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

NEW COMPETENCY-BASED FRAMEWORK FOR OIL AND GAS 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
This article presents a comprehensive framework for redesigning oil and gas engineering education through a competency-oriented, staged approach. The proposed model employs a three-tier system (A–Foundational, B–Intermediate, C–Advanced) with six sub-levels (A1–C2) aligned with Bloom's taxonomy and international accreditation standards. The framework integrates competency mapping as a unifying instrument that coordinates curriculum design, learning outcomes, assessment strategies, and continuous quality improvement. Grounded in outcomes-based education (OBE) principles and the Conceive-Design-Implement-Operate (CDIO) framework, this approach bridges the gap between academic preparation and industry requirements by incorporating standards from the American Petroleum Institute (API), International Organization for Standardization (ISO 14001), Health, Safety, and Environment (HSE) protocols, and Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK). The competency typology encompasses four domains: Universal Human Competencies (UHC), Universal Professional Competencies (UPC), Domain-Specific Professional Competencies (PC,) Self-Development Competencies (SDC), assessed through Knowledge-Skills-Attitude (K-S-A) models. Implementation strategies include diagnostic testing, rubric-based assessment, authentic project-based learning, and individualized learning pathways. The framework aims to produce graduates with robust technical competencies, digital fluency, ecological responsibility, and readiness for industry practice or entrepreneurial ventures.

Keywords: Competency-based education, oil and gas engineering, competency mapping, outcomes-based education, CDIO framework, engineering accreditation, curriculum design, industry standards.

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

Introduction

1.1 Background and Context

The global oil and gas industry faces unprecedented challenges requiring engineering graduates with advanced technical competencies, sustainability awareness, and digital transformation capabilities (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2019). Traditional knowledge-transmission pedagogies inadequately prepare students for complex, multidisciplinary problems in contemporary energy sectors. The disconnect between academic curricula and industry expectations has been well-documented, with employers consistently reporting gaps in graduates' practical skills, safety consciousness, and ability to integrate theoretical knowledge with operational contexts (Crawley et al., 2014).

Engineering education accreditation bodies worldwide have responded by mandating outcomes-based approaches. ABET (2023) requires engineering programs to demonstrate that graduates attain specific competencies aligned with professional practice. Similarly, UNESCO (2017) emphasizes education for sustainable development, requiring integration of environmental and social responsibility into engineering curricula. These international frameworks necessitate systematic curriculum redesign that transcends traditional disciplinary boundaries.

1.2 Problem Statement

Despite widespread recognition of competency-based education principles, many oil and gas engineering programs struggle with implementation challenges. Specific deficiencies include: (a) insufficient mapping between course-level activities and program-level competencies (Alimov, 2025); (b) assessment practices that emphasize knowledge recall over skill demonstration and professional attitude formation, despite advances in technology-enhanced assessment systems (Alimov et al., 2022); (c) weak continuous quality improvement (CQI) mechanisms that fail to systematically collect, analyze, and act upon attainment data; and (d) limited integration of industry standards such as API specifications, ISO environmental management systems, HSE protocols, and project management frameworks (Project Management Institute [PMI], 2021). Contemporary scholarship has also highlighted the need to update traditional taxonomies of educational objectives to reflect evolving professional education requirements and competency frameworks (Olimov et al., 2025).

Furthermore, existing curricula often lack explicit staging mechanisms that scaffold student development from foundational knowledge to advanced professional capabilities. This results in graduates who possess theoretical understanding but struggle with technology application, system integration, and decision-making in authentic engineering contexts.

1.3 Research Objectives

This article aims to establish a unified, systematic framework for defining, mapping, and assessing competencies across a staged progression model for oil and gas engineering education. Specific objectives include:

- Developing a three-tier competency progression model (A–B–C levels) with six sub-levels (A1–C2) aligned with cognitive development theories and Bloom's taxonomy
- Establishing comprehensive competency typologies encompassing technical, professional, personal, and cultural domains assessed through Knowledge-Skills-Attitude frameworks
- Creating systematic course-competency mapping matrices that ensure transparent alignment between learning activities and program outcomes
- Integrating industry standards (API, ISO 14001, HSE, PMBOK) into curriculum design and assessment practices
- Developing assessment strategies including diagnostic instruments, analytical rubrics, authentic project-based tasks, and portfolio methods
- Proposing implementation roadmaps and continuous quality improvement mechanisms for program-level deployment

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

2.1 Competency-Based and Outcomes-Based Education

Competency-based education (CBE) represents a paradigm shift from time-based to mastery-based learning, emphasizing demonstration of specific capabilities rather than seat time (OECD, 2019). Outcomes-based education (OBE), closely related to CBE, structures curriculum around clearly defined learning outcomes that students must achieve. ABET (2023) engineering criteria exemplify this

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

approach, requiring programs to document student attainment of eleven specific competencies ranging from problem-solving to ethical reasoning.

