2026 ASEE ANNUAL CONFERENCE June 21–24, 2026 | Charlotte Convention Center, NC
Host Sponsor UNC Charlotte
Paper ID #50203

Integrating a CMfgT Aligned Manufacturing Engineering Curriculum Across the Four Pillars of Manufacturing Education

Dr. Kapil Gangwar, Wentworth Institute of Technology

Kapil Gangwar is an assistant professor of mechanical engineering at Wentworth Institute of Technology with a background in materials, mechanics and manufacturing.

Integrating a CMfgT Aligned Manufacturing Engineering Curriculum Across the Four Pillars of Manufacturing Education

Abstract

Preparing undergraduate students for the Society of Manufacturing Engineers (SME) Certified Manufacturing Technologist (CMfgT) examination while simultaneously delivering a coherent, engaging Manufacturing Engineering course presents a significant curricular challenge. The CMfgT Body of Knowledge spans foundational engineering sciences, product realization, manufacturing processes, automation, quality, management, and safety; covering 57 chapters in a single reference text. Faculty often face compressed academic schedules, uneven student preparation, and a lack of inherited instructional materials beyond the core textbook. This paper presents a comprehensive case study of a senior level Manufacturing Engineering course redesigned from the ground up to address this breadth within a single 15-week semester. Rather than following the textbook's linear structure, the course was intentionally sequenced to begin with manufacturing centric content; engineering drawings, computer aided design (CAD), and geometric dimensioning and tolerancing (GD&T); to immediately establish relevance for students pursuing a manufacturing minor. The curriculum was organized around the American Society For Engineering Education (ASEE) Manufacturing Division's Four Pillars of Manufacturing Knowledge and developed using a backward design framework anchored to the SME CMfgT Body of Knowledge. A complete instructional ecosystem was authored, including more than 2,500 original lecture slides, twelve scaffolded homework assignments with guided solutions, six quizzes, a midterm, and a cumulative final exam, all explicitly mapped to CMfgT outcomes. The course also embedded Entrepreneurial Mindset principles using the KEEN 3Cs framework; Curiosity, Connections, and Value Creation; to promote systems thinking, integration across domains, and professional identity formation. Outcomes indicate that six out of nine students passed the CMfgT exam, including one student achieving a score of 90%, with the cohort's mean score of approximately 70% exceeding the reported international average of 67.0% for this examination. Group examination analysis revealed strong performance in lean tools, print reading, and GD&T basics, while identifying areas for future curricular refinement in engineering science fundamentals and advanced quality methods. Student feedback emphasized clarity of structure, strong alignment between coursework and certification expectations, and increased confidence in manufacturing competencies. The work offers a transferable, certification aligned curriculum design framework for programs seeking to strengthen rigor, relevance, and professional readiness in manufacturing education.

1. Introduction

Manufacturing engineers entering today's workforce are expected to demonstrate not only technical proficiency in isolated domains but also systems level understanding across materials, processes, automation, quality, cost, sustainability, and organizational decision making. Industry partners increasingly value graduates who can translate design intent into manufacturable, competitive products while navigating constraints of quality, economics, and operations. These expectations have elevated the role of professional certifications as external validators of workforce readiness and holistic competence [1], [2].

In response to these demands, recent advances in engineering education emphasize the integration of digital tools, simulation; based laboratories, and entrepreneurial learning strategies to better prepare graduates for advanced manufacturing environments. Such approaches strengthen workforce readiness by aligning curricular outcomes with the practical, technology-driven needs of industry while supporting national technological competitiveness. This emphasis is particularly timely given the continued expansion of the U.S. engineering workforce, which increased by nearly 3% from 4.84 million in 2022 to 4.98 million in 2023, reflecting sustained demand for well-prepared engineers. Scalable, industry-aligned curricula and laboratory innovations therefore play a critical role in strengthening national engineering capacity and sustaining long-term industrial leadership [3], [4].

