Review

Reimagining Engineering Drawing Education in the Contemporary Learning Environment

Dan Wang [1,*] **and Shasha Peng** [1]

[1] Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology, Haikou, Hainan, China

[*] Correspondence: Dan Wang, Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology, Haikou, Hainan, China

Abstract: Engineering drawing is the language of engineering, enabling precise communication among designers, manufacturers, constructors, and operators. In recent years, the educational environment has been reshaped by competency-based education, project-based learning, hybrid delivery models, and rapid digitalization across industry. At the same time, engineering practice has shifted from 2D drafting toward model-based definition (MBD), parametric 3D design, digital collaboration platforms, and standards-driven documentation workflows. These changes require engineering drawing education to move beyond procedural training in software commands and instead cultivate transferable competencies: spatial visualization, standards literacy, design intent expression, tolerancing reasoning, and collaborative engineering communication. This paper examines the misalignments between conventional teaching approaches and contemporary needs, and proposes an integrated framework that aligns learning outcomes, authentic tasks, and evidence-based assessment. The framework combines hand sketching as a cognitive tool, 2D and 3D CAD as communication media, and digital pedagogy (virtual labs, interactive feedback, and learning analytics) to support diverse learners. A staged curriculum structure and a multi-source assessment model are provided, together with implementation strategies, resource considerations, and quality assurance recommendations. The study aims to offer actionable guidance for institutions seeking to modernize engineering drawing education while preserving its foundational role in engineering thinking and professional practice.

Keywords: engineering drawing; engineering education; competency-based learning; CAD and MBD; project-based learning; standards and tolerancing

1. Introduction

Engineering drawing, broadly understood as the standardized and rule-governed representation of engineering intent, serves simultaneously as a cognitive instrument for designers and a formal communication medium within engineering practice. It enables engineers to externalize spatial reasoning, clarify functional relationships, and convey technical decisions in a form that is precise, verifiable, and reusable. Although advanced digital design technologies have rapidly evolved in recent decades, the fundamental educational purpose of engineering drawing has remained stable: to support learners in translating three-dimensional concepts into clear, unambiguous representations that can be accurately interpreted and acted upon by others [1].

Across different engineering domains, engineering drawings play distinct yet interrelated roles. In manufacturing-oriented disciplines, drawings function as authoritative documents that guide fabrication processes, dimensional inspection, and quality control. In civil and mechanical engineering contexts, they coordinate interfaces among components, define tolerances and fits, and articulate assembly logic across multiple stages of construction or production. In increasingly common interdisciplinary

projects, engineering drawings act as shared reference points that support collaborative decision-making, reduce ambiguity across professional roles, and enhance traceability throughout the design and implementation lifecycle [2]. These functions highlight that engineering drawing is not merely a technical skill but a foundational element of professional engineering cognition and coordination.

At the same time, the conditions under which students learn and practice engineering drawing have undergone significant transformation. Contemporary higher education systems increasingly emphasize outcome-based education, authentic assessment, and responsiveness to learner diversity in terms of prior knowledge, learning styles, and career orientation. Within this context, traditional drawing instruction that focuses narrowly on symbol memorization or isolated drafting exercises is often insufficient to meet broader educational objectives. Learners are now expected to demonstrate not only procedural proficiency but also conceptual understanding, problem-solving ability, and the capacity to apply knowledge flexibly in realistic scenarios.

Parallel to these educational shifts, industry practice has moved decisively from paper-based drawings toward integrated digital workflows. Modern engineering environments commonly combine two-dimensional technical documentation with parametric three-dimensional models, embedded metadata, and data-rich annotations. Drawings are no longer static end products but dynamic elements within broader information systems that support design iteration, simulation, manufacturing planning, and lifecycle management. Consequently, a contemporary engineering graduate is expected not only to produce technically correct drawings, but also to articulate design intent, justify tolerancing and standard selection, communicate effectively across disciplinary and organizational boundaries, and operate within established standards and quality assurance frameworks [3].

These changes raise important questions about the adequacy of existing approaches to engineering drawing education. While the disciplinary foundations of drawing-such as projection theory, dimensioning principles, and standard conventions-remain essential, their pedagogical organization and instructional delivery require reconsideration. In particular, there is a need to ensure that learning objectives, instructional activities, and assessment methods are coherently aligned so that students can progressively develop from basic representation skills to higher-level competencies involving interpretation, decision-making, and professional judgment.

