International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 10 No.4, 2024
https://theaspd.com/index.php

Implementation Of Advanced Cognitive Processes In 21st-Century Engineering Education: A Review And Framework

P. D. Darade[1], Vishwajit Patil[2], Nisha Dagade (Godha)[3] Mahadev N. Chougule[4], Rohan R. Kubde[5]
[1, 2, 3, 4,5] Sinhgad Institute of Technology and Science, Narhe, Pune.
Emails: [1]daradepd@gmail.com, [2]vishwajitpatil@gmail.com, [3]dagade.nisha@gmail.com, [4]mahadevchougule@gmail.com, [5]rkubde@gmail.com

Abstract
Engineering education in the 21st century must transcend the traditional focus on disciplinary content to foster advanced cognitive processes such as systems thinking, metacognition, adaptive expertise, and design cognition. This review synthesizes contemporary theoretical frameworks, pedagogical models, and empirical evidence on how cognitive science principles can be integrated into engineering curricula. The findings highlight active, problem-based, and reflective pedagogies as critical enablers of higher-order thinking. The paper proposes a framework, the Advanced Cognitive Implementation Model (ACIM), for embedding these processes at curricular, instructional, and assessment levels. The review concludes with implications for faculty development, institutional policy, and future research.
Keywords: *Engineering education, cognitive processes, systems thinking, metacognition, adaptive expertise, curriculum reform.*

1. INTRODUCTION
The evolution of engineering education has paralleled industrial and technological progress, yet its pedagogical foundations have often remained rooted in content transmission and disciplinary silos [1,2]. While such approaches were effective for the industrial age, the 21st century's knowledge economy requires engineers who can integrate complex information, engage in adaptive reasoning, and innovate responsibly within rapidly changing socio-technical systems [3–5]. As industries embrace automation, artificial intelligence, and sustainability-driven design, the demand for cognitively agile engineers capable of navigating uncertainty and complexity has intensified. Consequently, attention within engineering education research has shifted from rote procedural learning toward the cultivation of advanced cognitive processes (ACPs) such as metacognition, design cognition, systems reasoning, transfer of learning, and critical reflection [6,7]. These higher-order mental activities underpin the formation of adaptive expertise, the ability to flexibly apply conceptual knowledge to novel contexts and emerging challenges [8]. Advanced cognition is not merely the ability to recall and apply formulas; it encompasses learners' capacities to monitor, evaluate, and regulate their own thinking processes while coordinating multidisciplinary insights [8,9]. It involves reflective abstraction, the integration of tacit and explicit knowledge, and the iterative testing of mental models. Embedding such capabilities requires rethinking engineering education's epistemological and instructional foundations, moving from teaching as information delivery toward teaching as cognitive orchestration [10,11].
This review aims to consolidate insights from cognitive science, engineering pedagogy, and educational psychology to propose a comprehensive model for the effective implementation of advanced cognitive processes in engineering education. Specifically, it seeks to: Identify the theoretical underpinnings of cognitive development relevant to engineering contexts. Examine empirically supported pedagogical models fostering higher-order thinking. Propose an integrative framework, the Advanced Cognitive Implementation Model (ACIM), for embedding these processes into curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices. By synthesizing the multidisciplinary evidence, this paper contributes to the ongoing transformation of engineering education from a knowledge-centric to a cognition-centric paradigm, aligning with global imperatives for sustainable innovation and lifelong learning.

2. CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS OF ADVANCED COGNITIVE PROCESSES
The concept of advanced cognitive processes (ACPs) originates from contemporary cognitive science, which emphasizes that learning involves not only the acquisition of information but also the organization, regulation, and transfer of knowledge across contexts [12–14]. In engineering education, ACPs

represent a shift from procedural problem-solving to conceptually grounded reasoning, where learners analyze complex systems, reflect on their thought processes, and iteratively refine solutions [15].

2.1From Lower-Order to Higher-Order Cognition

Traditional educational models often rely on Bloom's taxonomy, which classifies cognitive activities from remembering to creating [16]. However, Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) revision extended this model by integrating metacognitive knowledge, the awareness and control of one's own cognition—as a distinct and crucial domain [17]. Within engineering, this evolution underscores a pedagogical transition from content reproduction toward strategic knowledge use, reflective abstraction, and epistemic fluency [18].