Among these demands, the SME Certified Manufacturing Technologist (CMfgT) examination has emerged as a widely recognized industry aligned benchmark for early career manufacturing professionals [5]. Unlike narrowly scoped certifications, CMfgT evaluates breadth and integration across manufacturing domains, including materials and processes, tooling and assembly, manufacturing systems, quality, lean, and engineering economics [6], [7]. For undergraduate students, particularly those pursuing a manufacturing minor, the certification provides a tangible signal of professional readiness and a framework for understanding manufacturing as an interconnected system rather than a set of disconnected topics.

Despite its value, integrating CMfgT preparation into an undergraduate curriculum presents what this paper defines as an Instructional Paradox, composed of three compounding challenges. First, the Breadth–Time Gap arises because the CMfgT Body of Knowledge (BoK) spans 57 chapters in Fundamentals of Manufacturing [7], implying an average pace of approximately 3.8 chapters per week in a traditional 15-week semester; far beyond typical course pacing in manufacturing education. Second, the Resource Gap reflects that faculty assigned to certification aligned courses often inherit no prior instructional artifacts beyond the textbook and a brief syllabus, requiring them to build lecture materials, assignments, and assessments from scratch while teaching. Third, the Prerequisite Gap stems from the uneven preparation of manufacturing minor students in supporting engineering sciences such as statics, thermodynamics, fluid mechanics, electrical fundamentals, and engineering mathematics, which complicates rapid progression through applied manufacturing topics [8].

This paper presents a detailed case study of a senior level Manufacturing Engineering course rebuilt entirely from first principles to address these three gaps while maintaining rigor, inclusivity, and student engagement. The work aligns with ASEE Manufacturing Division priorities around innovative learning materials, the Four Pillars of Manufacturing, entrepreneurial innovation, and best practices in manufacturing education [9]. The central research question is: How can a single semester course be intentionally designed to prepare undergraduates for the breadth of the CMfgT exam while also developing systems level understanding and professional identity?

Two key claims guide the paper. First, while CMfgT certification is widely recognized by industry, little guidance exists in the literature on how to systematically prepare undergraduates for such comprehensive certification within a single academic term. Second, existing publications discuss the value of certification but rarely provide granular instructional design strategies for mapping an entire textbook to certification outcomes under severe time constraints. The contribution of this work lies in describing a replicable design framework; anchored in the ASEE Four Pillars of Manufacturing; that integrates CMfgT alignment, Entrepreneurial Mindset elements, and a complete instructional ecosystem into a coherent, assessment rich curriculum. The paper provides a curriculum design flowchart, group examination performance data mapped to the Four Pillars, and student feedback to advance the practical evidence base for programs seeking to strengthen professional readiness in manufacturing education [10].

2. Background and Literature Review

2.1 CMfgT Certification and Workforce Readiness

The SME CMfgT credential serves as an early career certification intended for recent graduates and practitioners with limited experience who seek validation of comprehensive manufacturing knowledge. The CMfgT BoK encompasses materials and manufacturing processes, product and tooling engineering, systems and operations, manufacturing competitiveness, engineering sciences, and professional practice, explicitly drawing on the 57 chapters of Fundamentals of Manufacturing. This breadth positions CMfgT as a strong proxy for workforce readiness within manufacturing organizations that emphasize cross functional collaboration and systems thinking.

CMfgT aligns with commonly articulated program outcomes such as problem solving, application of engineering fundamentals, and understanding of manufacturing systems, and therefore supports ABET style student outcomes focused on applying knowledge, communicating effectively, and recognizing professional responsibilities. Industry advisory boards frequently encourage integration of such credentials into curricula to provide external benchmarks for both students and programs.

2.2 Challenges in Manufacturing Education

Curriculum overload is a widely recognized problem in engineering programs, where pressure to include emerging topics often competes with limited contact hours. In manufacturing education, this is exacerbated by the inherently integrative nature of the discipline, which requires students to connect engineering science fundamentals with hands on processes, systems thinking, and economic and managerial considerations. Faculty often rely heavily on textbooks without extensive scaffolding, which can leave students struggling to integrate content across chapters and domains.