Against this background, this paper addresses a central question: how can engineering drawing education be redesigned to respond effectively to the contemporary learning environment while remaining faithful to its disciplinary foundations? Rather than proposing a complete replacement of traditional content, the paper focuses on restructuring educational design around clear learning outcomes, meaningful learning experiences, and credible assessment evidence. The discussion is organized around the alignment of these elements, offering a practical framework and concrete implementation strategies intended to support educators and program designers in developing engineering drawing curricula that are both academically rigorous and professionally relevant.

2. The Contemporary Educational Environment and the Evolving Role of Engineering Drawing

2.1. From knowledge transmission to competency development

Across higher education and vocational education systems, a dominant reform trajectory has been the gradual shift from an emphasis on knowledge transmission toward a focus on competency development. This shift reflects the growing recognition that mastering isolated facts or procedures is insufficient for preparing students to perform effectively in real engineering contexts. In the field of engineering drawing, competencies extend well beyond the ability to operate drafting tools or follow predefined steps. They

encompass a combination of cognitive, analytical, and communicative abilities that together enable learners to produce, interpret, and evaluate technical representations [4].

Key competencies in engineering drawing include spatial reasoning and mental visualization, which allow learners to understand and manipulate three-dimensional forms through two-dimensional representations. Visual literacy is equally important, as students must accurately interpret symbols, conventions, and graphical hierarchies embedded in standardized drawings. In addition, competency involves the ability to read and apply technical standards, to understand geometric and dimensional constraints, and to engage in constraint-based thinking when making design decisions. Equally critical is the capacity to critique existing drawings, identify ambiguities or inconsistencies, and revise representations in response to feedback from instructors, peers, or simulated professional stakeholders [5].

Within competency-based educational settings, these abilities must be made explicit as learning outcomes rather than assumed as by-products of practice [6]. Course content needs to be sequenced in a progressive manner, moving from foundational concepts such as projection principles and dimensioning rules toward more complex tasks involving tolerance allocation, functional annotation, and design intent communication. Assessment practices must also evolve accordingly. Instead of relying solely on written examinations that test declarative knowledge, effective evaluation should be grounded in observable performance, such as the quality of student-produced drawings, the rationale provided for design choices, and the ability to interpret and improve existing technical documents [7].

2.2. Digital transformation and hybrid learning as a new baseline

Digital transformation has profoundly reshaped the learning environment for engineering drawing. Online platforms, learning management systems, and specialized software have expanded student access to drawing resources, interactive tutorials, and shared workspaces for collaboration [8]. Hybrid learning models, which combine face-to-face instruction with online components, have increasingly become a baseline rather than an exception. For skill-intensive subjects such as engineering drawing, this flexibility supports repeated practice, self-paced learning, and timely feedback, all of which are essential for developing proficiency.

However, the widespread adoption of digital tools also introduces new pedagogical challenges. Differences in access to hardware, software, and stable learning environments can lead to uneven learning experiences among students [9]. Learners also enter courses with varying levels of prior exposure to digital tools, which may affect their ability to engage effectively with advanced software-based tasks. More importantly, there is a risk that students focus on memorizing software procedures or interface operations without developing a solid understanding of underlying geometric principles, representation logic, and standard conventions.

As a result, effective educational redesign requires a deliberate and balanced integration of digital tools with conceptual instruction and guided practice. Digital technologies should be used not merely to accelerate drafting speed, but to support deeper learning objectives, such as visualizing complex geometries, exploring alternative representations, and understanding the consequences of design decisions. Structured learning activities, scaffolded exercises, and instructor-mediated feedback are necessary to ensure that digital environments enhance rather than dilute the disciplinary rigor of engineering drawing education [10].

2.3. Industry trends: from drafting to model-based definition and data continuity

Industry practice has undergone a parallel transformation, moving from traditional drafting-centered workflows toward model-centered approaches that emphasize data continuity across the product lifecycle. In many engineering sectors, three-dimensional

models increasingly serve as authoritative sources of product definition, while two-dimensional drawings are retained where required by contractual obligations, regulatory frameworks, or supply-chain constraints. This coexistence reflects both technological advancement and practical considerations within complex production ecosystems.

Model-based definition (MBD) and related digital product definition approaches embed dimensions, tolerances, surface specifications, and other technical information directly within the three-dimensional model. These models are designed to be readable not only by human users but also by downstream digital systems supporting manufacturing, inspection, and lifecycle management. Under such conditions, the quality of engineering communication depends not only on graphical accuracy but also on data structure, naming conventions, revision control, and collaborative practices across teams and organizations.

Consequently, engineering drawing education must prepare learners for environments in which drawings and models are tightly integrated rather than treated as separate or sequential artifacts. Students need to understand how traditional drawing principles translate into model-based contexts, how to ensure consistency between different representation forms, and how to manage information integrity across revisions. By addressing these industry trends within the curriculum, engineering drawing education can maintain its foundational role while equipping learners with competencies that are aligned with contemporary professional practice.