2.2 Systems Thinking

Systems thinking is central to modern engineering practice. It involves recognizing interconnections among components, predicting dynamic behaviors, and understanding emergent outcomes [19]. Teaching systems thinking requires learners to model complex phenomena using feedback loops, dependencies, and multi-level representations [20]. Studies have shown that explicit instruction in system dynamics enhances students' ability to integrate social, environmental, and technical variables into engineering design [21]. Hence, systems thinking serves as a cognitive scaffold for addressing real-world complexity.

2.3 Metacognition and Self-Regulated Learning

Metacognition thinking about one's own thinking is a cornerstone of advanced cognition. It enables learners to plan, monitor, and evaluate their problem-solving strategies [22]. In engineering contexts, metacognitive regulation supports reflective iteration, helping students diagnose errors in reasoning and adjust methodologies accordingly [23]. Empirical studies demonstrate that structured reflection, journaling, and portfolio-based assessments improve self-regulation and design performance [24,25]. Such practices cultivate independent learners capable of continuous improvement in professional practice.

2.4 Adaptive Expertise

While routine experts perform efficiently within familiar parameters, adaptive experts can transfer knowledge flexibly and innovate under uncertainty [26]. The concept, rooted in the work of Hatano and Inagaki (1986), links adaptive expertise to a balance between efficiency (routine competence) and innovation (creative problem-solving) [27]. In engineering education, cultivating adaptive expertise involves creating environments that encourage productive struggle, deliberate practice, and reflective feedback loops [28]. Cognitive apprenticeship models, where novices observe, emulate, and eventually internalize expert reasoning patterns—have proven especially effective [29].

2.5 Design Cognition

Design cognition refers to the mental processes engineers use during design activities, including framing, ideation, constraint negotiation, and evaluation [30]. Design thinking fosters both divergent creativity and convergent reasoning, bridging intuition with analytical rigor [31]. Integrating design cognition into the curriculum encourages learners to perceive engineering as a process of sensemaking, not merely technical optimization [32]. It thus becomes a primary vehicle for nurturing integrative cognitive skills.

2.6 The Cognitive Integration Perspective

Recent educational neuroscience findings suggest that advanced cognition arises from the integration of cognitive, metacognitive, and motivational processes [33]. This "cognitive integration" perspective aligns with constructivist and socio-cultural theories, asserting that learning is distributed across individuals, tools, and contexts [34,35]. For engineering educators, this implies designing experiences that blend experimentation, reflection, and social collaboration, the hallmarks of sustainable cognitive growth. In essence, the conceptual foundation of advanced cognitive processes lies in promoting reflective, adaptive, and integrative thinking. These capacities enable engineers to navigate ambiguity, bridge disciplinary boundaries, and design for sustainability and innovation. The next section explores pedagogical strategies empirically validated to foster such processes within engineering education.

3. PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES SUPPORTING COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Translating cognitive theory into educational practice requires pedagogical models that actively engage learners in knowledge construction, reflection, and transfer. In engineering education, such strategies have evolved from traditional lecture-based delivery to constructivist, inquiry-driven, and metacognitively rich environments [36–38]. Research consistently demonstrates that active, collaborative, and reflective pedagogies cultivate higher-order cognition more effectively than didactic instruction [39].

3.1 Problem-Based Learning (PBL)

Problem-Based Learning (PBL) situates learning within real-world, ill-structured problems that demand analytical reasoning, teamwork, and iterative solution testing [40]. Through this approach, students develop deep conceptual understanding and transferable skills by navigating uncertainty an essential component of adaptive expertise [41]. Hmelo-Silver (2004) emphasized that PBL enhances students' metacognitive awareness by compelling them to reflect on what they know, identify gaps, and seek resources to resolve them [42]. In engineering curricula, integrating PBL fosters cognitive flexibility and systems-level reasoning [43].