The shift to competency-based models addresses criticisms that traditional engineering education overemphasizes theoretical knowledge at the expense of practical application and professional skills. UNESCO (2017) argues that sustainable development requires education systems that develop not only cognitive competencies but also socio-emotional and behavioral dimensions—directly aligning with holistic competency frameworks.

2.2 Cognitive Development and Learning Progression

The staged competency model draws on constructivist learning theories, particularly Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development (ZPD) and Bruner's (1960) spiral curriculum. Vygotsky's ZPD concept suggests that learners progress most effectively when instruction targets capabilities just beyond their current independent performance level. This principle justifies the three-tier structure, where each level builds systematically on prior achievements.

Bruner's (1960) spiral curriculum advocates revisiting fundamental concepts at increasing complexity levels, enabling deeper understanding through iterative engagement. Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of educational objectives provides the cognitive framework for competency progression, mapping lower-order thinking skills (remembering, understanding, applying) to A-level competencies, middle-order skills (analyzing) to B-level, and higher-order skills (evaluating, creating) to C-level competencies.

2.3 CDIO Framework for Engineering Education

The Conceive-Design-Implement-Operate (CDIO) framework provides a comprehensive model for engineering education reform (Crawley et al., 2014). CDIO emphasizes integrated learning experiences that mirror professional engineering practice, where graduates must not only possess technical knowledge but also demonstrate abilities to conceive systems meeting stakeholder needs, design solutions considering constraints, implement designs through transformation into operational systems, and operate systems throughout their lifecycles.

This framework aligns naturally with oil and gas engineering, where professionals must integrate geological knowledge, drilling technology,

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

production operations, and facilities management into coherent field development strategies. The CDIO approach supports the proposed competency model's emphasis on authentic project-based learning and integration across disciplinary boundaries.

2.4 Industry Standards Integration

Professional engineering practice in oil and gas requires adherence to multiple regulatory and quality frameworks. The American Petroleum Institute (API, 2023) publishes technical standards governing equipment specifications, operational procedures, and safety protocols. ISO 14001:2015 (International Organization for Standardization [ISO], 2015) establishes environmental management system requirements increasingly demanded by industry stakeholders and regulatory agencies.

Health, Safety, and Environment (HSE) consciousness represents a critical professional competency, given the high-risk nature of petroleum operations. Similarly, project management capabilities aligned with PMBOK guidelines (PMI, 2021) are essential for graduates entering technical and leadership roles. Integration of these standards into curriculum design ensures that academic preparation aligns with professional practice expectations.

3. Methodology: Competency Mapping Framework

3.1 Three-Tier Competency Level Model

The proposed framework employs a three-tier structure with six progressive sub-levels, creating a scaffolded pathway from novice to expert performance. Each tier corresponds to specific cognitive capabilities as defined by Bloom's (1956) taxonomy, ensuring alignment between competency expectations and developmental readiness.

A-Level (Foundational): Students at A1 (Foundation Entry) and A2 (Foundation Advanced) develop core theoretical understanding, technical terminology, and basic process awareness. Cognitive operations emphasize recognition, comprehension, and application of fundamental principles. Typical learning activities include basic laboratory exercises, equipment identification tasks, and structured problem sets. This level aligns with Bloom's remember, understand, and apply categories.

B-Level (Intermediate): Students at B1 (Intermediate Entry) and B2 (Intermediate Advanced) advance to modeling, analysis, and technological application. Learning activities incorporate simulation tools, case study analysis, and portfolio development demonstrating competency across multiple contexts. This level emphasizes Bloom's apply and analyze categories, requiring students to break down complex problems and identify relationships between system components.

