Engineering Educators Bringing the World Together
2025 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition
Palais des congrès de Montréal, Montréal, QC • June 22–25, 2025 ASEE
Paper ID #46150

Diversity Drives Innovation Bridging the Atlantic: A Comparative Analysis of UK and US Higher Education Engineering Education Systems

Dr. Roger V. Gonzalez P.E., University of Texas at El Paso

Roger V. Gonzalez is the inaugural chairman and professor of the Department of Engineering Education and Leadership. He is the Mike Loya Endowed Chair in Engineering. He also serves as the Director of the Engineering Leadership program for the College of Engineering. Dr. Gonzalez earned a B.S. in Mechanical Engineering in 1986 from UTEP. He earned his M.S. in Biomedical Engineering and Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering from The University of Texas at Austin and was a Post-Doctoral Fellow at the premier Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago and Northwestern Medical School. Professor Gonzalez has been recognized for scholarly work, education innovation, and socio-entrepreneurial humanitarian efforts. He is known and respected for actively incorporating students into all three of these areas.

Among many highlights of his scholarly work, he is a Fellow of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) and a Fellow of the American Institute for Medical and Biological Engineering (AIMBE) and was awarded a prestigious National Institutes of Health (NIH) National Research Service Award for his work in neuromuscular control and musculoskeletal biomechanics in children with juvenile rheumatoid arthritis. Dr. Gonzalez's scholarly work includes over 100 publications in journals and conference proceedings.

For his efforts and innovation in engineering education, Dr. Gonzalez has received the American Society of Engineering Educators (ASEE) Teaching Award, the Minnie Stevens Piper Foundation Award, and LeTourneau University's top research and scholarship award. He was also a Finalist for the IEEE Global Humanitarian Engineer of the Year award in 2013. He serves as an engineering program evaluator for the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET).

Dr. Gonzalez was awarded a faculty fellowship by UTEP and the University College London (UCL), where he served as a Visiting Professor, to spend the 22-23 academic year traveling throughout the United Kingdom visiting over 25 universities in England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and The Netherlands. His research focused on how professional development plays a role in engineering education and how approaches to broadening access impact higher education.

Dr. Gonzalez is the Founder, former CEO, and President of LIMBS International (www.limbs.org), one of the most recognized international providers of low-cost prosthetic components. LIMBS is a 501(c)3 non-profit humanitarian organization that designs, creates, and deploys prosthetic devices to transform the lives of amputees in the developing world by restoring their ability to walk. Since its founding in 2004, the LIMBS Knee has helped thousands of amputees in over 50 countries on four continents.

Dr. Peter Golding, University of Texas at El Paso

Professor in the Department of Engineering Education and Leadership at UTEP.

Bridging the Atlantic: A Comparative Analysis of UK and US Higher Education Engineering Education Systems

A comparative analysis of the UK and the US engineering education systems highlights key differences and similarities in their approaches to training the next generation of engineers. The research is based on a year-long study conducted in the UK, involving visits to numerous universities, attendance at academic conferences, and frank discussions with administrators, academics, and diverse faculty.

The study reveals distinct variations in program structure, student demographics, academic/faculty roles, and external influences on engineering education in both countries. While the UK and the US share much of a common engineering language and strong historical ties, their engineering education systems have evolved along different paths, leading to unique strengths and challenges. The comparative analysis contributes to the international discourse on engineering education by:

- Offering insights into diverse approaches to engineering education, fostering cross-cultural understanding and collaboration.
- Providing valuable information for students considering international study opportunities in engineering.
- Informing engaged faculty and administrators seeking to enhance their programs through international benchmarking and best practices.

By examining the contrasts and commonalities between these two prominent engineering education systems, this paper aims to stimulate discussion and promote the exchange of ideas among engineering educators worldwide. It underscores the importance of international perspectives in addressing engineering education's complex challenges in an increasingly globalized world.

