2025 ASEE Northeast Section Conference, March 22, 2025, University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, CT, USA.

A Student's View on the Role of Project Based Learning in Engineering Technology Education: A Review

Samuel Servati
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Technology State University of New York
(SUNY Canton), Canton, NY USA.
Serva101@canton.edu

PS. Dhanasekaran
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Technology
State University of New York (SUNY Canton),
Canton, NY USA. dhanasekaran@canton.edu

Abstract - **Project Based Learning (PBL) has emerged as a transformative methodology in engineering and technology education, addressing the evolving needs of students and the demands of modern industry. By immersing students in real world challenges, PBL enables them to design, implement, and evaluate solutions while developing critical technical and interpersonal skills. This review highlights the benefits, challenges, and outcomes of integrating PBL into the engineering and technology curricula. Key benefits of PBL include fostering technical competence, critical thinking, teamwork, and adaptability. It provides students with opportunities to engage deeply with engineering concepts, preparing them for global industry demands. Evidence suggests that PBL enhances academic performance, retention of knowledge, and confidence in applying theoretical concepts to practical scenarios. Collaborative projects further develop essential communication and teamwork skills while promoting creativity and innovation through open ended problem solving. Despite its advantages, implementing PBL poses challenges. Resource demands, assessment complexities, and the need for faculty training can hinder its adoption. Successful integration requires institutional commitment, collaboration with industry, and robust evaluation models. Blended learning and online resources have shown promise in expanding PBL's reach, particularly during disruptions like the COVID-19 pandemic. This review underscores PBL's potential to bridge the gap between theory and practice, equipping students with skills crucial for navigating an innovation driven economy. Future research should focus on scalable integration models and refining assessment strategies to optimize PBL's impact in engineering education.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Engineering and technology education are undergoing a shift toward experiential learning methodologies, with PBL standing out as an effective strategy to bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge and real-world applications [1]. Traditional lecture-based methods often fail to provide students with the hands-on experience necessary to excel in the workforce [2]. Educators often face challenges ensuring students truly conceptualize the material, not only to pass exams but to develop a true understanding of engineering concepts. A significant portion of students, particularly those from technical institutions, benefit more from hands-on experiences where they can see, hear, and interact with concepts in real time [1]. For example, if students in a CNC machining course only learned how to write G-code without ever seeing how the machine executes it, their understanding of CNC mechanisms would be significantly different from those who get hands-on practice with programming, testing, and refining their code directly on a CNC machine. This active engagement fosters deeper learning and better preparation for industry [1]. PBL enables a blended approach that incorporates lectures, group activities, cooperative learning, online and face-to-face tutoring, and hands-on experimentation. Mathematics and theoretical calculations remain essential, but by supplementing them with physical demonstrations and real-world applications, students are better able to relate abstract equations to tangible engineering solutions [3]. This multidisciplinary approach aligns well with STEM education, where hands-on learning is a critical component in fostering engagement and improving retention [4]. An illustrative example comes from a dynamics course where students struggled with pulley systems. Initially, the concept remained abstract despite lectures and problem sets. However, when students were taken outside and engaged in a tug-of-war experiment—one person pulling against a team of twenty using a pulley system—the practical demonstration made the principles of mechanical advantage and force distribution clear. This ability to bridge theory with physical experience is fundamental in engineering education and strengthens students' conceptual frameworks. Furthermore, declining interest in STEM disciplines, lower test scores, and the struggles of students with learning disabilities in inclusive classrooms pose ongoing challenges [2]. Many students lack the motivation to pursue advanced STEM courses, which affects enrollment in post-secondary STEM programs and ultimately leads to a shortage of professionals in critical fields [5]. To address these issues, PBL has been developed as a targeted strategy that integrates knowledge from science, technology, engineering, and mathematics into real-world problem-solving [1]. While the resource requirements of PBL can be a challenge, the long-term impact on students is significant. Engineering graduates from technical institutions will likely enter hands-on roles in the industry, where practical problem-solving is more valuable than theoretical knowledge alone. Providing students with real-world engineering challenges in the classroom gives them a head start in applying their skills to actual fieldwork [2].