C-Level (Advanced): Students at C1 (Advanced Entry) and C2 (Advanced Capstone) demonstrate design capabilities, innovation, and professional decision-making. Activities center on integrated industry projects, capstone design experiences, and thesis research. This level addresses Bloom's evaluate and create categories, requiring synthesis of knowledge across disciplines and generation of novel solutions to ill-structured problems.

3.2 Competency Typology and K-S-A Model

The framework employs a multi-dimensional competency taxonomy addressing four domains:

Universal Human Competencies (UHC) include logical reasoning, computational thinking, foreign language proficiency, ecological awareness, and safety culture. These competencies support lifelong learning and adapt to evolving professional contexts.

Universal Professional Competencies (UPC) encompass technical documentation, graphical literacy, teamwork, and project communication skills applicable across engineering disciplines.

Domain-Specific Professional Competencies (PC) represent domain-specific knowledge and skills: petroleum geology, drilling technology, reservoir engineering, production operations, field development planning, and facilities design. These competencies directly address technical requirements specified by API (2023) standards.

Self-Development Competencies (SDC) include professional responsibility, initiative, leadership, ethical conduct, and resilience—critical attributes for effective professional practice.

Each competency is assessed through a Knowledge-Skills-Attitude (K-S-A) model recognizing that professional capability requires integration of cognitive understanding (Knowledge), performance capability (Skill), and dispositional orientations (Attitude). This holistic approach aligns with UNESCO's (2017) emphasis on cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral learning dimensions.

3.3 Five-Step Competency Mapping Process

Systematic competency map construction for individual courses follows a structured five-step methodology:

Step 1: Course Selection and Program Alignment. Identify the course within the overall program structure and determine its contribution to program-level outcomes (PLOs). For example, 'Oil Field Development Technology' contributes primarily to design competencies (PLO-3) and system integration capabilities (PLO-2).

Step 2: K-S-A Unpacking. Decompose course-level competencies into specific knowledge elements (theoretical concepts, technical vocabulary), skill components (analytical methods, tool operation, design procedures), and attitude dimensions (HSE consciousness, ethical responsibility, sustainability awareness).

Step 3: Level-Specific Learning Outcome Definition. Articulate measurable learning outcomes at appropriate A1–C2 levels using precise action verbs from Bloom's (1956) taxonomy. For instance, A1-level outcomes might state 'identify primary recovery mechanisms,' while C2-level outcomes require 'design integrated field development plans evaluating technical, economic, and environmental constraints.'

Step 4: Assessment Tool Selection. Choose appropriate instruments matching competency level and domain: diagnostic tests for foundational knowledge (A-level), laboratory performance rubrics for intermediate skills (B-level), and comprehensive project evaluation criteria for advanced integration (C-level). Instruments must demonstrate validity (measuring intended competencies) and reliability (consistent results across evaluators and occasions).

Step 5: Practice Integration. Embed authentic learning experiences: laboratory sessions with industry equipment, computer simulations using professional software, site visits to operational facilities, and capstone projects addressing real industry challenges. This integration bridges academic-industry gaps and supports the CDIO framework's emphasis on engineering practice (Crawley et al., 2014).

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

4. Results: Competency Map Architecture

4.1 Level-Specific Competency Maps

Comprehensive competency maps have been developed for each of the six progression levels. Tables 1-3 present representative maps for A1, B2, and C2 levels, illustrating the evolution of competency expectations across the program.

Table 1A1 Level (Foundation Entry) Competency Map

Competency Type	Focus Areas	Representative Courses	Assessment Methods
Universal Human Competencies (UHC)	Logical thinking, IT literacy, safety basics, English proficiency	Physics, Chemistry, Engineering Graphics, Introduction to IT, English	Written tests, lab safety checklists, practical assignments
Universal Professional Competencies (UPC)	Petroleum terminology, basic geology, drilling fundamentals, production awareness	Oil & Gas Geology, Industry Introduction, Production Operations I	Oral examinations, terminology quizzes, mini-project reports
Self-Development Competencies (SDC)	Self-management, academic integrity, work culture, time management	Ethics, Personal Development Seminar	Reflection journals, attendance records, peer evaluations
Domain-Specific Professional Competencies (PC)	Technical drawing interpretation, basic teamwork, communication	Engineering Graphics, Design Fundamentals	Drawing submissions, group project grades, presentation rubrics