Keywords: Comparative Analysis, UK-US Engineering Education, International Perspectives, Program Structure, Student Experience, Academic/Faculty Roles, Cultural norms, Engineering globalization.

Introduction and Context

Engineering provides solutions crucial to human well-being and societal growth. Despite remarkable advancements, engineers continuously learn from past failures, emphasizing the need for education that extends beyond technical expertise. The Hatfield rail crash in 2000 exemplifies the devastating consequences of engineering management and execution errors [1]. Similarly, the 2019 Keystone Dam incident highlights the importance of a broader understanding of environmental factors in engineering decisions [2].

As Vyas [3] stated, engineering disasters often result from a complex interplay of design flaws, underestimations, and insufficient knowledge. They serve as stark reminders of the evolving

roles and responsibilities of engineers. Modern engineering demands a multifaceted skillset encompassing safety protocols, public policy, business acumen, sustainability, and ethics, emphasizing the crucial role of trust placed in engineers by society.

Recognizing the dynamic nature of society and the accelerating pace of technological change, the National Academy of Engineering (NAE) emphasized the need for adaptation in engineering education and practice to effectively address future challenges [4].

Looking Abroad While Viewing Within

This paper examines the engineering education systems in the UK and the US, two globally respected frameworks attracting international students and scholars. While some programs align with the US model globally, the Bologna Process has significantly influenced European higher education by promoting quality and portability through standardized degree structures, credit systems, and quality assurance guidelines [5]. The Bologna Process aims to enhance the recognition of European higher education systems and foster collaboration within Europe and internationally. However, each institution can retain its distinct identity based on geographical location, focus, student cohort, and industrial engagement.

This comparative analysis examines the similarities and differences between the UK and US models, aiming to stimulate discussion and promote the exchange of ideas among engineering educators worldwide.

Research Methodology

The research draws on a year-long fellowship in the UK, involving visits to nearly 30 universities across diverse regions. The study encompassed:

- Site Visits: Observations of academic environments and discussions with over 200 academics and faculty members across various university classifications.
- Conferences: Participation in academic conferences to gather insights regarding current trends and challenges.
- Qualitative Data: Extensive interviews provided qualitative data, revealing perspectives on program structures, student experiences, faculty roles, and external influences.

Comparison of Program Structures

The UK and US systems exhibit distinct differences in program structures, impacting student learning experiences and career preparation.

Program Length and Design

UK engineering programs are generally shorter than their US counterparts. A bachelor's degree typically takes three years, while a master's degree can be completed in one year. The shorter duration is attributed to the focused nature of UK programs, allowing students to specialize early in their academic journey. In contrast, US programs encourage a broader education across

disciplines, with general education courses often comprising one-third of the requirements for a bachelor's degree [6].

Table 1: Program Length of Study: UK vs US

Degree	UK	US
Bachelor's	3 years (longer with foundation, sandwich, or internship year)	4 years (longer at some schools and majors)
Master's	1 year	1.5 - 2 years
Doctoral	3-4 years	4-6 years (longer for students going from BS directly to PhD without a master's)

Focused Versus Broad Curriculum

The difference in program design stems from the distinct educational philosophies in the UK and the US [7]. The UK system emphasizes early specialization, with students narrowing their focus at the pre-university level. After completing secondary school at ages 15-16, students intending to pursue university education spend two years studying 3-4 subjects directly relevant to their chosen university course. These A-levels exams, comparable to the ACT or SAT in the US but focused on course-specific subjects, determine university admission [8].

Integration of Professional Development

Another key distinction lies in the integration of professional development within the curriculum. UK engineering programs often incorporate internship opportunities, ranging from short-term placements to a "sandwich year," providing students with practical experience and enhancing their employability [9]. The sandwich year, lasting nine months to a year, typically includes academic requirements alongside paid work experience. While internship participation rates vary across institutions, data suggests that graduates with a sandwich year experience have higher rates of further study, sustained employment, and higher earnings [10].

