Educator Insights: A Journal of Teaching Theory and Practice
Volume 01, Issue 10, October 2025
brightmindpublishing.com
ISSN (E): 3061-6964

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AND PRACTICES IN ENGINEERING EDUCATION

Alimov Azam Anvarovich1
1Professor, Department of Standardization, Metrology and Certification, Joint Belarusian–Uzbek Intersectoral Institute of Applied Technical Qualifications in Tashkent, 100000, Uzbekistan
Email: aaanvarovich@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0229-0510

Abstract

Background. Petroleum engineering education is under pressure to deliver structured, competency-based curricula aligned with international standards and fast-evolving industry needs.

Objective. To compare level-based teaching approaches and competency frameworks in petroleum (and closely allied energy/resources) programs across the European Union, the United States, Japan, and South Korea, and to distill actionable models for competency mapping and curriculum design.

Methods. A comparative documentary analysis of accreditation frameworks (EUR-ACE/ENAEE, ABET, JABEE, ABEEK), exemplar institutional curricula, and professional competency maps (SPE, PetroSkills, Washington Accord attributes). Sources included official accreditation criteria, program specifications, and publicly available curriculum maps. The analysis examined curricular structure (foundation→core→advanced), competency domains, sequencing/progression, assessment practices, and industry integration.

Results. All regions implement progressive, level-based curricula (analogous to staged proficiency such as A1→C2) beginning with fundamental sciences and advancing to specialist petroleum topics. Common competency domains include technical knowledge, analysis and design, inquiry/research, professional practice, communication/teamwork, ethics, and lifelong learning. Regional emphases differ: the EU leverages Bologna/EUR-ACE mobility and project-based learning; the U.S. centers ABET outcomes with capstone design; Japan integrates petroleum within broader resource/chemical engineering under JABEE; South

Korea delivers energy-sector versatility via ABEEK with strong government–industry programs.

Conclusions. Explicit competency mapping, progressive structuring, and industry-aligned assessment are the keystones of robust petroleum engineering curricula. Curriculum maps operationalize graduate-attribute development across levels and enable continuous improvement.

Keywords: Petroleum engineering education; competency mapping; curriculum design; ABET; EUR-ACE; JABEE; ABEEK; level-based learning; CDIO; PBL.

Introduction

1.1. Background

Petroleum engineering has undergone rapid transformation due to digitalization, complex subsurface challenges, decarbonization pressures, and global labor mobility. Content-centric course lists—without explicit links to outcomes—no longer suffice. Leading systems have converged toward level-based curricula that scaffold competencies from foundational sciences to advanced disciplinary practice, mirroring staged proficiency frameworks in other domains (e.g., A1→C2), and aligning with international accords (Alimov, 2025; Crawley et al., 2014).

1.2. Problem Statement

Despite broad agreement on competency-based education (CBE), noticeable variation persists in how programs structure learning sequences and map competencies to courses (Olimov et al., 2025). This heterogeneity complicates: (i) graduate mobility and recognition, (ii) alignment with industry expectations, (iii) program-level assessment and improvement, and (iv) benchmarking across institutions.

1.3. Research Objectives

This study aims to: (1) compare curricular structuring in the EU, U.S., Japan, and South Korea; (2) examine accreditation-driven competency frameworks; (3) identify effective competency-mapping models; and (4) provide practical guidance for designing internationally competitive petroleum engineering programs.

2. Methods

2.1. Design

Comparative documentary analysis was employed, focusing on accreditation criteria, program specifications, and competency matrices. The unit of analysis was the curriculum architecture (levels/years/modules) and the explicit mapping of courses to graduate attributes (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Celik, 2019).

2.2. Sources

Accreditation: EUR-ACE (ENAEE), ABET (general + petroleum program criteria), JABEE, ABEEK/Washington Accord attributes.