3. Common Misalignments in Current Engineering Drawing Instruction

3.1. Tool-centered teaching and superficial competence

A frequent weakness in contemporary instruction is an overemphasis on software commands and interface navigation. Students may learn how to create views, apply dimensions, or generate assemblies, yet struggle to select appropriate tolerances, interpret functional requirements, or detect ambiguity. Tool-centered teaching produces fragile competence: performance collapses when learners face unfamiliar tasks, new software versions, or interdisciplinary constraints.

3.2. Fragmented curricula and weak transfer to real engineering tasks

Engineering drawing is often taught as a standalone course disconnected from design, manufacturing, and quality topics. When drawing assignments do not link to real parts, mechanisms, or construction components, students lack motivation and cannot experience the consequences of representation choices. Fragmentation is especially visible when 2D drawing, 3D modeling, and tolerancing are taught in isolation, preventing learners from understanding how geometry, function, and inspection fit into a single workflow.

3.3. Limited feedback loops and an overreliance on final submissions

Drawing proficiency improves through iterative feedback and correction. Yet many courses rely on final submission grading with limited formative feedback due to large class sizes or constrained instructional time. In such contexts, students may repeat the same errors (projection mistakes, missing datums, inconsistent dimensioning, improper sectioning) without developing self-check strategies. The absence of process evidence also makes it difficult to assess collaboration and professional habits such as revision management and documentation discipline.

3.4. Equity and learner diversity challenges

Spatial visualization ability varies widely among learners and is influenced by prior experience. Some students enter with extensive exposure to graphics, games, or maker activities, while others do not. If instruction assumes uniform readiness, the course may unintentionally disadvantage novices. Moreover, accessibility considerations (visual

impairments, neurodiversity, language barriers) require teaching materials and assessment formats that provide multiple representations and pathways to competence.

4. A Competency-Scenario-Evidence Framework for Engineering Drawing Education

4.1. Defining core competencies

A modern engineering drawing curriculum can be structured around a small set of measurable competencies. This paper proposes six clusters that capture both foundational and contemporary requirements:

- Spatial visualization and geometric reasoning (mental rotation, sectional interpretation, assembly comprehension).
- Standards literacy (projection conventions, line types, dimensioning rules, symbol systems, and standard updates).
- Design intent expression (choosing views, sections, and annotations to communicate function and constraints).
- Tolerancing and inspection reasoning (datums, fits, GD&T principles, and manufacturability considerations).
- Digital modeling and documentation workflow (parametric 3D CAD, drawing generation, file management, and version control).
- Collaborative communication (review practices, markup etiquette, traceability, and interdisciplinary coordination).

4.2. Building authentic learning scenarios

Competencies become teachable when embedded in scenarios that resemble professional work. Scenarios should be small enough for classroom use but realistic enough to expose trade-offs. Examples include a bracket redesign to reduce weight while maintaining stiffness, a gearbox housing requiring datum strategy for machining, or a modular frame that must interface with purchased components. Each scenario should specify functional requirements, manufacturing constraints, inspection needs, and collaboration roles so that drawings are produced as part of decision-making rather than as isolated artifacts.

4.3. Evidence-based assessment and learning portfolios

Assessment should focus on evidence that a learner can perform in context. In addition to final drawings, evidence may include: sketches that reveal reasoning, constraint trees in parametric models, tolerancing justification notes, revision histories, peer review comments, and reflection logs documenting error detection and correction. A portfolio approach supports authenticity and makes learning progression visible, enabling both formative feedback and quality assurance (Table 1).

Table 1. Competency Map for Engineering Drawing Education (Example).

Competency	Learning Tasks	Common Mistakes	Assessment Evidence
Spatial visualization & geometry	Freehand sketches; multi-view to 3D reconstruction; section view interpretation	Incorrect projection; misread sections; inconsistent view relationships	Timed reconstruction exercise; annotated sketches; error-correction log
Standards literacy	Apply line types, symbols, and dimensioning rules according to relevant standards	Missing centerlines; incorrect symbols; ambiguous dimension placement	Standards quiz with applied tasks; drawing checklist compliance score