Comparison of Student Experiences

Entry Requirements and Admission Processes

Entry requirements and admission processes differ, reflecting the distinct educational pathways in each country [11], [12].

UK:

- A-Level Exams: Students complete A-level exams following secondary school, focusing on subjects specific to their intended university course.
- UCAS Application: Applications are submitted through the centralized UCAS system, allowing students to apply to up to five courses at different universities.

- Emphasis on Specialization: Students are expected to have a clear understanding of their chosen field before entering university, limiting flexibility to switch courses once admitted.

US:

- Standardized Tests: Traditionally, students took the ACT or SAT, broad-based exams assessing general academic skills. However, the usefulness of these tests has been increasingly questioned, and many universities have adopted test-optional or test-blind admissions policies [13].
- Holistic Review: Admissions decisions consider factors like GPA, recommendations, essays, and extracurricular activities.
- Flexibility in Major Selection: Students often apply to universities without declaring a major, allowing them to explore various fields before specializing [14].

Student Support and Representation

Student support and representation also vary between the two systems [15].

UK:

- Students' Unions: Students' unions are integral to UK universities, providing advocacy, support services, and representation in university governance. They play a significant role in shaping university policies and advocating for student rights, including issues related to tuition fees, mental health services, and workers' rights [16].
- Consumer Protection: Higher education providers in the UK are subject to consumer protection laws, ensuring students can access clear information about courses, fees, and consumer rights [17].

US:

- Limited Student Union Presence: Students' unions are less prevalent in US universities, particularly at the undergraduate level, although their presence is growing. Their focus has traditionally been on graduate student concerns and issues related to working conditions [18].
- Less Emphasis on Consumer Protection: While students in the US have certain rights and protections, the emphasis on consumer protection in higher education is less pronounced compared to the UK.

Assessment Methods

Table 2: Comparison of Module/Course Grading Scales in the UK and the US

Grade Range	UK	US
90-100%	A - First-Class Honors (1st)	A - Superior
80-89%		B - Excellent
70-79%	B - Upper Second-Class (2.1)	C - Average
60-69%	C - Lower Second-Class (2.2)	D - Below Average
50-59%	D - Third Class (3rd)	F - Fail

Grade Range	UK	US
40-49%		F - Fail
0-39%	Fail	F - Fail

Assessment methods differ significantly between the two systems [19]. The UK system primarily relies on summative assessment, often with 70-100% of a student's grade determined by the final exam. Students typically have limited coursework assignments, focusing on independent research and engagement with an academic mentor. The US system employs a more formative approach, with multiple components contributing to the final grade, including assignments, projects, class participation, and exams.

Comparison of Faculty Roles

Faculty Development and Recognition

Faculty development and recognition are key factors influencing teaching quality and research output [20], [21].

UK:

- Professional Standards Framework (PSF): The PSF provides a framework for recognizing and rewarding teaching excellence in higher education. Many universities incorporate PSF training into PhD programs and offer fellowship awards to acknowledge teaching quality [22].
- Emphasis on Research for Promotion: Despite efforts to recognize teaching excellence, research output remains a primary factor for career advancement and promotion in UK universities [23].

US:

- Teaching Excellence Recognition: While quality teaching is valued, research productivity often carries greater weight in promotion and tenure decisions, particularly at research-intensive universities.
- Tenure System Under Pressure: The traditional tenure system, intended to protect academic freedom and provide job security, is facing challenges, with an increasing reliance on contingent and part-time faculty [24].

Quality Control and Academic Freedom

Approaches to quality control and academic freedom highlight fundamental differences in the two systems [25].

UK:

- External Examiners: The use of external examiners ensures rigorous quality control and adherence to national standards [26].
- Prescriptive Standards: Detailed course policies and procedures dictate module content, teaching methods, and assessment, limiting academic freedom but ensuring consistency and accountability.