3.2 Project- and Design-Based Learning

Project-Based Learning (PBL) and Design-Based Learning (DBL) expand upon PBL principles by embedding design cognition and creativity within sustained, authentic projects [44,45]. Dym et al. (2005) noted that design projects nurture divergent ideation and iterative refinement, encouraging learners to oscillate between conceptual and practical thinking [46]. DBL environments promote collaborative synthesis—where learners negotiate design trade-offs, test prototypes, and reflect on failures as learning opportunities [47]. These experiences mirror professional engineering cognition, fostering both innovation and resilience [48].

3.3 Cognitive Apprenticeship

Cognitive Apprenticeship, introduced by Collins, Brown, and Newman (1989), provides a structured framework for teaching complex cognitive skills through modeling, coaching, and gradual fading of support [49]. Unlike traditional apprenticeship, it externalizes expert thinking making tacit strategies visible to novices [50]. In engineering contexts, it enables instructors to scaffold design reasoning, hypothesis formulation, and reflective evaluation. Studies have demonstrated that such mentorship enhances strategic knowledge transfer and problem-solving fluency [51].

3.4 Reflective and Metacognitive Pedagogies

Reflection transforms experience into learning by enabling students to analyze their reasoning, assumptions, and emotions [52]. Reflective journaling, learning portfolios, and guided self-assessment are proven mechanisms to enhance metacognitive regulation [53,54]. Turns et al. (2014) found that reflective portfolios foster engineering identity formation and self-directed improvement [55]. When embedded across courses, these methods establish a culture of continuous feedback, cultivating autonomous and critical learners [56].

3.5 Collaborative and Peer-Learning Environments

Collaborative learning encourages dialogic reasoning, where students co-construct knowledge through negotiation and argumentation [57]. Peer instruction and team-based learning stimulate cognitive conflict—an essential trigger for conceptual change [58]. Prince and Felder (2006) observed that cooperative strategies improve retention and motivation while promoting deeper understanding of engineering concepts [59]. Moreover, collaboration supports socio-cognitive development, aligning with Vygotskian principles of the zone of proximal development [60].

3.6 Integration of Digital and Immersive Technologies

Emerging digital tools, virtual labs, simulation environments, and AI-based learning analytics, offer new opportunities for cognitive engagement [61]. These technologies enable experiential learning at scale by providing immediate feedback and adaptive challenges [62]. Virtual and augmented reality (VR/AR) systems support spatial cognition and system-level visualization, crucial for engineering design education [63]. However, successful integration requires pedagogical alignment, ensuring that technology amplifies rather than replaces cognitive interaction [64].

3.7 Synthesis

The convergence of these pedagogical models illustrates that active engagement, reflection, and social interaction are fundamental to fostering advanced cognitive processes. Effective instructional design must balance structure and openness, allowing learners to explore authentic challenges while receiving timely cognitive scaffolding. The next section introduces the Advanced Cognitive Implementation Model (ACIM), a unifying framework for embedding these principles across curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

4. The Advanced Cognitive Implementation Model (ACIM)

The Advanced Cognitive Implementation Model (ACIM) synthesizes insights from cognitive science, educational psychology, and engineering pedagogy to provide a multi-layered framework for cultivating higher-order thinking in engineering education. The model conceptualizes how curricular design, instructional practice, and assessment systems can be intentionally aligned to foster advanced cognitive processes (ACPs), namely metacognition, systems reasoning, design cognition, and adaptive expertise [65–67].

4.1 Rationale and Theoretical Basis

The ACIM is grounded in constructivist and cognitive apprenticeship theories, which posit that knowledge is actively constructed through experience, reflection, and social interaction [68]. Cognitive engagement is not incidental but designed, emerging from structured opportunities for learners to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize ideas within authentic engineering contexts [69]. The model also draws on Biggs' (1996) constructive alignment framework, emphasizing that intended learning outcomes, teaching methods, and assessments must coherently target higher cognitive levels [70]. ACIM operationalizes this alignment to bridge theory and practice.