A study published in the Journal of Turkish Science Education compared students in STEM project-based learning (PBL) environments with those in traditional non-STEM PBL schools. The study found that, during the first two years, there was no statistically significant difference in student achievement between the two groups. However, by the third year, students in STEM PBL schools exhibited significantly higher scores in subjects such as geometry, probability, and problem-solving [2]. These subjects, which require high levels of spatial reasoning and conceptual thinking, directly benefit from hands-on, problem-solving approaches intrinsic to PBL methodologies. These findings reinforce the argument that long-term exposure to PBL fosters deeper conceptual understanding and improved problem-solving abilities. This delayed impact suggests that PBL's benefits accumulate over time as students become more proficient in applying learned concepts to real-world challenges. Furthermore, the study emphasized that STEM PBL students demonstrated superior retention of mathematical knowledge compared to their non-PBL counterparts, suggesting a link between experiential learning and cognitive reinforcement [1]. A prime example of this methodology in action can be seen at SUNY Canton, where students enrolled in the Advanced Machine Design course do not merely learn theory from a textbook. Instead, they engage in an applied learning project where they reverse-engineer an engine hoist, take precise measurements, document their findings, and design the entire system in CAD software such as Autodesk Inventor. To validate their work, they conduct Finite Element Analysis (FEA) and compare their computational models to real-world load-bearing data. This hands-on approach enables students to internalize engineering principles more effectively than passive learning methods would allow [1].

II. ACTIVE VS. PASSSIVE LERANING

One of the biggest challenges in modern education is catering to diverse learning styles especially concerning PBL. Traditional lecture-based instruction relies heavily on passive learning, where students absorb information without direct engagement. This approach disadvantages students with ADHD, dyslexia, or those who learn best through tactile and visual methods [3]. In contrast, active learning, a fundamental component of PBL, engages students through hands-on problem-solving, discussions, and iterative design tasks. Research indicates that active learning increases knowledge retention and boosts student motivation by giving them a sense of ownership over their education [6]. A compelling example of active learning in PBL can be observed in SUNY Canton's Intro to Engineering course. Traditionally, projectile motion is taught using static problem sets and theoretical derivations. However, the course was redesigned to include a trebuchet-building project, where students apply projectile motion equations to design and construct catapults. Their objective is to optimize launch angles and mechanical efficiency to maximize projectile distance. The hands-on experiment transforms abstract concepts into tangible, measurable learning experiences, bridging the gap between theory and application [7]. One student reflected that he learned more during this single project than in an entire semester of physics, reinforcing the effectiveness of problem-solving through hands-on experimentation [2].

III. LONG-TERM EDUCATIONAL IMPACT OF PBL

Sustained exposure to PBL has been shown to enhance cognitive skills and improve standardized test performance over multiple years. Research suggests that students engaging in STEM PBL experience an average improvement of one-quarter of a standard deviation in their strongest subjects, with an overall improvement of one-fifth of a standard deviation compared to control groups [2]. These findings indicate that STEM PBL enhances problem-solving skills at a deeper level than traditional instruction alone. Additionally, the study recommends integrating multidisciplinary components into PBL curricula, ensuring students experience STEM disciplines as interconnected fields rather than isolated subjects [8]. Engineering education particularly benefits from this approach, as real-world engineering problems rarely fit neatly into a single discipline. Instead, they require knowledge synthesis across multiple technical areas, a skill PBL uniquely develops.

IV. BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN THEORY AND APPLICATION

One of the fundamental takeaways from research on PBL's impact is its role in bridging the gap between theoretical knowledge and hands-on application. Many graduates enter the workforce with a strong theoretical foundation but limited experience applying these concepts to real-world problems. This disconnect is especially pronounced in engineering, where design principles, force distributions, and material behaviors must be understood beyond equations [6]. Through PBL, students gain an intuitive understanding of engineering principles by physically interacting with real-world systems. This is particularly beneficial in fields requiring iterative design processes, such as mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, and robotics. By testing models in Finite Element Analysis (FEA), running simulations, and constructing prototypes, students develop industry-relevant skills long before they enter the workforce [7].