US:

- Accreditation through ABET: ABET accreditation focuses on program outcomes and continuous improvement rather than prescriptive standards, allowing greater flexibility and innovation in program design and delivery [27].
- Strong Emphasis on Academic Freedom: Faculty have significant autonomy in developing and teaching courses, fostering creativity and innovation but potentially leading to variations in quality.

Comparison of External Influences

Industry Partnerships and Funding Models

External factors, including industry partnerships and funding models, significantly shape engineering education [28], [29].

UK:

- Strong Industry-University Partnerships: UK universities have a strong tradition of collaboration with industry, often incorporating internships and sandwich year placements into their programs.
- Government-Funded Tuition Fees: Tuition fees for UK students are capped by the government, and students can access government loans to cover tuition costs and living expenses [30].
- Reliance on International Student Fees: To offset funding shortfalls, UK universities increasingly rely on tuition fees from international students, which are not subject to government caps [31].

US:

- Industry Partnerships Present but Less Integrated: Industry partnerships exist, but internships are often less formally integrated into the curriculum.
- Higher Tuition Fees and Varied Funding Sources: Tuition fees in the US are generally higher than in the UK, and students often rely on a combination of scholarships, grants, loans, and personal savings to fund their education.
- Less Reliance on International Students: International students represent a smaller proportion of the student population in the US and contribute less significantly to university funding [32].

University Reputation and Tradition

University reputation and tradition play a significant role in shaping the educational landscape [33].

UK:

- Centuries-Old Traditions: UK universities, particularly Oxbridge (Oxford and Cambridge), have centuries-old traditions that deeply influence academic culture, teaching practices, and research priorities.

- Influence on Government and Policy: UK universities' historical prestige and influence extend to government and policy, with a significant proportion of UK Parliament members holding degrees from these institutions [34].

US:

- Shorter History but Rising Prestige: While US universities have a shorter history than their UK counterparts, institutions like the Ivy League have gained international recognition and prestige.
- Less Centralized Influence: The influence of elite universities in the US is less centralized compared to the UK, with greater diversity and regional variation in higher education institutions [35].

Discussion and Implications

The comparative analysis reveals distinct strengths and challenges in both the UK and US engineering education systems [36]. The UK system's emphasis on early specialization, practical experience through internships, and rigorous quality control through external examination produces graduates who are well-prepared for specific career paths and accustomed to a structured learning environment. However, the system's limited flexibility, heavy reliance on summative assessment, and financial dependence on international student fees challenge student choice, diversity, and economic stability.

The US system's flexible admissions policies, broader curriculum, diverse teaching methods, and strong emphasis on academic freedom foster a more student-centered and adaptable learning environment, encouraging exploration and innovation. However, the lack of early specialization, less integrated practical experience, and potential for variations in quality across institutions require students to be more proactive in shaping their educational journey and seeking out career-relevant opportunities [37].

Key implications for engineering education include:

1. Balancing Specialization and Breadth: Finding the right balance between early specialization and broader education is crucial for preparing graduates for a rapidly changing job market [38].
2. Integrating Practical Experience: Incorporating practical experience through internships, project-based learning, and industry collaborations enhances student employability and prepares them for real-world engineering challenges [39].
3. Promoting Active Learning: Shifting from passive lecture-based teaching to active learning strategies that foster critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication skills is essential for developing adaptable and innovative engineers [40].
4. Recognizing and Rewarding Teaching Excellence: Creating a culture that values and rewards teaching excellence alongside research output is vital for attracting and retaining high-quality faculty and ensuring a positive student learning experience [41].
5. Ensuring Financial Sustainability and Equity: Developing sustainable funding models that provide access and affordability for all students while supporting high-quality education and research is critical for the long-term health of engineering education systems [42].

These differences in learning environments have essential implications for graduates' skills and career paths. The UK's structured approach, emphasizing early specialization and industry placements, may lead to better industry preparedness and a smoother transition into the workforce. Graduates from UK programs will likely have a deeper understanding of their chosen field and have practical experience directly relevant to their career goals.