Institutional exemplars: UT Austin (U.S.), selected EU institutions following Bologna (e.g., TU Delft; Aalborg PBL model), Japanese resource/chemical engineering programs (e.g., University of Tokyo; Kyoto University), and South Korean energy/resources engineering programs (e.g., SNU; KMOU; PNU).

Professional frameworks: SPE Technical Knowledge Matrix; PetroSkills competency maps; Washington Accord Graduate Attributes.

2.3. Analytical Framework

We coded evidence into five categories: (i) structure (foundation→core→advanced), (ii) competency domains, (iii) progression/sequence logic, (iv) assessment and curriculum mapping practices, (v) industry integration mechanisms (Anderson et al., 2001; Fink, 2013).

2.4. Limitations

Findings rely on publicly available documents; institution-specific or informal practices may be underrepresented. The analysis emphasizes representative programs rather than an exhaustive census.

3. Results

3.1. European Union (EUR-ACE/Bologna)

Structure. Two-cycle 3+2 model (BSc 180 ECTS; MSc 120 ECTS).

Progression.

Level 1 (A1–A2 analogous; Years 1–2): calculus, differential equations, physics, chemistry, geology, statics/materials/thermodynamics.

Level 2 (B1–B2; Years 2–3): fluid/heat/mass transfer, rock mechanics, intro to petroleum engineering, reservoir fundamentals.

Level 3 (C1–C2; MSc): drilling, production, reservoir simulation, EOR, economics and project management.

Competencies (EUR-ACE): knowledge/understanding; analysis; design; investigation; engineering practice; transferable skills (ENAEE, 2021).

Pedagogical innovations: PBL (Aalborg), design thinking/entrepreneurship (TU Delft), mobility via EHEA/joint degrees (Kolmos et al., 2004).

3.2. United States (ABET)

Structure. Four-year BS (≈120–130 credits) with ABET accreditation.

Progression.

Foundational (Years 1–2): math through ODEs; physics/chemistry; statics/dynamics/materials; programming/data; general education.

Intermediate (Year 3): drilling, production, reservoir fundamentals, well testing, petrophysics/formation evaluation.

Advanced (Year 4): advanced reservoir/EOR, facilities design, economics/risk, technical electives, capstone design.

ABET outcomes: problem solving; design under constraints; communication; ethics; teamwork; experimentation; lifelong learning—plus petroleum-specific content expectations (ABET, 2022).

Mapping practice: explicit course-to-outcome matrices; capstone integration of technical + professional competencies (Shuman et al., 2005).

3.3. Japan (JABEE)

Structure. Petroleum content is typically embedded within resource/chemical engineering; specialization often intensifies at MSc level.

JABEE core competencies (a–i): global perspective; social/ethical responsibility; math & science application; professional knowledge/practice; innovative design; communication; self-directed learning; project management; teamwork (JABEE, 2019).

Progression. Strong math/science/informatics base (Years 1–2) → targeted petroleum/resource modules and research projects (late UG/MSc).
System supports: MEXT initiatives for global engineers; English-medium offerings; JCCP training.

3.4. South Korea (ABEEK)

Structure. Petroleum is delivered within Energy & Resources Engineering; breadth includes petroleum, mining, renewables, mineral processing.
Progression. Math/science/programming (Years 1–2) → geophysics/exploration, drilling, petroleum principles, mining economics, renewables (Years 3–4).
Strengths: ABEEK outcome mapping, mandatory internships/co-ops in many programs, government-funded practice-oriented initiatives (ABEEK, 2020).

3.5. Competency Mapping Tools

PetroSkills: four proficiency tiers (Foundation → Intermediate → Advanced → Expert) adaptable to academic levels; programs target Foundation/Intermediate at graduation for core competencies (PetroSkills, 2023).
Academic curriculum maps: rows = program outcomes; columns = courses; cells = I/R/M (Introduced/Reinforced/Mastered) or staged levels (A1→C2) (Alimov et al., 2022).
CDIO & PBL: lifecycle-anchored experiences and authentic projects scaffold technical/professional growth across years (Crawley et al., 2014).

