, and improved faculty well-being. As illustrated in Table 7, hybrid models that blend physical and digital components yield long-term cost savings by reducing reliance on traditional laboratory infrastructure while sustaining instructional quality (Sousa et al., 2022). The associated conceptual diagram integrates learning management systems, digital labs, mobile access, and smart assessment tools into a cohesive blended learning ecosystem. To support such environments, institutions must implement comprehensive digital competence frameworks covering pedagogical, technical, and ethical training for both educators and students (Joshi et al., 2024). Equitable access to devices and stable internet connectivity is also essential for inclusive learning (Hockly & Dudeney, 2018). Faculty benefit through reduced administrative workload, enabling more focus on mentorship and personalized support (Guppy et al., 2022). Despite these advantages, several challenges remain. Limited funding, outdated infrastructure, and shortages of trained educators hinder adoption, particularly in developing regions (Zhang, 2012). Curriculum rigidity can impede innovation (Narong, 2024). Moreover, weak assessment mechanisms complicate evaluation of sustainability learning outcomes (Zhang, 2012). Finally, integrating advanced

technologies raises ethical and environmental concerns, including data privacy, energy use, and digital equity (Henriksen, 2024).

Table 7: Integrated Physical and Digital modality for Sustainable Delivery

Dimension	Benefit	Scalability
Hybrid Learning	Boosts engagement, lowers absenteeism	Across STEM and non-STEM fields
Digital Competency	Enables safe, ethical, and productive tech use	Required across all academic roles
Smart Learning Environment.	Adaptive, personalized education	Applicable with mobile tech
Sustainability	Reduces costs, supports flexible delivery	Highly scalable with LMS
Equity and Access	Bridges digital divides	Needs institutional policy support

In conclusion, the transformation of digital electronics education is not isolated it paves the way for a holistic evolution in engineering education. With strategic planning and institutional commitment, these tools and methods can be effectively integrated into broader academic ecosystems, preparing students for the future of work and lifelong learning.

Conclusion

The integration of blended pedagogies, smart learning technologies, and digital competence frameworks provides a transformative model for Digital Electronics education. Using flipped classrooms, virtual labs, and adaptive learning environments enhances engagement, reduces operational costs, and supports scalable, inclusive Education 4.0 practices. The FLEX-PED framework highlights the need for strategic institutional commitment and continuous pedagogical refinement. Future research should evaluate its effectiveness across engineering disciplines, develop cross-institution resource-sharing models, and assess long-term sustainability impacts. Extending this approach to interdisciplinary domains can help educators co-create future-ready classrooms that meaningfully bridge technology and pedagogy.

References:

- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Complete Edition*. New York: Longman.
- Arefin, M., Nabi, M., Sadeque, S., & Gudimetla, P. (2021). Incorporating sustainability in engineering curriculum: a study of the Australian universities. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 22(3), 576-598. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-07-2020-0271>.
- Barbosa, P., Carmo, R., Gomes, J., & Viana, W. (2023). Adaptive learning in computer science education: A scoping review. *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, 29, 9139–9188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12066-z>.
- Dung, Q. (2024). Outdoor teaching aims to enhance the positive learning attitude of 6th-grade students in biology at tuyen quang school for excellence. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 5(1), 644-648. <https://doi.org/10.54660/ijmrge.2024.5.1.644-648>.
- Eppinga, M., Lozano-Cosme, J., Scisciolo, T., Arens, P., Santos, M., & Mijts, E. (2020). Putting sustainability research into practice on the university campus. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 21(1), 54-75. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-03-2019-0131>.
- Fan, H. et al. (2023). Interdisciplinary Project-Based Learning: Experiences and Reflections from Teaching Electronic Engineering in China. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 66, 73-82. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TE.2022.3186184>.
- France, J., Milovanovic, J., Shealy, T., & Godwin, A. (2022). Engineering students' agency beliefs and career goals to engage in sustainable development: differences between first-year students and seniors. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 23(7), 1580-1603. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-04-2021-0161>.