On the other hand, the US system's broader education, with its focus on flexibility and exploration, might foster greater adaptability, innovation, and a wider range of career options. US graduates may be better equipped to navigate the complexities of a rapidly changing job market and adapt to emerging technologies and industries. While both approaches have their strengths, the optimal choice may depend on individual learning styles, career aspirations, and the specific demands of the engineering profession in different contexts.

Conclusion

The UK and US engineering education systems, shaped by their unique historical, cultural, and societal contexts, offer valuable lessons for engineering educators worldwide. By understanding the strengths and challenges of each system, educators can critically evaluate their own practices and identify areas for improvement [43]. As the engineering profession continues to evolve, collaboration and the exchange of best practices across borders are essential for preparing the next generation of engineers to address global challenges and drive innovation in a rapidly changing world.

The comparative analysis reveals that while both systems have developed effective approaches to engineering education, they face common challenges in adapting to technological change, maintaining educational quality, and ensuring financial sustainability. The UK's structured approach and emphasis on early specialization contrasts with the US's flexible pathways and broader education base, each offering distinct advantages for different types of learners and career paths [44].

Future Directions

Future research should explore the impact of these system differences on student outcomes, including career success, job satisfaction, and contributions to society. Investigating the long-term impact of early specialization versus broad-based education on career adaptability and innovation potential is crucial [45]. Additionally, it will be crucial to contrast students' learning experiences in the two systems, their preparedness for careers, and their readiness for civic obligations and responsibilities.

Understanding how different approaches to professional development, licensure, and continuing education shape the professional trajectories of engineers is essential for informing policy decisions and ensuring the ongoing relevance and effectiveness of engineering education systems worldwide [46]. A reviewer of this paper suggested an excellent idea: to gather extensive inputs from students in both systems for comparative analysis.

Other key areas for future investigation include:

1. Longitudinal studies of graduate outcomes across both systems
2. Impact of teaching methods on innovation capabilities
3. Effectiveness of different approaches to industry collaboration
4. Role of technology in engineering education delivery
5. Strategies for promoting diversity and inclusion in engineering

By embracing the diversity of approaches and fostering international collaboration, engineering educators can collectively strive to create dynamic and responsive education systems that empower future engineers to tackle complex global challenges and shape a sustainable and equitable future [47].

References

[1] P. Cheston, "The scandal of Hatfield," Evening Standard, Apr. 13, 2012. [Online].

[2] M. Fernandez and J. Schwartz, "Army Corps under fire: In a flood, it released more water," New York Times, May 31, 2019.

[3] K. Vyas, "23 of the worst engineering disasters to date," Interesting Engineering, Mar. 22, 2023.

[4] National Academy of Engineering, "The engineer of 2020: Visions of engineering in the new century," National Academy of Sciences, National Academies Press, 2004.

[5] "Bologna Process," European University Association. [Online].

[6] B. Klaus and P. Horn, "Comparison of engineering education in the United States Versus the United Kingdom," in Proc. 2016 ASEE Annual Conf. & Exposition, 2016.

[7] C. Arlett, F. Lamb, R. Dales, and E. Hurdle, "Meeting the needs of industry: The drivers for change in engineering education," Engineering Education, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 18-25, 2010.

[8] "A guide to integrated masters degrees," Masters Compare. [Online].

[9] M. Grey, "The placement panacea," Higher Education Policy Institute, Apr. 11, 2019.

[10] Department for Education, "Graduate outcomes (LEO): Employment and earnings outcomes of higher education graduates by subject studied and graduate characteristics in 2016/17," GOV.UK, Mar. 28, 2019.

[11] B. Holmes and C. Duda, "Applying to college as undecided major: Pros, cons," US News and World Report, Dec. 14, 2020.

[12] M. Churchill, "The SAT and ACT are less important than you might think," Inside Higher Ed, Jan. 29, 2023.

[13] F. Cineas, "Why elite colleges are bringing the SAT back," Vox, Feb. 27, 2024.