Design intent expression	Select minimal view set; use sections/details; communicate interfaces and constraints	Over-dimensioning; under-dimensioning; unclear functional surfaces	Design intent memo; instructor/peer rubric on clarity and sufficiency
Tolerancing & inspection reasoning	Choose datums; apply fits and GD&T; plan inspection approach	Inconsistent datums; meaningless tolerances; non-manufacturable specs	Tolerance justification note; inspection plan; rubric on functional validity
Digital workflow	Parametric modeling; drawing generation; version naming; revision control	Broken constraints; unmanaged files; inconsistent revisions	Model tree review; version history; CAD file audit checklist
Collaborative communication	Peer review sessions; markup/issue tracking; interdisciplinary handover	Unstructured feedback; unclear responsibilities; missing traceability	Peer review records; issue tracker export; teamwork contribution report

5. Pedagogical Strategies for Modern Engineering Drawing Education

5.1. Rebalancing hand sketching and digital tools

Hand sketching remains pedagogically valuable even in fully digital industries. As a low-friction medium, sketching externalizes thinking, supports rapid iteration, and reveals misconceptions. Rather than treating sketching as an outdated skill, educators can position it as a cognitive instrument that complements CAD. For example, learners may sketch orthographic views before modeling to predict hidden features, or sketch datum strategies to clarify inspection intent. In practice, short sketching drills (5-10 minutes) can be embedded at the start of lab sessions to prime spatial reasoning and reduce dependence on trial-and-error modeling.

5.2. Project-based learning with incremental complexity

Project-based learning (PBL) aligns engineering drawing with professional workflows by requiring students to produce representations that serve a purpose. Effective PBL uses incremental complexity: early projects emphasize correctness of projection and basic dimensioning; later projects introduce functional tolerancing, assembly constraints, and documentation for manufacturing or construction coordination. A useful pattern is the 'design-document-review-revise' cycle, in which each iteration includes a structured review meeting and a revision submission, mirroring industry practices.

To prevent PBL from becoming unstructured, instructors should provide scaffolds such as drawing checklists, model templates, and example rubrics. The goal is not to reduce challenge, but to make expectations explicit and to help students internalize professional quality criteria.

5.3. Integrating standards and tolerancing through decision-making tasks

Standards and tolerancing are best learned as decision-making rather than memorization. Instead of isolated symbol quizzes, students can be asked to justify choices: Which surfaces are functionally critical? What datum scheme best supports manufacturing and inspection? How does a tighter tolerance affect cost and feasibility? By linking tolerancing to function and process, learners develop engineering judgment and avoid the common misconception that 'tighter is always better.'

5.4. Digital collaboration: version control, review culture, and traceability

Modern drawing work is collaborative and iterative. Courses should therefore teach practical collaboration habits: file naming conventions, revision labeling, change logs, and structured review comments. Simple tools such as shared folders with controlled permissions, cloud-based CAD collaboration spaces, or issue trackers can be introduced gradually. Importantly, collaboration should be assessed, not merely encouraged, so that students recognize it as a professional competency.

5.5. Virtual labs and interactive feedback for scalable practice

Large classes often limit instructor feedback. Virtual labs and interactive feedback mechanisms can partially address this constraint. Examples include: automated checks for missing views or incorrect line types, guided tutorials with embedded questions, and screen-recorded feedback on common mistakes. Where feasible, short diagnostic tasks can be delivered online to identify learners who need targeted support in spatial visualization or standards interpretation. Such approaches should be designed as complements to human feedback, not substitutes, preserving the instructor's role in evaluating reasoning quality and professional communication.

6. Assessment Design and Quality Assurance

6.1. A multi-source assessment model

An assessment system aligned with competency development typically combines multiple sources of evidence. A suggested distribution is: (a) formative checks (quizzes, micro-sketch tasks, short modeling drills), (b) project deliverables (drawings, models, tolerancing rationale), and (c) communication evidence (peer reviews, presentations, reflections). Each component should map to specific competencies and be evaluated with transparent rubrics.

6.2. Rubrics that evaluate clarity, correctness, and professional intent

Drawing rubrics should balance three dimensions: technical correctness (projection rules, line conventions, dimensioning accuracy), communication clarity (sufficiency of views, readability, logical annotation), and professional intent (function-based tolerancing, manufacturability, inspection readiness). Including intent as a criterion discourages purely aesthetic submissions and reinforces the idea that drawings are instruments for action in engineering systems.

6.3. Learning portfolios and academic integrity

As CAD models and drawings can be easily copied, academic integrity is a growing concern. Portfolio-based assessment can mitigate this by requiring process evidence such as intermediate versions, constraint explanations, and reflection on revisions. Oral defenses or short viva-style checks on key design decisions can further verify authorship. Integrity policies should be communicated clearly and framed as professional ethics: in industry, misrepresentation of documentation can lead to safety hazards, legal disputes, and financial loss.