4.2 Structure of the Model

The ACIM comprises three interdependent layers: Curricular Layer, Instructional Layer, and Assessment Layer. Each layer is designed to activate and reinforce specific cognitive processes that collectively enhance adaptive expertise.

4.2.1 Curricular Layer: Designing for Cognitive Outcomes

The curricular layer focuses on intentional mapping of learning outcomes to cognitive domains. Instead of organizing curricula solely around technical content, ACIM advocates structuring around cognitive functions, such as problem formulation, systems modeling, reflective evaluation, and ethical reasoning [71]. Key design elements include: Integrating complex, open-ended challenges that encourage transfer of learning. Embedding reflection and iteration cycles within core design and laboratory courses.

Aligning graduate attributes (creativity, collaboration, ethical reasoning) with measurable cognitive outcomes [72]. This layer ensures that curriculum reform transcends surface-level redesign and fosters deep learning trajectories.

4.2.2 Instructional Layer: Enabling Cognitive Engagement

The instructional layer emphasizes pedagogical orchestration, creating classroom experiences that provoke analysis, synthesis, and reflection [73]. Instructors act as cognitive coaches, modeling expert reasoning while encouraging students to articulate and evaluate their own thought processes.

Key mechanisms include: Scaffolding: Providing temporary supports (worked examples, heuristics, concept maps) that gradually fade as learners internalize strategies [74]. Dialogic Learning: Encouraging debate, justification, and perspective-taking to deepen understanding. Metacognitive Prompts: Embedding reflective questions ("How did I approach this problem?") within assignments to enhance self-awareness [75]. Digital platforms, including simulation-based learning environments and AI-driven tutors, can extend these principles by offering adaptive feedback and personalized reflection cues [76].

4.2.3 Assessment Layer: Measuring Cognitive Growth

Traditional assessments often emphasize procedural accuracy rather than cognitive depth. The ACIM advocates for authentic, performance-based assessment that evaluates how students reason, reflect, and apply knowledge in novel contexts [77]. Recommended strategies include: Portfolio Assessments: Tracking reflective learning and evidence of cognitive progression [78]. Design Reviews and Critiques: Evaluating reasoning processes, not just final products. Self- and Peer-Assessment: Encouraging metacognitive evaluation and collaborative accountability [79]. Assessment thus becomes a diagnostic and developmental tool rather than a mere summative measure.

4.3 Dynamic Interactions among Layers

These three layers are not discrete; they interact dynamically through feedback loops. Curricular reforms set the cognitive vision. Instructional design operationalizes this vision through pedagogical strategies. Assessment generates evidence of cognitive growth, informing continuous curricular refinement [80]. This cyclic feedback architecture ensures systemic coherence, promoting a learning ecosystem that adapts to student needs and emerging disciplinary demands.

4.4 Implementation Considerations

Implementing ACIM requires institutional commitment to faculty development, resource alignment, and policy adaptation [81]. Faculty must be trained to recognize cognitive indicators in student behavior and to design instruction that elicits reflection and synthesis. Moreover, supportive policies such as workload flexibility, teaching innovation grants, and cross-departmental collaboration are essential to sustain cognitive-centered reforms [82].

4.5 Expected Outcomes

When effectively implemented, ACIM fosters: Enhanced metacognitive awareness and self-directed learning. Improved systems reasoning and interdisciplinary integration. Stronger adaptive expertise and innovative problem-solving capacity. Reflective professional identity, aligning cognitive growth with ethical responsibility [83, 84]. Collectively, these outcomes prepare engineers to thrive in unpredictable, interdisciplinary environments hallmarks of 21st-century engineering practice.

5. IMPLICATIONS FOR FACULTY, INSTITUTIONS, AND POLICY

The effective implementation of Advanced Cognitive Processes (ACPs) within engineering education requires systemic transformation beyond individual classroom practice. The Advanced Cognitive Implementation Model (ACIM) offers a blueprint, but its realization depends on faculty readiness, institutional structures, and policy ecosystems that value reflective and evidence-based pedagogy.