- Guppy, N., Verpoorten, D., Boud, D., Lin, L., Tai, J., & Bartolic, S. (2022). The post-COVID-19 future of digital learning in higher education: Views from educators, students, and other professionals in six countries. *Br. J. Educ. Technol.*, 53, 1750-1765. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13212>.
- Heck, T., & Meurers, W. (2023). Exercise Generation Supporting Adaptivity in Intelligent Tutoring Systems. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 659–665. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36336-8_102.
- Henriksen, D., Mishra, P., & Stern, R. (2024). Creative Learning for Sustainability in a World of AI: Action, Mindset, Values. *Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16114451>.
- Hockly, N., & Dudeney, G. (2018). Current and Future Digital Trends in ELT. *RELC Journal*, 49, 164 - 178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688218777318>.
- Islam, A., Mok, M., Gu, X., Spector, J., & Hai-Leng, C. (2019). Ict in higher education: an exploration of practices in malaysian universities. *IEEE Access*, 7, 16892-16908. <https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2019.2895879>.
- Jin, J., Chen, H., Huang, Y., Yang, J., Sun, J., Zhao, J., ... & Yan, C. (2024). Diversified blended teaching innovation and practice of comprehensive education—for science and engineering general studies in china. *Frontiers in Educational Research*, 7(5). <https://doi.org/10.25236/fer.2024.070529>.
- Jones, P., Selby, D., & Sterling, S. (2010). *Sustainability Education: Perspectives and Practice across Higher Education*. London: Earthscan. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X11404173>.
- Joshi, K., Kumar, R., Bharany, S., Saini, D., Kumar, R., Ibrahim, A., Abdelmaboud, A., Nagmeldin, W., & Medani, M. (2024). Exploring the Connectivity Between Education 4.0 and Classroom 4.0: Technologies, Student Perspectives, and Engagement in the Digital Era. *IEEE Access*, 12, 24179-24204. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3357786>.
- Kattwinkel, D., Song, Y., & Bender, B. (2018). Analysis of ecodesign and sustainable design in higher education.. <https://doi.org/10.21278/idc.2018.0305>.
- Kotter, J. (2012). *Leading Change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Kumar, L., & Sharma, R. (2025). Adapting to Industry 4.0: evaluating SMEs preparedness through a comprehensive digital readiness assessment maturity model by validating stakeholders' perceptions. *Business Process Management Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/bpmj-07-2024-0546>.
- Lassnig, M., Müller, J., Klieber, K., Zeisler, A., & Schirl, M. (2021). A digital readiness check for the evaluation of supply chain aspects and company size for Industry 4.0. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jmtm-10-2020-0382>.
- Leifler, O., & Dahlin, J. (2020). Curriculum integration of sustainability in engineering education – a national study of programme director perspectives. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-09-2019-0286>.
- Li, H., Huang, Z., Yang, T., Zhang, W., Chen, M., Li, Z., & Ren, K. (2023). Individual sustainability competence development in engineering education: Community interaction open-source learning. *PLOS ONE*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294421>.
- Licorish, S., Owen, H., Daniel, B., & George, J. (2018). Students' perception of kahoot!'s influence on teaching and learning. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-018-0078-8>.
- M. Ayob, K. Chellappan and N. M. Ali, "Intelligent tutoring tool for digital logic design course (ITDiL)," *Proceedings of IEEE Region 10 International Conference on Electrical and Electronic Technology. TENCON 2001* (Cat. No.01CH37239), Singapore, 2001, 2, pp. 899–902 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TENCON.2001.949726>.
- Martín, S., Martín, E., Moreno-Pulido, A., Meier, R., & Castro, M. (2019). A comparative analysis of worldwide trends in the use of information and communications technology in engineering education. *Ieee Access*, 7, 113161-113170. <https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2019.2935019>.
- Michelotto, F., & Joia, L. (2024). Organizational Digital Transformation Readiness: An Exploratory Investigation. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer19040159>.
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A Framework for Teacher Knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108, 1017-1054. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x>.
- Narong, D. (2024). A system-based framework for engineering education as sustainable development. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 49, 911 - 927. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2024.2374481>.
- Nelson, N. and Brennan, R. (2018). A snapshot of engineering education in Canada. *Proceedings of the Canadian Engineering Education Association (CEEA)*. <https://doi.org/10.24908/pceea.v0i0.13072>.