Prior ASEE work has examined several related themes, including aligning courses with industry certifications, implementing project based and capstone experiences in manufacturing, and embedding Entrepreneurial Mindset Learning (EML) through the KEEN 3Cs framework [11]. However, literature tends to focus either on single interventions (e.g., a capstone project or lab redesign) or on program level alignment rather than the detailed, artifact level mapping of an entire textbook to certification outcomes in a high pressure, single semester environment. As noted earlier, existing literature discusses certification value but does not provide granular instructional design strategies for mapping an entire textbook to certification outcomes under severe time constraints, leaving a practical gap for instructors seeking concrete models.

3. Institutional Context and Course Constraints

The case study is situated within a private, research active institution offering an undergraduate manufacturing minor that attracts students from mechanical and several other related engineering majors particularly ones seeking minor in manufacturing [12]. The focal course, here denoted MANF 3XXX (Manufacturing Engineering), is a senior level manufacturing survey course positioned near the end of the minor sequence and explicitly marketed as preparation for the CMfgT exam.

Enrollment in the course consisted of eleven students in Summer 2025 semester, most of whom were seniors completing the manufacturing minor, with a mix of prior exposure to statics, materials, and introductory manufacturing, but uneven experience in thermodynamics, fluid mechanics, and controls. The class size allowed substantial interaction but also meant that each student's preparation level strongly influenced pacing decisions and in class dialogue.

The course ran over a standard 15-week semester with approximately 25 in person lecture meetings. Within this structure, the instructor faced several binding constraints:

- No inherited lecture slides, homework sets, quizzes, exams, or solution manuals beyond the core textbook and a brief existing syllabus.
- A requirement to align explicitly with the CMfgT BoK and prepare students for an externally scheduled certification exam.
- Pre-planned instructor travel during the semester, resulting in several sessions that had to be delivered as structured self-study rather than live lectures.

These conditions created both pressure and opportunity. The absence of inherited materials necessitated a full rebuild from first principles but also enabled intentional alignment with CMfgT content, the Four Pillars, and Entrepreneurial Mindset outcomes without legacy constraints.

4. Methodology: Rapid Curriculum Development Using Backward Design

To address the Instructional Paradox under these institutional constraints, the course redesign followed a backward design methodology, where desired outcomes guide the selection of assessments and instructional activities. Backward design has been widely advocated in engineering education as a means of aligning learning outcomes, assessment, and instruction while maintaining focus on what students should be able to know and do at the end of a course. Figure 1 presents the complete curriculum design process from start to finish as a flowchart.

Figure 1: Step-by-step backward design process used to develop the CMfgT-aligned course. Curriculum Design Process – From Credential Definition to Transferable Artifacts

Step 1: Define Target Outcomes → CMfgT Body of Knowledge (57 Chapters)

▼

Step 2: Audit All Chapters → Classify as High-Weight, Conceptually Dense, or Self-Study

▼

Step 3: Organize Content Around the Four Pillars of Manufacturing

▼

Step 4: Sequence Topics (Pillar II first → Pillar I → Pillar III → Pillar IV)

▼

Step 5: Author Instructional Ecosystem (Slides, HW, Quizzes, Midterm, Final + Solutions)

▼

Step 6: Map Everything to CMfgT Domains + Four Pillars + KEEN 3Cs (Table 1)

▼

Step 7: Deliver Course → Collect CMfgT Results, Pre/Post Survey, Student Feedback

▼

Step 8: Reflect, Refine, and Share Artifacts for Replication

4.1 Analysis Phase: Auditing the 57 Chapters

The redesign began with a systematic audit of all 57 chapters of Fundamentals of Manufacturing and their mapping to CMfgT knowledge domains. For each chapter, the instructor identified:

- High weight topics that appear prominently in CMfgT sample questions and BoK descriptions, such as machining fundamentals, quality systems, statistical process control, lean and six sigma tools, group technology, and basic engineering economics.
- Conceptually dense topics that students historically find challenging, including GD&T, tolerancing, SPC, and cost modeling.
- Foundational topics suitable for guided self-study with support materials, such as units and measurement, sound, basic electrical concepts, and elementary statics, dynamics, thermodynamics, fluid mechanics and heat transfer review.