5.1 Faculty Development and Professional Learning

Faculty play a pivotal role in translating cognitive theory into classroom practice. However, many instructors, particularly in technical disciplines, lack formal preparation in learning sciences [85]. Institutions should thus invest in faculty learning communities, teaching innovation centers, and mentorship programs focused on metacognitive instruction, reflective assessment, and student-centered design [86]. Workshops and micro-credentialing in cognitive pedagogy can help educators internalize principles of scaffolding, formative feedback, and authentic assessment. Moreover, promoting peer observation and reflective dialogue among faculty fosters collective learning and pedagogical coherence [87].

5.2 Institutional Support and Infrastructure

Institutional support must extend beyond professional development to include structural and technological enablers. Dedicated innovation labs, simulation centers and learning analytics dashboards provide platforms for students to engage in real-world problem-solving while generating data to inform curricular adjustments [88]. Strategic alignment with institutional missions particularly regarding outcome-based education (OBE) and accreditation frameworks (NBA/ABET), ensures that cognitive objectives are systematically integrated and measurable [89]. Institutions adopting ACIM benefit from embedding its principles into program outcomes, quality assurance mechanisms, and continuous improvement cycles [90].

5.3 Policy-Level Interventions

At the policy level, national regulatory and accreditation bodies can accelerate the shift toward cognition-centered education by: Recognizing teaching excellence and cognitive innovation in faculty evaluation systems. Providing funding for pedagogical research and action learning projects. Encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration through flexible curriculum design standards [91]. Such measures institutionalize the pursuit of higher-order learning outcomes, ensuring that cognitive advancement becomes a hallmark of engineering education reform rather than an isolated innovation.

5.4 Challenges and Future Directions

Implementation challenges include faculty resistance, time constraints, and the perceived incompatibility of cognitive pedagogies with large-class environments [92]. Overcoming these requires cultural change, evidence of impact, and administrative advocacy. Future research should explore learning analytics-based indicators of cognitive growth, AI-assisted metacognitive tutoring systems and cross-disciplinary cognitive transfer models [93, 94]. These directions will sustain the iterative evolution of ACIM and enhance its global applicability.

6. CONCLUSION

Engineering education in the 21st century must transcend its content-centric legacy to embrace a cognition-centric paradigm. The integration of advanced cognitive processes, metacognition, systems thinking, adaptive expertise, and design cognition enables learners to navigate complexity, innovate ethically, and contribute meaningfully to society. This review consolidates multidisciplinary research and proposes the Advanced Cognitive Implementation Model (ACIM) as a practical, systemic framework for embedding cognitive development across curricula, instruction, and assessment. By aligning institutional