Table 2 B2 Level (Intermediate Advanced) Competency Map

Competency Type	Focus Areas	Representative Courses	Assessment Methods
Universal Human Competencies (UHC)	Strategic thinking, standards literacy, research methods	Management Principles, Technical Standards & Regulations	Strategy analysis papers, standards compliance matrix
Universal Professional Competencies (UPC)	Emergency response protocols, resource planning, equipment selection, well operations	Field Development Technology, Automation Systems, Production Well Operations	Laboratory studies, case analysis, technical short papers
Self-Development Competencies (SDC)	Resilience under pressure, critical self-assessment, professional growth	Professional Psychology, Ethics in Practice	Reflective essays, structured interviews, self-assessment portfolios
Domain-Specific Professional Competencies (PC)	Technical documentation authorship, analytical brief preparation, project reporting	Project Development Courses, Technical Communication	Design documentation review, analytical report assessment

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

Table 3 C2 Level (Advanced Capstone) Competency Map

Competency Type	Focus Areas	Representative Courses	Assessment Methods
Universal Human Competencies (UHC)	Integrated system design, techno-economic analysis, risk assessment, optimization	Integrated Well & Field Operations, Capstone Design Project, Thesis Research	Comprehensive design portfolio, thesis defense, external examiner review
Universal Professional Competencies (UPC)	Sustainable development principles, global energy transitions, environmental stewardship	Sustainable Energy Systems, Environmental Technology, Globalization & Energy	Expert panel review, sustainability impact assessment, policy analysis papers
Self-Development Competencies (SDC)	Professional leadership, engineering ethics, effective communication, career readiness	Leadership & Management, Professional Practice Seminar	Leadership portfolio, ethical case analysis, oral defense, professional conduct evaluation
Domain-Specific Professional Competencies (PC)	Innovation management, international project collaboration, entrepreneurship	International Project Management, Startup Fundamentals	Business model presentation, international collaboration project, startup pitch evaluation

4.2 Course-Competency Mapping Matrix

The course-competency matrix provides a systematic visualization of how individual courses contribute to program-level outcomes across the student's academic progression. Table 4 presents a representative matrix structure showing the Introduction-Reinforcement-Mastery (I-R-M) model with associated competency levels.

Table 4 Course-Competency Matrix (Partial Representation)

PLO	Description	Calculus	Drilling Tech	Reservoir Eng	Production	HSE/Ethics	Capstone
PLO-1	Apply math/science to O&G problems	I-A1	R-B2	M-C1	M-C1	R-B2	M-C2
PLO-2	Identify/formulate/solve complex problems	I-A2	R-B2	M-C1	M-C1	R-B2	M-C2
PLO-3	Design under constraints (HSE, env., econ.)	—	R-B2	R-B2	R-B2	I-B1	M-C2
PLO-4	Experimentation & data analysis	I-A1	R-B2	R-B2	R-B2	R-B2	M-C1
PLO-5	Modern tools & digital workflows	I-A1	R-B2	R-B2	R-B2	R-B2	M-C1
PLO-6	Communication (written/oral/visual)	I-A1	R-B2	R-B2	R-B2	R-B2	M-C2
PLO-7	Ethics, safety, sustainability	I-A1	R-B2	R-B2	R-B2	R-B2	M-C1
PLO-8	Teamwork & project management	I-A1	R-B2	R-B2	R-B2	R-B2	M-C2

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

Note. I = Introduced, R = Reinforced, M = Mastered. Level indicators (A1–C2) specify competency progression stage. This matrix ensures transparent tracking of competency development and identifies potential gaps or redundancies in curriculum design.

4.3 Assessment Strategy Framework

Assessment approaches must align with competency levels and domains. Table 5 summarizes the assessment strategy framework across the three competency tiers.

Table 5 Level-Based Assessment Strategy Framework

Competency Level	Primary Assessment Methods	Key Evaluation Criteria	Representative Rubric Dimensions
A-Level (Foundational)	Diagnostic quizzes, structured tests, laboratory procedure checklists, oral examinations, short practical tasks	Knowledge accuracy, procedural compliance, terminology precision, safety protocol adherence	Correctness of calculations, accuracy of equipment operation, completeness of safety checks, clarity of technical terminology
B-Level (Intermediate)	Design memoranda, simulation reports, case study analyses, technical portfolios, peer review exercises	Analytical depth, model fidelity, solution justification, integration of multiple concepts, error analysis	Quality of problem formulation, appropriateness of modeling assumptions, thoroughness of uncertainty analysis, clarity of technical communication
C-Level (Advanced)	Integrated design projects, capstone thesis, external examiner reviews, industry presentations, startup pitches	Innovation, system integration, constraint satisfaction, techno-economic viability, sustainability impact, professional communication	Comprehensiveness of requirements analysis, creativity of solutions, quality of risk assessment, alignment with API/ISO/HSE standards, economic feasibility, environmental responsibility