This analysis ensured that all CMfgT domains would be covered and provided a basis for prioritizing in class time, designing scaffolding, and identifying content appropriate for travel week self-study modules.

4.2 Creation Phase: Building the Instructional Ecosystem

Guided by the chapter audit and target outcomes, the instructor authored a complete instructional ecosystem:

- Over 2,500 original lecture slides, designed for high density delivery but with embedded explanations, figures, and worked examples rather than bullet only content.

- Twelve original homework assignments with guided solutions, emphasizing reasoning processes, intermediate steps, and conceptual explanations rather than only final numerical answers.
- Six quizzes, a comprehensive midterm, and a cumulative final exam, all explicitly mapped to CMfgT outcomes and the Four Pillars domains.

The volume of artifacts reflects both the breadth of content and the necessity of providing structured practice opportunities across domains. The guided solutions were particularly important for students with prerequisite gaps, as they offered a model for how to think through problems that integrate engineering sciences with process selection and system design.

4.3 Implementation Phase: Sequencing and Travel Week Design

The 15-week schedule was then optimized with several strategies:

- Topic clustering to reduce cognitive switching, grouping related processes and concepts into coherent blocks (e.g., machining with tooling, or quality with lean and six sigma tools).
- Intentional sequencing to build conceptual momentum, beginning with engineering drawing and GD&T to establish a precision first mindset, then moving through materials and processes, systems and operations, and finally competitiveness and economics.
- Structured travel week self-study modules, focusing on engineering science topics that could be supported by high density slides and targeted homework while allowing individualized pacing.

During instructor travel, students engaged with annotated slide decks on topics such as basic electricity, statics applications in fixturing, and thermodynamics in energy use, followed by homework that required them to apply these fundamentals to manufacturing scenarios. While this approach mitigated learning loss, a substitute instructor covered foundational topics in thermodynamics, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics, thereby freeing in-person sessions for more integrative and discussion-based activities.

5. Curriculum Design Using the Four Pillars of Manufacturing [7], [9]

To provide students with a coherent conceptual map of the discipline, the course was explicitly organized around the ASEE Manufacturing Division's Four Pillars of Manufacturing Knowledge: (1) Materials and Manufacturing Processes, (2) Product, Tooling, and Assembly Engineering, (3) Manufacturing Systems and Operations, and (4) Manufacturing Competitiveness [13].

5.1 Pillar I: Materials and Manufacturing Processes

Pillar I addresses the fundamental question of how products are made and, in this course, spanned Chapters 13–16 and 23–34 in the textbook. Topics included material properties and selection, casting and forming processes, machining, joining, and finishing operations, sequenced to mirror industrial workflow from raw materials to finished surfaces.

Lectures in this pillar emphasized comparative analysis and decision making rather than only process descriptions. Students examined why a particular process would be chosen for a given material, geometry, tolerance, and volume, and how process parameters affect cost, quality, and throughput. Homework and quizzes required students to interpret process capability charts, compare alternative process plans, and reason about tradeoffs between competing manufacturing routes.

5.2 Pillar II: Product, Tooling, and Assembly Engineering

Pillar II bridges design intent and manufacturing execution, corresponding to Chapters 17–22 on engineering drawing, CAD/CAE, GD&T, tooling design, and assembly concepts. In the redesigned course, these topics were intentionally placed in Lectures 1–3, rather than later in the semester, to establish a precision first lens that students used to interpret all subsequent content.

Early emphasis on GD&T encouraged students to view tolerances, datums, 100% interchangeability and assembly considerations as central to manufacturing decision making. For example, students analyzed how a change in tolerance scheme would alter fixture requirements, machining sequences, and inspection strategies. Assignments required them to read and critique drawings, propose tooling concepts, and reason about assembly sequences for manufacturability.