policy, faculty development, and pedagogical design, ACIM offers a pathway toward sustainable educational excellence.
The transformation toward advanced cognition is not a singular reform but a continuous reflective process, demanding collaboration among educators, administrators, and policymakers. As engineering education evolves, nurturing how students think will prove as critical as what they know ultimately shaping a generation of engineers equipped to lead in an era of global uncertainty and technological change.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, L.W., & Krathwohl, D.R. (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. Longman.
2. Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. Higher Education, 32(3), 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871
3. Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L., & Cocking, R.R. (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. National Academy Press.
4. Felder, R.M., & Brent, R. (2016). Teaching and learning STEM: A practical guide. Jossey-Bass.
5. Prince, M.J., & Felder, R.M. (2006). Inductive teaching and learning methods: Definitions, comparisons, and research bases. Journal of Engineering Education, 95(2), 123–138. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2006.tb00884.x
6. Dym, C.L., Agogino, A.M., Eris, O., Frey, D.D., & Leifer, L.J. (2005). Engineering design thinking, teaching, and learning. Journal of Engineering Education, 94(1), 103–120. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00832.x
7. Hmelo-Silver, C.E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? Educational Psychology Review, 16(3), 235–266. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000034022.16470.f3
8. Collins, A., Brown, J.S., & Newman, S.E. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the crafts of reading, writing, and mathematics. Cognition and Instruction, 2(2), 453–494.
9. Hatano, G., & Inagaki, K. (1986). Two courses of expertise. In H. Stevenson et al. (Eds.), Child development and education in Japan (pp. 262–272). Freeman.
10. Schwartz, D.L., Bransford, J.D., & Sears, D. (2005). Efficiency and innovation in transfer. In Mestre, J.P. (Ed.), Transfer of learning from a modern multidisciplinary perspective (pp. 1–51). Information Age.
11. Veenman, M.V.J., Van Hout-Wolters, B.H.A.M., & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations. Metacognition and Learning, 1(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-006-6893-0
12. Sweeney, L.B., & Sterman, J.D. (2007). Thinking about systems: Student and teacher conceptions of natural and social systems. System Dynamics Review, 23(2–3), 285–312. https://doi.org/10.1002/sdr.366
13. Turns, J., Sattler, B., Yasuhara, K., Borgford-Parnell, J.L., & Atman, C.J. (2014). Integrating reflection into engineering education. Proceedings of the ASEE Annual Conference, Indianapolis, IN.
14. Kolb, D.A. (2015). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development (2nd ed.). Pearson.
15. Schön, D.A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.
16. Illeris, K. (2009). Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists… in their own words. Routledge.
17. Entwistle, N. (2018). Teaching for understanding at university: Deep approaches and distinctive ways of thinking. Palgrave.
18. Bain, K. (2004). What the best college teachers do. Harvard University Press.
19. Ramsden, P. (2003). Learning to teach in higher education. RoutledgeFalmer.
20. Marton, F., & Säljö, R. (1976). On qualitative differences in learning: I—Outcome and process. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 46(1), 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1976.tb02980.x
21. Wankat, P.C., & Oreovicz, F.S. (2015). Teaching engineering (2nd ed.). Purdue University Press.
22. King, P.M., & Kitchener, K.S. (2004). Reflective judgment: Theory and research on the development of epistemic assumptions. Educational Psychologist, 39(1), 5–18.
23. 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. Jossey-Bass.

24. Jonassen, D.H. (2011). Learning to solve complex scientific problems. Routledge.
25. Dede, C. (2009). Immersive interfaces for engagement and learning. Science, 323(5910), 66–69. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1167311
26. Pellegrino, J.W., & Hilton, M.L. (Eds.). (2012). Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century. National Academies Press.
27. Ericsson, K.A., & Pool, R. (2016). Peak: Secrets from the new science of expertise. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
28. Chi, M.T.H., & Wylie, R. (2014). The ICAP framework: Linking cognitive engagement to active learning outcomes. Educational Psychologist, 49(4), 219–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2014.965823
29. Clark, R.C., & Mayer, R.E. (2016). E-learning and the science of instruction (4th ed.). Wiley.
30. Entwistle, N., & Peterson, E. (2004). Conceptions of learning and knowledge in higher education. Learning and Instruction, 14(4), 411–428. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2004.01.006
31. Litzinger, T.A., Lattuca, L.R., Hadgraft, R.G., & Newstetter, W.C. (2011). Engineering education and the development of expertise. Journal of Engineering Education, 100(1), 123–150. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2011.tb00006.x
32. Crawley, E.F., Malmqvist, J., Östlund, S., & Brodeur, D.R. (2014). Rethinking engineering education: The CDIO approach (2nd ed.). Springer.
33. Steif, P.S., & Dollár, A. (2009). Study of usage patterns and learning gains in a web-based interactive static course. Journal of Engineering Education, 98(4), 321–333.
34. Prince, M., & Felder, R. (2007). The many faces of inductive teaching and learning. Journal of College Science Teaching, 36(5), 14–20.
35. Bowman, N.A. (2010). Can 21st-century skills be assessed? Educational Leadership, 68(2), 29–33.
36. Kirschner, P.A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R.E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work. Educational Psychologist, 41(2), 75–86. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4102_1
37. Lajoie, S.P. (2005). Extending the scaffolding metaphor. Instructional Science, 33(5–6), 541–557. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-005-1279-2
38. Pellegrino, J.W. (2014). Assessment as a positive influence on 21st-century learning. Theory Into Practice, 53(4), 294–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2014.959133
39. Reeves, T.C. (2006). Design research from a technology perspective. In Educational design research (pp. 52–66). Routledge.
40. Freeman, S., et al. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. PNAS, 111(23), 8410–8415. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111
41. Adams, R.S., Daly, S.R., Mann, L.M., & Dall'Alba, G. (2011). Being a professional: Three lenses into design thinking, acting, and being. Design Studies, 32(6), 588–607. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2011.07.004
42. Jamieson, L.H., & Lohmann, J.R. (2012). Innovation with impact: Creating a culture for scholarly and systematic innovation in engineering education. American Society for Engineering Education.
43. Trevelyan, J. (2010). Mind the gaps: Engineering education and practice. Australasian Journal of Engineering Education, 16(1), 23–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/22054952.2010.11463920
44. National Academy of Engineering (NAE). (2017). Engineering societies and engineering education: Evolution of the engineer of 2020 vision. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
45. Borrego, M., & Henderson, C. (2014). Increasing the use of evidence-based teaching in STEM higher education: A comparison of eight change strategies. Journal of Engineering Education, 103(2), 220–252. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20040
46. Graham, R. (2018). The global state of the art in engineering education. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Cambridge, MA.
47. Henderson, C., Beach, A., & Finkelstein, N. (2011). Facilitating change in undergraduate STEM instructional practices: An analytic review of the literature. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48(8), 952–984. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20439