V. CHALLENGES AND CONSIDERATIONS IN IMPLEMENTING PBL

While PBL offers significant benefits for students, its implementation presents numerous challenges, particularly in resource allocation, assessment methodologies, and faculty adaptation. Institutions must navigate these barriers to fully integrate PBL into engineering education while ensuring its effectiveness and sustainability [4] . One of the primary obstacles in implementing PBL is the high demand for resources, especially in institutions with limited budgets. Many hands-on projects require specialized equipment, raw materials, and laboratory spaces, which may not always be readily available [7]. CNC-based projects, for example, require access to expensive aluminum stock, CNC machines, and software such as Fusion 360 or Autodesk Inventor. At institutions with constrained funding, securing these resources can be a challenge. Many PBL projects rely on donations from industry partners, faculty grants, or university funding allocations. At SUNY Canton, the ability to build and test trebuchets in an introductory engineering course was contingent on external funding and material donations [9]. Without these contributions, hands-on experiences would have been limited, diminishing the effectiveness of the PBL approach. Moreover, in thermodynamics courses, experiments on heat dissipation in aluminum often require specialized test stands. When funding was unavailable for purchasing dedicated equipment, students creatively repurposed existing resources by constructing a test stand using a simple two-by-two aluminum block with a thermocouple to monitor temperature changes. The experiment was further enhanced using a wind tunnel built by a previous capstone group, demonstrating how reusing existing infrastructure can support PBL [8]. Despite these creative solutions, many institutions struggle to scale PBL due to limited infrastructure. Schools lacking dedicated lab space for hands-on projects find it difficult to offer students meaningful experiential learning opportunities. Sustainable solutions require long-term budget allocations for PBL initiatives and increased efforts to secure external funding through grants and industry sponsorships [4]. Evaluating student performance in PBL differs significantly from traditional assessments that rely on standardized testing. Since PBL emphasizes both technical competencies and soft skills, determining a fair and effective grading system can be challenging [9]. Unlike multiple-choice exams, PBL requires students to collaborate, communicate, and present findings, making assessment more complex. Many institutions use a combination of project presentations, peer and self-assessments, industry evaluations, and functionality-based grading to measure student success. Project presentations allow students to demonstrate their solutions and explain their problem-solving process to faculty and peers, while peer and self-assessments encourage students to reflect on their contributions and those of their teammates. Industry evaluations provide external professional feedback to ensure projects align with real-world engineering standards [8]. Functionality-based grading determines whether students successfully designed, built, and tested a working prototype. However, standardizing these assessments across different faculty members and institutions remains a challenge. Unlike traditional exams, where results are numerical, PBL grading involves subjective components such as creativity, teamwork, and iteration. Research suggests that combining structured rubrics with qualitative feedback provides the most effective assessment model [4]. Another significant challenge of implementing PBL is faculty adaptation. Many educators are accustomed to traditional lecture-based instruction and may lack the hands-on experience required for guiding students through PBL projects [8]. A professor taking over a hydraulics lab at SUNY Canton initially struggled to operate pneumatic systems. Over time, through professional development and self-directed learning, the professor became proficient, demonstrating that faculty training is essential for PBL success. This example illustrates that faculty must undergo similar hands-on learning experiences as their students to effectively teach PBL courses [1]. To address this gap, institutions have adopted various faculty training programs, including workshops on active learning techniques to help faculty transition from traditional teaching methods to hands-on facilitation. Some universities encourage collaboration with industry experts, allowing faculty to co-develop projects with engineering professionals to enhance real-world relevance [8]. The integration of support staff, such as lab assistants and technical experts, helps bridge the gap between theoretical instruction and hands-on application [8]. Many universities now employ technical instructors or machine shop specialists to assist students with capstone projects. These professionals provide practical knowledge on machining, fabrication, and testing, allowing students to gain insight from experienced tradespeople alongside their engineering coursework [4]. PBL also requires a philosophical shift in how education is delivered. Many engineering faculty excel in traditional lecture-based courses but struggle with facilitating open-ended, project-driven environments. This gap underscores the need for professional development programs focused on active learning methodologies [8]. At many institutions, the Advanced Machine Design professor may be highly knowledgeable in engineering principles but lack practical machining experience. This highlights the importance of faculty upskilling and integrating applied knowledge into instruction. While hiring additional staff to teach hands-on courses is an option, institutions must also focus on training existing faculty through workshops and industry partnerships [1]. Despite the evident benefits of PBL, its widespread adoption remains hindered by resource limitations, assessment challenges, and faculty training requirements. Institutions must proactively address these barriers through sustainable funding models, well-defined assessment frameworks, and professional development programs for faculty. Industry partnerships and grants play a vital role in securing resources, but long-term institutional support is necessary to ensure the continued success of PBL initiatives [4]. Ultimately, PBL prepares students for real-world engineering challenges by fostering adaptability, teamwork, and problem-solving skills. While its implementation demands additional effort from faculty and administrators, the long-term benefits outweigh the challenges, making it a worthwhile investment in the future of engineering education [8].