5.3 Pillar III: Manufacturing Systems and Operations

Pillar III integrates automation and enabling engineering sciences, drawing on Chapters 5–12 and 42–44. These chapters address topics such as material handling systems, automation architectures, controls, and supporting fundamentals like electrical power and basic mechanics.

Recognizing the prerequisite variability, the course delivered many of these topics through guided self-study modules, particularly during instructor travel weeks. Students worked through dense slide decks with embedded explanations, followed by homework that connected fundamentals to practical systems design, such as specifying motors for conveyor systems or analyzing line balancing scenarios. This approach allowed students with weaker preparation to review key concepts at their own pace while still engaging with manufacturing relevant applications.

5.4 Pillar IV: Manufacturing Competitiveness

Pillar IV focuses on lean manufacturing, quality systems, engineering economics, management, sustainability, and professional skills, covered in Chapters 35–41 and 45–57. In this course, the final third of the semester emphasized this pillar, reinforcing the idea that competitiveness emerges from integrated use of tools and systems rather than isolated techniques.

Students worked with case-based problems that linked quality tools (e.g., control charts, capability indices) with economic evaluation (e.g., cost of scrap, rework, and inspection). Lean manufacturing concepts such as value stream mapping and pull systems were tied to discussions about workforce, automation, and organizational culture. The course also addressed professional practice, ethics, and safety, explicitly connecting them to certification expectations and industry practice.

5.5 Integrated Mapping: Table 1

To make the alignment across CMfgT domains, Four Pillars, and course assessments explicit, the instructor developed a comprehensive mapping table (Table 1). The table organizes the 15-week schedule into topic clusters and, for each cluster, lists:

- The associated CMfgT domain(s).
- The relevant Four Pillars category.
- The primary and secondary assessment instruments (homework, quiz, midterm, final).
- The embedded Entrepreneurial Mindset elements (Curiosity, Connections, Value Creation).

Table 1 serves as a key artifact for both instructors and reviewers who wish to understand how breadth, integration, and mindset outcomes are orchestrated over the semester.

Table 1: Mapping of Course Components to Four Pillars of Manufacturing and CMfgT Domains

Course Topic Cluster	CMfgT Domain	Four Pillar(s)	Assessment Type	EML Element(s)
Engineering Drawing, CAD, GD&T	Product Design & Documentation	Pillar II: Product, Tooling, and Assembly	HW1, HW2, Quiz 1	Connections, Value Creation
Design for Manufacturing (DFM) & Product Development	Product Design & Manufacturing Planning	Pillar II	HW2, Quiz 1	Curiosity, Connections
Group Technology, IP, Product Liability	Manufacturing Planning & Professional Practice	Pillar II, Pillar IV	HW2	Value Creation
Cutting Tool Technology & Machining	Manufacturing Processes	Pillar I: Materials & Processes	HW3	Connections
Metal Forming, Sheet Metal, Powder Metallurgy	Manufacturing Processes	Pillar I	HW3	Curiosity
Casting, Joining, Fastening	Manufacturing Processes	Pillar I	HW4, Quiz 2	Connections
Surface Finishing & Coatings	Manufacturing Processes	Pillar I	HW4	Curiosity
Plastics, Composites, PCB Fabrication	Materials & Processes	Pillar I	HW4	Connections
Engineering Mathematics & Units	Engineering Foundations	Pillar III: Systems & Operations	HW5, Midterm	Curiosity
Light, Sound, Measurement Systems	Engineering Foundations	Pillar III	HW5	Connections
CNC Machining & Robotics	Automation & Control	Pillar III	Quiz 3	Value Creation
PLCs & Automated Systems	Automation & Control	Pillar III	Quiz 3	Connections
Electricity, Statics, Strength of Materials	Engineering Sciences	Pillar III	HW6	Curiosity