Each assessment level incorporates both direct measures (examination performance, project deliverables) and indirect measures (student surveys, employer feedback, alumni testimonials) to ensure comprehensive competency evaluation.

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

5. Discussion: Implementation and Quality Assurance

5.1 Continuous Quality Improvement Cycle

Sustainable curriculum improvement requires systematic CQI mechanisms aligned with ABET (2023) accreditation requirements. The proposed framework employs a four-phase quality cycle:

Plan: Faculty and industry advisory board members collaboratively review competency maps, I-R-M coverage patterns, and attainment thresholds. This phase establishes clear, measurable targets for each PLO and identifies courses primarily responsible for competency development.

Do: Collect comprehensive assessment data including direct evidence (examination scores, rubric-based project evaluations, laboratory performance assessments) and indirect evidence (exit surveys, employer evaluations, internship supervisor reports, alumni career progression data).

Check: Analyze attainment rates against established thresholds, typically requiring 70-80% of students to achieve satisfactory or higher performance levels. Triangulate across multiple assessment points to identify consistent patterns versus isolated anomalies. Disaggregate data by student cohort, instructional method, and assessment instrument to detect systematic variations.

Act: Implement evidence-based curriculum modifications: adjust learning outcome sequencing, modify assessment weightings, add reinforcement opportunities for underperforming competencies, update course content to reflect technological advances, or enhance industry partnership activities. Document all changes and their rationales to support future assessment cycles and accreditation self-studies.

5.2 Twelve-Month Implementation Roadmap

Systematic deployment of the competency mapping framework follows a structured twelve-month timeline:

Months 0-2 (Foundation): Conduct comprehensive competency inventory for all courses. Establish program-level outcomes (PLOs) and course-level outcomes (CLOs) with explicit alignment to ABET criteria and industry standards. Form curriculum committee including faculty, industry representatives, and student representatives.

Months 3-4 (Development): Draft A1-C2 level descriptors with specific performance indicators. Develop assessment rubrics for each competency level and domain. Create course-competency matrices showing I-R-M patterns.

Months 5-6 (Alignment): Build comprehensive curriculum alignment matrices. Map assessment tools to specific competencies. Identify gaps requiring new assessments or revised learning activities.

Months 7-9 (Pilot): Implement pilot testing in 2-3 representative courses spanning A, B, and C levels. Establish laboratory and simulation infrastructure. Provide faculty training on competency-based assessment, rubric application, and CDIO pedagogies (Crawley et al., 2014).

Months 10-12 (Evaluation and Scale-up): Analyze pilot results through faculty focus groups and student feedback. Make data-driven CQI adjustments to competency descriptors, assessment rubrics, and course sequencing. Develop scale-up plan for program-wide implementation in subsequent academic year.

5.3 Expected Outcomes and Impact

Implementation of the staged competency mapping framework is anticipated to produce multiple beneficial outcomes:

- **Enhanced curriculum transparency:** Students gain clear understanding of competency expectations at each program stage, supporting self-directed learning and metacognitive development
- **Improved teaching-learning-assessment alignment:** Systematic mapping ensures that learning activities, instructional methods, and assessment instruments coordinate to develop and measure intended competencies (Bloom, 1956)
- **Industry-ready graduates:** Integration of API, ISO, HSE, and PMBOK standards (API, 2023; ISO, 2015; PMI, 2021) ensures graduates possess competencies directly applicable to professional practice
- **Individualized learning pathways:** Diagnostic assessments at each level enable identification of student strengths and weaknesses, supporting customized remediation or acceleration strategies
- **Micro-credential opportunities:** Competency-based structure facilitates development of stackable credentials, supporting lifelong learning and professional development beyond initial degree attainment
- **Strengthened accreditation compliance:** Systematic documentation of competency attainment, assessment practices, and CQI mechanisms directly addresses ABET (2023) and international accreditation requirements

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

• **Data-driven program improvement:** Continuous quality improvement cycles based on comprehensive assessment data enable evidence-based curricular evolution responding to technological changes and emerging industry needs

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This article presents a comprehensive competency mapping framework that transforms oil and gas engineering education from traditional knowledge-transmission models to systematic, staged development of professional capabilities. The three-tier structure (A-B-C levels with A1-C2 sub-levels) provides scaffolded progression aligned with cognitive development theories (Vygotsky, 1978; Bloom, 1956) and outcomes-based education principles (ABET, 2023).