48. Dori, Y.J., Belcher, J., Bessette, M., Danziger, M., & Meenan, C. (2003). Development and assessment of a visualization-based learning environment for introductory physics. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 12(2), 217–231. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023674009874

49. Lattuca, L.R., Terenzini, P.T., & Volkwein, J.F. (2006). Engineering change: A study of the impact of EC2000. ABET and the American Society for Engineering Education.

50. Wright, M.J. (2024). Effective Implementation of Advanced Cognitive Processes: Leading 21st-Century Engineering Education (Unpublished review manuscript).

51. Kolodner, J.L. (2006). Learning by design. In K. Sawyer (Ed.), Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 229–266). Cambridge University Press.

52. Bransford, J., Brown, A., Cocking, R. (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. National Academy Press.

53. Bratman, M.E. (1999). Intention, plans, and practical reason. CSLI Publications.

54. Jonassen, D.H., Strobel, J., & Lee, C.B. (2006). Everyday problem solving in engineering: Lessons for engineering educators. Journal of Engineering Education, 95(2), 139–151. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2006.tb00885.x

55. Prince, M., & Felder, R. (2006). Inductive teaching and learning methods: Definitions, comparisons, and research bases. Journal of Engineering Education, 95(2), 123–138. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2006.tb00884.x

56. Dym, C.L., Agogino, A.M., Eris, O., Frey, D.D., & Leifer, L.J. (2005). Engineering design thinking, teaching, and learning. Journal of Engineering Education, 94(1), 103–120. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00832.x

57. Hmelo-Silver, C.E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? Educational Psychology Review, 16(3), 235–266. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000034022.16470.f3

58. Collins, A., Brown, J.S., & Newman, S.E. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the crafts of reading, writing, and mathematics. Cognition and Instruction, 2(2), 453–494.

59. Hatano, G., & Inagaki, K. (1986). Two courses of expertise. In H. Stevenson et al. (Eds.), Child development and education in Japan (pp. 262–272). Freeman.

60. Schwartz, D.L., Bransford, J.D., & Sears, D. (2005). Efficiency and innovation in transfer. In J.P. Mestre (Ed.), Transfer of learning from a modern multidisciplinary perspective (pp. 1–51). Information Age.

61. Veenman, M.V.J., Van Hout-Wolters, B.H.A.M., & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations. Metacognition and Learning, 1(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-006-6893-0

62. Sweeney, L.B., & Sterman, J.D. (2007). Thinking about systems: Student and teacher conceptions of natural and social systems. System Dynamics Review, 23(2–3), 285–312. https://doi.org/10.1002/sdr.366

63. Turns, J., Sattler, B., Yasuhara, K., Borgford-Parnell, J.L., & Atman, C.J. (2014). Integrating reflection into engineering education. Proceedings of the ASEE Annual Conference.