VI. CONCLUSION

Project-Based Learning (PBL) has demonstrated its transformative impact on engineering and technology education by bridging the gap between theoretical knowledge and real-world applications. Through active engagement, PBL fosters essential technical skills, critical thinking, adaptability, and teamwork, preparing students to meet the evolving demands of the modern industry. Research and case studies affirm that PBL enhances academic performance, increases retention rates, and equips students with the ability to translate complex theoretical concepts into practical solutions. These benefits highlight PBL's role in cultivating engineers who are not only proficient in calculations and design but also capable of addressing real-world challenges with creativity and confidence. However, the implementation of PBL is not without challenges. The high demand for resources, including funding for materials, laboratory infrastructure, and faculty training, remains a significant barrier to its scalability. Institutions with limited budgets must rely on grants, industry sponsorships, and innovative resource allocation strategies to sustain PBL initiatives. Moreover, assessing student outcomes in PBL environments presents unique difficulties, as traditional grading metrics often fail to capture the full scope of student learning. Effective evaluation methods must incorporate project presentations, peer assessments, industry feedback, and performance-based criteria to ensure a comprehensive understanding of student achievements. Faculty adaptation is another crucial factor in the success of PBL. Many educators, particularly those trained in traditional lecture-based instruction, may struggle to facilitate hands-on, project-driven learning experiences. Investing in faculty training programs, fostering collaborations with industry professionals, and integrating technical support staff are essential measures to enable a smooth transition to PBL-based curricula. As institutions refine their pedagogical approaches, it is imperative to provide educators with the tools and resources necessary to foster student engagement and innovation. Despite these challenges, the long-term benefits of PBL far outweigh its implementation hurdles. By emphasizing hands-on learning, real-world problem-solving, and interdisciplinary collaboration, PBL equips students with the skills required to excel in an innovation-driven economy. As engineering education continues to evolve, further research should focus on refining assessment strategies, improving faculty development programs, and expanding PBL's reach through blended and online learning models. Ultimately, the widespread adoption of PBL holds the potential to redefine engineering education by producing graduates who are not only technically competent but also capable of leading innovation and solving complex global challenges.

REFERENCES

[1]. Riazifar, N., and Khajehsaeid, H. "Enhancing Engineering Education through Problem-Based Learning." *WMG, University of Warwick*, 2024.

[2]. Ali, M., Hussin, S., and Abdullah, N. "The Effect of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Project-Based Learning (PBL) on Students' Achievement in Four Mathematics Topics." *Journal of STEM Education*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 45-56, 2022.

[3]. Verma, A. K., Dickerson, D. L., and McKinney, S. "Engaging Students in STEM Careers with Project-Based Learning--MarineTech Project." Technology and Engineering Teacher, vol. 25, pp. 36-42, 2011.

[4]. Savage, R. N., Chen, K. C., and Vanasupa, L. "Integrating Project-Based Learning throughout the Undergraduate Engineering Curriculum." Journal of STEM Education, vol. 8, no. 3 & 4, pp. 15-21, 2007.

[5]. Reis, A. C. B., Barbalho, S. C. M., and Zanette, A. C. D. "A Bibliometric and Classification Study of Project-Based Learning in Engineering Education." Production, vol. 27, pp. e20162258, 2017. DOI: 10.1590/0103-6513.225816.

[6]. O'Connor, S., Power, J., Blom, N., and Tanner, D. "Engineering Students' Perceptions of Problem and Project-Based Learning (PBL) in an Online Learning Environment." Australasian Journal of Engineering Education, vol. 14, no. 5, 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/22054952.2024.2357404

[7]. García, P., and Sánchez, J. "Project-Based Learning for Robot Control Theory." International Journal of Robotics Education, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 100-115, 2021.

[8]. Lavado-Anguera, S., Velasco-Quintana, P.-J., and Terrón-López, M.-J. "Project-Based Learning (PBL) as an Experiential Pedagogical Methodology in Engineering Education: A Review of the Literature." Educ. Sci., vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 617, 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14060617.

[9]. Ramírez de Dampierre, M., Gaya-López, M. C., and Lara-Bercial, P. J. "Evaluation of the Implementation of Project-Based Learning in Engineering Programs: A Review of the Literature." Educ. Sci., vol. 14, no. 10, pp. 1107, 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14101107.