[14] R. Johnson, "New survey finds most college grads would change majors," Best Colleges, Mar. 20, 2023.

[15] B. Maples, "What is a student union?" University Compare, Aug. 2, 2021.

[16] NUS Charity, "Our impact on history," NUS UK.

[17] "Protecting students as consumers," Office for Students, Jun. 15, 2023.

[18] L. Knox, "We're not slowing down, student workers say," Inside Higher Ed, Apr. 26, 2023.

[19] J. Smurthwaite, "Understanding the undergraduate grading system in the UK," Hotcoursesabroad, Apr. 28, 2023.

[20] "Professional standards framework (PSF 2023)," AdvanceHE, 2023.

[21] "Reward and recognition of teaching in higher education," The Higher Education Academy, Feb. 2009.

[22] "Teaching and learning accreditation," AdvanceHE.

[23] R. Adams, "Tuition fees from UK students fail to cover costs of undergraduate courses at UCL," The Guardian, Sep. 11, 2021.

[24] G. Colby, "Data snapshot: Tenure and contingency in US higher education," American Association of University Professors, Mar. 2023.

[25] "The UK quality code for higher education," Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, May 2023.

[26] "External Examining Principles," UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment.

[27] P. Hylton and W. Otoupal-Hylton, "Comparison of engineering education in the United States Versus the United Kingdom," in Proc. 2016 ASEE Annual Conf. & Exposition.

[28] C. Edwards, "Engineering skills crisis: A multi-pronged problem," Engineering and Technology, Jan. 12, 2023.

[29] M. Daks, "Engineering a solution to a shortage," NJBIZ, Mar. 13, 2023.

[30] J. Cassidy, "Student loans: How do they work, what can I borrow, and when do I pay it back?" BBC News, May 16, 2023.

[31] C.A. Garcia et al., "Fifth of UK universities' income comes from overseas students, figures show," The Guardian, Jul. 14, 2023.

[32] A. Parker, "International students in the US," Prosperity for All, Feb. 28, 2023.

[33] T. Chamorro-Premuzic and B. Frankiewicz, "6 Reasons why higher education needs to be disrupted," Harvard Business Review, Nov. 19, 2019.

[34] "MPs and their degrees: Here's where and what our UK politicians studied," Studee, Dec. 13, 2019.

[35] K. Schaeffer, "Nearly all members of the 118th Congress have a bachelor's degree," Pew Research Center, Feb. 2, 2023.

[36] Royal Academy of Engineering, "Thinking like an engineer: Implications for the education system," Centre for Real World Learning, May 2014.

[37] Taylor et al., "The skills imperative 2035: What does the literature tell us about essential skills most needed for work?" National Foundation for Educational Research, Mar. 3, 2022.

[38] McDonald, "Engineering zero: Bringing the engineering profession together to meet the net zero ambition," Royal Academy of Engineers, Jun. 24, 2021.

[39] Royal Academy of Engineering, "Educating engineers for the 21st century," Jun. 2007.

[40] Hurix, "Top 6 teaching strategies adopted by higher-ed institutions post-Covid," Feb. 22, 2023.

[41] "UK higher education providers – Advice on consumer protection law," Competition and Markets Authority, May 31, 2023.

[42] S. Weale, "Funding model for UK higher education is 'broken,' say university VCs," The Guardian, May 31, 2023.

[43] National Academy of Engineering, "The engineer of 2020: Visions of engineering in the new century," 2004.

[44] B. Bharkhada, "How has university funding changed?" MAKEuk.

[45] Department for Education, "Sustainability and climate change: A strategy for the education and children's services systems," GOV.UK, Apr. 21, 2022.

[46] Committee on Policy and Advocacy, "Employment practices—Use of engineering titles," National Society of Professional Engineers, Jan. 2023.

[47] Department for Education, "Graduate outcomes (LEO): Employment and earnings outcomes of higher education graduates by subject studied and graduate characteristics in 2016/17," GOV.UK, Mar. 28, 2019.