3.6. Comparative Summary

Aspect	European Union	United States	Japan	South Korea
Structure	3+2 (BSc+MSc)	4-year BS	Integrated within broader engineering; specialization at MSc	4-year Energy & Resources
Accreditation	EUR-ACE	ABET	JABEE	ABEEK
Specialization timing	Largely MSc	Years 3–4	Primarily MSc	Years 3–4
Industry integration	PBL, mobility, partnerships	Capstone, SPE ties	JCCP/MEXT programs	Gov-funded co-ops/internships
Competency framing	6 EUR-ACE domains	7 ABET outcomes + petroleum criteria	9 JABEE criteria (a–i)	ABEEK (Washington Accord)
Distinctive feature	Bologna/EHEA mobility	Mature assessment/continuous improvement	Integration with resources/chemE	Energy-sector versatility

4. Discussion

4.1. Universal Principles

Progressive structuring. Foundation → core → advanced specialism; aligns with Bloom's taxonomy progression (remember/understand → apply/analyze → evaluate/create) (Anderson et al., 2001; Krathwohl, 2002).

Convergent domains. Technical (math/science, analysis/design, labs/field) + professional (communication, teamwork, ethics, project management) + contemporary (sustainability, digitalization, interdisciplinarity) (Passow & Passow, 2017).

4.2. Regional Strengths & Trade-offs

EU: high mobility, PBL depth; challenge—maintaining coherence across diverse institutions.

U.S.: strong assessment culture & capstone integration; challenge—breadth vs depth within 4 years.

Japan: flexible integration & research orientation; challenge—later petroleum specialization.

South Korea: government–industry synergy and outcome monitoring; challenge—balancing breadth with depth.

4.3. Why Competency Maps Matter

Maps clarify expectations, align courses, enable measurement, support CQI (continuous quality improvement), and communicate value to students/employers/accreditors (Uchiyama & Radin, 2009).

4.4. Pedagogical Models that Work

PBL: authentic, multidisciplinary problems cultivate integration and soft skills (Kolmos et al., 2004).

CDIO: staged experiential cycle across all years, not only capstone (Crawley et al., 2014).

Co-op/Internships: earlier professional socialization, higher employability (Raelin, 2008).

4.5. Contemporary Drivers

Energy transition. Integrate CCUS, reservoir geomechanics for storage, produced-water management, and renewables electives (Fahes et al., 2023).

Digital transformation. Embed programming, data analytics, and simulation workflows across the sequence; introduce digital oilfield concepts early and iterate (Mohaghegh, 2017).

Globalization. Align to Washington Accord; include regulatory/policy literacy and intercultural teamwork (IEA, 2013).

4.6. Practical Design Implications (Actionable Checklist)

1. Define outcomes aligned with ABET/EUR-ACE/JABEE/ABEEK and SPE/PetroSkills.
2. Map outcomes to courses with I/R/M or staged levels; ensure every outcome has multiple reinforcement points and at least one mastery point.
3. Sequence deliberately (prerequisites → integration modules → capstone/thesis).
4. Integrate practice (labs, field trips, design studios, simulators, internships) across all years.
5. Assess multi-modally (concept inventories, performance rubrics, portfolios, simulation KPIs).
6. Close the loop (CQI): analyze achievement data annually; adjust syllabi, assessment weights, and scaffolding.
7. Engage industry (advisory boards, adjuncts, projects, site visits).
8. Future-proof (sustainability/digital electives; micro-credentials/badges).

5. Conclusions

Across regions, robust petroleum engineering programs share progressive scaffolding, explicit competency frameworks, authentic experiential learning, and strong industry engagement. Competency maps are the operational backbone for coherence and improvement. Adhering to international standards while tailoring to local industry needs yields globally mobile and practice-ready graduates.

Future directions: comparative longitudinal studies of different pedagogical models; validation of mapping/assessment methods; optimal integration of energy-transition content; and the influence of institutional culture on CBE implementation.