6.4. Program-level feedback and continuous improvement

At the program level, engineering drawing courses should contribute data to continuous improvement processes. Useful indicators include: competency attainment rates, error patterns over time, student confidence surveys, and feedback from downstream courses and industry partners. This evidence can guide decisions about curriculum sequencing, software stack selection, and support services for learners with low initial visualization ability.

7. Implementation Roadmap and Discussion

7.1. Curriculum sequencing and credit allocation

Institutions may implement reform through a staged roadmap. In the first stage, refine learning outcomes and rubrics, introduce process-oriented submissions, and strengthen sketch-to-model connections. In the second stage, build project-based modules that link drawing with manufacturing, measurement, or construction coordination tasks. In the third stage, integrate model-based definition practices and digital collaboration tools, and establish program-level review mechanisms.

7.2. Faculty development and industry engagement

Faculty readiness is critical. Training should cover both technical updates (standards, CAD/MBD workflows) and pedagogy (project design, rubric-based assessment, feedback strategies). Collaboration with industry can provide authentic cases, quality criteria, and exposure to current documentation practices. When enterprise data cannot be shared, parameterized or de-identified cases can still support realism without compromising confidentiality.

7.3. Resource considerations and accessibility

Digital-integrated instruction requires hardware, licensed software, and stable network access. Institutions should consider equity in access by providing on-campus labs, remote desktop solutions, or low-cost student licenses where possible. Accessibility can be improved through captioned tutorials, multiple representation formats, and flexible assessment options that preserve standards while accommodating diverse learning needs.

7.4. Limitations and future directions

This paper proposes a general framework rather than a single prescriptive curriculum. Local implementation should consider disciplinary context (mechanical, civil, mechatronics), institutional mission, and student demographics. Future research can evaluate specific interventions-such as virtual-reality visualization training or automated standards checking-through controlled studies that measure learning gains, transfer to downstream courses, and workplace performance.

8. Conclusion

Engineering drawing education sits at the intersection of engineering thinking, professional standards, and digital practice. In the contemporary educational environment, effective instruction must align explicit competencies with authentic scenarios and evidence-based assessment. A balanced approach-combining sketching for cognition, CAD for precision, and model-based definition for data continuity-can develop learners who not only produce correct drawings but also communicate design intent, justify tolerancing, and collaborate responsibly. By implementing staged curriculum reform, strengthening feedback loops, and using portfolios and rubrics as quality tools, institutions can modernize engineering drawing education while sustaining its enduring value as the language of engineering.

References

1. C. Y. YAO, J. H. SHAN, J. L. ZHU, and Y. SUN, "Teaching Reform of" Engineering Drawing" under Background of the" New Engineering,".
2. Y. S. Chang, "3DCAD effects on creative design performance of different spatial abilities students," *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 397-407, 2014.
3. J. W. Guo, X. C. Cao, L. Xie, J. J. Jin, and C. D. Wang, "Development of engineering drawing ability for emerging engineering education," In *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, September, 2017, p. 012070.

4. X. Li, and M. Ma, "Reform Thinking of Strengthening Students' Ability Training in the Practice of Descriptive Geometry and Mechanical Drawing Course," In *2020 International Conference on Advanced Education, Management and Social Science (AEMSS2020)*, July, 2020, pp. 19-22. doi: 10.2991/assehr.k.200723.094

5. M. Tejera, S. Galiç, and Z. Lavicza, "3D modelling and printing in teacher education: A systematic literature review," *Journal for STEM Education Research*, pp. 1-32, 2025. doi: 10.1007/s41979-025-00147-2

6. S. V. McLaren, "Exploring perceptions and attitudes towards teaching and learning manual technical drawing in a digital age," *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 167-188, 2008. doi: 10.1007/s10798-006-9020-2

7. M. R. Clinciu, and R. Clinciu, "Current perspectives on innovative methods used in teaching technical drawing," In *IOP Conference series: Materials Science and engineering*, January, 2021, p. 012014. doi: 10.1088/1757-899x/1009/1/012014

8. A. Álvarez-Marín, and J. A. Velazquez-Iturbide, "Augmented reality and engineering education: A systematic review," *IEEE transactions on learning technologies*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 817-831, 2022.

9. R. Molina-Carmona, M. L. Pertegal-Felices, A. Jimeno-Morenilla, and H. Mora-Mora, "Assessing the impact of virtual reality on engineering students' spatial ability," 2018. doi: 10.1108/978-1-78756-555-520181013

10. M. Zhang, "Information Teaching Mode of Mechanical Drawing in Higher Vocational College Based on Big Data Technology," 2021.