The framework's integration of four competency domains (General Cultural, General Professional, Professional, and Personal) assessed through Knowledge-Skills-Attitude models addresses the multidimensional nature of engineering expertise. Systematic course-competency matrices ensure transparent alignment between learning activities and program outcomes, while staged assessment strategies match evaluation approaches to developmental levels.

Critical to the framework's effectiveness is integration of industry standards including API specifications, ISO environmental management systems, HSE protocols, and PMBOK project management practices (API, 2023; ISO, 2015; PMI, 2021). This integration ensures graduates possess competencies directly transferable to professional contexts, addressing persistent complaints about academic-industry alignment gaps.

The CDIO framework (Crawley et al., 2014) provides pedagogical foundation emphasizing authentic engineering practice through conceive-design-implement-operate experiences. Combined with systematic CQI mechanisms, the framework supports continuous evolution responding to technological advances and changing industry requirements.

6.1 Recommendations for Implementation

Successful implementation requires attention to several critical factors:

Activate industry advisory boards: Regular engagement with petroleum industry professionals ensures curriculum relevance, provides authentic project opportunities, facilitates student internships, and validates competency definitions against current practice requirements.

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

Invest in infrastructure: Competency development requires access to industry-standard software (drilling simulation, reservoir modeling, production optimization tools), physical laboratory equipment, and field data sets. Partnerships with industry can offset infrastructure costs through equipment donations and software educational licenses.

Provide professional development: Faculty require training in competency-based education principles, CDIO pedagogies, rubric development and application, and CQI methodologies. Ongoing professional development ensures consistent, high-quality implementation across courses.

Expand sustainability and digital transformation content: Contemporary oil and gas practice increasingly emphasizes environmental stewardship, carbon management, and digital technologies including artificial intelligence, machine learning, and data analytics. Curriculum must evolve to address these emerging competency domains while maintaining traditional technical foundations (UNESCO, 2017; OECD, 2019).

6.2 Future Research Directions

Several areas warrant further investigation to advance competency-based oil and gas engineering education:

- Longitudinal studies tracking graduate career trajectories and competency utilization in professional practice
- Comparative analyses of competency attainment across different pedagogical approaches (traditional lecture, problem-based learning, project-based learning, flipped classroom)
- Development of automated assessment systems utilizing artificial intelligence to provide real-time feedback on competency demonstrations
- Investigation of competency transferability across petroleum engineering sub-disciplines and related fields
- Examination of competency framework effectiveness in diverse educational contexts (different countries, institutional types, student demographics)

The staged competency mapping framework presented in this article provides a systematic, evidence-based approach to engineering education reform. Through careful attention to developmental progression, comprehensive competency assessment, industry standards integration, and continuous quality improvement, petroleum engineering programs can produce graduates fully prepared for the technical, professional, and ethical challenges of contemporary energy industry practice.

References

1. ABET. (2023). Criteria for accrediting engineering programs, 2024–2025. ABET. https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/criteria-for-accrediting-engineering-programs-2024-2025/
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. American Petroleum Institute. (2023). Recommended practices and standards for oil & gas operations. API.
5. Bloom, B. S. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Longmans, Green.
6. Bruner, J. S. (1960). The process of education. Harvard University Press.
7. Crawley, E. F., Malmqvist, J., Östlund, S., Brodeur, D. R., & Edström, K. (2014). Rethinking engineering education: The CDIO approach (2nd ed.). Springer.
8. International Organization for Standardization. (2015). ISO 14001:2015 Environmental management systems—Requirements with guidance for use. ISO.
9. 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
10. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). OECD skills outlook 2019: Thriving in a digital world. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/df80bc12-en
11. Project Management Institute. (2021). A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK guide) (7th ed.). PMI.
12. UNESCO. (2017). Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000247444
13. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.