References

1. ABET. (2022). Program criteria for petroleum engineering and similarly named programs. https://www.abet.org
2. Accreditation Board for Engineering Education of Korea. (2020). Accreditation criteria. ABEEK.
3. Alimov, A. A. (2025). Mapping learning trajectories in engineering education: The Bandura–Alimov developmental curve. International Journal of Advanced Education and Research, 10(3), 24-29.
4. Alimov, Azam, et al. "Creation of distance learning software for assessing the learning outcomes of future engineers based on the “smart” technology." AIP Conference Proceedings. Vol. 2647. No. 1. AIP Publishing LLC, 2022.
5. Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P. W., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, P. R., Raths, J., & Wittrock, M. C. (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. Longman.
6. Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). Teaching for quality learning at university (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
7. Blasingame, T. (2011). SPE technical knowledge for graduating engineers matrix. Society of Petroleum Engineers.
8. Celik, B. (2019). Curriculum mapping for program evaluation and development. In A. Serbessa & S. Mekonnen (Eds.), Curriculum studies in the context of teacher training (pp. 89-104). IGI Global.
9. Crawley, E. F., Malmqvist, J., Östlund, S., Brodeur, D. R., & Edström, K. (2014). Rethinking engineering education: The CDIO approach (2nd ed.). Springer.
10. European Federation of Chemical Engineering. (2020). Recommendations for chemical engineering education in Bologna process. EFCE.
11. European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education. (2021). EUR-ACE framework standards and guidelines (4th ed.). ENAEE.
12. Fahes, M., Plaksina, T., & Cairns, A. J. (2023). Maintaining petroleum engineering education to support the energy mix of the future. Journal of Petroleum Technology, 75(3), 42-48. https://doi.org/10.2118/0323-0042-JPT

13. Fink, L. D. (2013). Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
14. Graham, R. (2018). The global state of the art in engineering education. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
15. International Engineering Alliance. (2013). Graduate attributes and professional competencies (Version 3). IEA.
16. Japan Accreditation Board for Engineering Education. (2019). Criteria guide. JABEE.
17. Kolmos, A., Fink, F. K., & Krogh, L. (Eds.). (2004). The Aalborg PBL model: Progress, diversity and challenges. Aalborg University Press.
18. Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. Theory into Practice, 41(4), 212-218.
19. Marinetraining.eu. (2021). KMOU energy & resources engineering program description. https://marinetraining.eu
20. Mohaghegh, S. D. (2017). Shale analytics: Data-driven analytics in unconventional resources. Springer.
21. New Model Institute for Technology and Engineering. (2021). BEng programme specification and curriculum map. NMITE.
22. Olimov, K. T., Alimov, A. A., Bezgodova, S. A., & Musayeva, N. N. (2025). Updating the taxonomy of educational goals in the context of contemporary professional education challenges. The Education and Science Journal, 27(7), 9-32. https://doi.org/10.17853/1994-5639-2025-7-9-32
23. Passow, H. J., & Passow, C. H. (2017). What competencies should undergraduate engineering programs emphasize? A systematic review. Journal of Engineering Education, 106(3), 475-526.
24. PetroSkills. (2023). Competency maps & toolkits. https://www.petroskills.com
25. Raelin, J. A. (2008). Work-based learning: Bridging knowledge and action in the workplace. Jossey-Bass.
26. Shuman, L. J., Besterfield-Sacre, M., & McGourty, J. (2005). The ABET 'professional skills'—Can they be taught? Can they be assessed? Journal of Engineering Education, 94(1), 41-55.
27. Uchiyama, K. P., & Radin, J. L. (2009). Curriculum mapping in higher education: A vehicle for collaboration. Innovative Higher Education, 33(4), 271-280.
28. University of Texas at Austin. (2023). B.S. in petroleum engineering – Curriculum. https://www.pge.utexas.edu.