- Papenfuss, J. and Merritt, E. (2019). Pedagogical laboratories: a case study of transformative sustainability education in an ecovillage context. *Sustainability*, 11(14), 3880. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11143880>.
- Parry, S. and Metzger, E. (2023). Barriers to learning for sustainability: a teacher perspective. *Sustainable Earth Reviews*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42055-022-00050-3>.
- Pirola, F., Cimini, C., & Pinto, R. (2019). Digital readiness assessment of Italian SMEs: a case-study research. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jmtm-09-2018-0305>.
- Sigahi, T., Rampasso, I., Anholon, R., & Sznclwar, L. (2022). Classical paradigms versus complexity thinking in engineering education: an essential discussion in the education for sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 24(1), 179-192. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijsh-11-2021-0472>.
- Singh, B. (2023). Role of educational leadership for sustainable development. *Education & Self Development*, 18(4), 30-41. <https://doi.org/10.26907/esd.18.4.04>.
- Sousa, M., Marôco, A., Gonçalves, S., & Machado, A. (2022). Digital Learning Is an Educational Format towards Sustainable Education. *Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031140>.
- Tilbury, D. (2011). Education for Sustainable Development: An Expert Review of Processes and Learning. UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001914/191442e.pdf>.
- Torre, A., Belver, R., Aguirrebeña, J., & Merlo, C. (2024). Application of simulation and virtual reality to production learning. *Education + Training*, 66(2/3), 145-165. <https://doi.org/10.1108/et-02-2023-0051>.
- Wang, F., Xi, Q., & Ruan, Z. (2023). Research and exploration on information and computer technology enabling the future of engineering education ecology., 164-170. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-238-5_22.
- Wang, Y., Sommier, M., & Vasques, A. (2022). Sustainability education at higher education institutions: pedagogies and students' competences. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 23(8), 174-193. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijsh-11-2021-0465>.
- Wilson, D. (2019). Exploring the intersection between engineering and sustainability education. *Sustainability*, 11(11), 3134. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11113134>.
- Wolff, L. and Ehrström, P. (2020). Social sustainability and transformation in higher educational settings: a utopia or possibility?. *Sustainability*, 12(10), 4176. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12104176>.
- Yan, L. and Qi, W. (2021). Construction of language teachers' professional competence in education for sustainable development in higher education for post-pandemic era. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(2), 304. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1202.12>.
- Yuan, W., Ma, Y., Deng, Y., & Liu, X. (2024). Factors affecting sustainability-related career expectations among engineering undergraduates in china: an empirical study based on a modified college impact model. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(5), 409. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14050409>.
- Zhang, Q., Vanasupa, L., Mihelcic, J., Zimmerman, J., & Platukyte, S. (2012). Challenges for Integration of Sustainability into Engineering Education. <https://doi.org/10.18260/1-2--21052>.

Copyright Statement

Copyright © 2025 Kalaivani Chellappan and Noor Fazila Kamal: The authors assign to the Research in Engineering Education Network (REEN) and educational non-profit institutions a non-exclusive licence to use this document for personal use and in courses of instruction provided that the article is used in full, and this copyright statement is reproduced. The authors also grant a non-exclusive licence to REEN to publish this document in full on the World Wide Web (prime sites and mirrors), on portable media and in printed form within the REES and RCEE & RHED 2025 proceedings. Any other usage is prohibited without the express permission of the authors.