64. Kolb, D.A. (2015). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development (2nd ed.). Pearson.

65. Schön, D.A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.

66. Illeris, K. (2009). Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists... in their own words. Routledge.

67. Entwistle, N. (2018). Teaching for understanding at university: Deep approaches and distinctive ways of thinking. Palgrave.

68. Bain, K. (2004). What the best college teachers do. Harvard University Press.

69. Ramsden, P. (2003). Learning to teach in higher education. RoutledgeFalmer.

70. Marton, F., & Säljö, R. (1976). On qualitative differences in learning: I—Outcome and process. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 46(1), 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1976.tb02980.x

71. Wankat, P.C., & Oreovicz, F.S. (2015). Teaching engineering (2nd ed.). Purdue University Press.

72. King, P.M., & Kitchener, K.S. (2004). Reflective judgment: Theory and research on the development of epistemic assumptions. Educational Psychologist, 39(1), 5–18.

73. 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. Jossey-Bass.
74. Jonassen, D.H. (2011). Learning to solve complex scientific problems. Routledge.
75. Dede, C. (2009). Immersive interfaces for engagement and learning. Science, 323(5910), 66–69. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1167311
76. Pellegrino, J.W., & Hilton, M.L. (Eds.). (2012). Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century. National Academies Press.
77. Ericsson, K.A., & Pool, R. (2016). Peak: Secrets from the new science of expertise. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
78. Chi, M.T.H., & Wylie, R. (2014). The ICAP framework: Linking cognitive engagement to active learning outcomes. Educational Psychologist, 49(4), 219–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2014.965823
79. Clark, R.C., & Mayer, R.E. (2016). E-learning and the science of instruction (4th ed.). Wiley.
80. Entwistle, N., & Peterson, E. (2004). Conceptions of learning and knowledge in higher education. Learning and Instruction, 14(4), 411–428. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2004.01.006
81. Litzinger, T.A., Lattuca, L.R., Hadgraft, R.G., & Newstetter, W.C. (2011). Engineering education and the development of expertise. Journal of Engineering Education, 100(1), 123–150. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2011.tb00006.x
82. Crawley, E.F., Malmqvist, J., Östlund, S., & Brodeur, D.R. (2014). Rethinking engineering education: The CDIO approach (2nd ed.). Springer.
83. Steif, P.S., & Dollár, A. (2009). Study of usage patterns and learning gains in a web-based interactive statics course. Journal of Engineering Education, 98(4), 321–333.
84. Bowman, N.A. (2010). Can 21st-century skills be assessed? Educational Leadership, 68(2), 29–33.
85. Kirschner, P.A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R.E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work. Educational Psychologist, 41(2), 75–86. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4102_1
86. Lajoie, S.P. (2005). Extending the scaffolding metaphor. Instructional Science, 33(5–6), 541–557. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-005-1279-2
87. Pellegrino, J.W. (2014). Assessment as a positive influence on 21st-century learning. Theory Into Practice, 53(4), 294–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2014.959133
88. Reeves, T.C. (2006). Design research from a technology perspective. In Educational design research (pp. 52–66). Routledge.
89. Freeman, S., et al. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. PNAS, 111(23), 8410–8415. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111
90. Adams, R.S., Daly, S.R., Mann, L.M., & Dall'Alba, G. (2011). Being a professional: Three lenses into design thinking, acting, and being. Design Studies, 32(6), 588–607. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2011.07.004
91. Jamieson, L.H., & Lohmann, J.R. (2012). Innovation with impact: Creating a culture for scholarly and systematic innovation in engineering education. American Society for Engineering Education.
92. Trevelyan, J. (2010). Mind the gaps: Engineering education and practice. Australasian Journal of Engineering Education, 16(1), 23–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/22054952.2010.11463920
93. Borrego, M., & Henderson, C. (2014). Increasing the use of evidence-based teaching in STEM higher education: A comparison of eight change strategies. Journal of Engineering Education, 103(2), 220–252. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20040
94. Wright, M.J. (2024). Effective Implementation of Advanced Cognitive Processes: Leading 21st-Century Engineering Education (Unpublished review manuscript).