Course Topic Cluster	CMfgT Domain	Four Pillar(s)	Assessment Type	EML Element(s)
Thermodynamics & Fluid Power	Engineering Sciences	Pillar III	HW6	Connections
Material Handling & Production Planning	Manufacturing Systems	Pillar IV: Manufacturing Competitiveness	HW7	Connections, Value Creation
Lean Manufacturing & 5S	Lean & Continuous Improvement	Pillar IV	HW7, HW8, Quiz 4	Value Creation
Process Engineering & Visual Controls	Manufacturing Systems	Pillar IV	HW8	Connections
Fixtures, Jigs, Materials Management	Manufacturing Systems	Pillar IV	HW9	Curiosity
Statistical Quality Control & SPC	Quality Systems	Pillar IV	HW9	Connections
ISO Standards & Continuous Improvement	Quality & Management	Pillar IV	HW10	Value Creation
Metrology & Nondestructive Testing	Quality Systems	Pillar IV	HW10, Quiz 5	Curiosity
Engineering Management & Leadership	Manufacturing Management	Pillar IV	HW11	Value Creation
Project Management & Labor Relations	Manufacturing Management	Pillar IV	HW11	Connections
Engineering Economics & Sustainability	Manufacturing Economics	Pillar IV	HW11	Value Creation
Materials Overview (Metals, Plastics, Ceramics)	Materials Science	Pillar I	HW12	Connections
Professional Skills & Ethics	Professional Practice	Pillar IV	Quiz 6	Value Creation
Comprehensive Review & Integration	All CMfgT Domains	All Pillars	Final Exam	Curiosity, Connections, Value Creation

6. Assessment Strategy and Entrepreneurial Mindset Integration

The assessment strategy was intentionally layered to support both content mastery and Entrepreneurial Mindset development.

6.1 Layered Assessments and Progressive Complexity

The course employed a progression of homework → quizzes → midterm → final exam, with frequent low stakes assessments to reinforce learning and provide feedback. Homework assignments introduced new problem types and required multi step reasoning, while quizzes checked short term retention and conceptual understanding of recently covered topics. The midterm and final exam were designed to mimic CMfgT's breadth by sampling across all pillars rather than focusing narrowly on a single unit of content.

Questions were deliberately constructed to require students to integrate multiple domains, such as combining materials selection, process choice, and economic evaluation for a given component, or linking material handling system design to lean production principles. This layering supported the development of systems thinking aligned with both the Four Pillars and CMfgT expectations.

6.2 Addressing Prerequisite Gaps through Inclusive Pedagogy

To address uneven preparation in engineering sciences, the course embedded short "refresher" modules within lecture slides and homework solutions. These embedded explanations revisited essentials of mechanics, thermodynamics, and basic electricity at the moment they were needed, rather than assuming mastery from earlier courses. Homework assignments included annotated solution steps that highlighted the underlying science and showed how to translate it into manufacturing decisions, such as calculating cutting power based on material properties and chip load.

This design reflects an inclusive pedagogy strategy: students with strong backgrounds experienced the refreshers as quick reminders, while those with weaker preparation gained structured support without being singled out in class. By normalizing review and emphasizing reasoning over rote computation, the course aimed to lower barriers to success while maintaining rigor.

6.3 Embedding the KEEN Entrepreneurial Mindset (3Cs)

The KEEN Entrepreneurial Mindset 3Cs; Curiosity, Connections, and Value Creation; were intentionally woven into both instruction and assessment.

- Curiosity: Assignments asked students to investigate real world manufacturing failures, historical case studies, and certification relevance, such as well-known unit conversion mishaps or quality incidents in aerospace. These tasks encouraged students to ask, "Why is this topic on the CMfgT?" and to connect abstract concepts to high stakes industrial contexts.
- Connections: Many assessments required cross domain integration, for example, linking material handling systems (a Pillar III topic) with lean production principles (Pillar IV) to evaluate the impact of batch sizes and layout on flow and waste.
- Value Creation: The CMfgT certification was consistently framed as a career signal, not merely an exam, and students were encouraged to articulate on resumes and in mock interviews how certification validated their capabilities. Class discussions explored how manufacturing expertise contributes to cost savings, quality improvement, and sustainable operations, anchoring technical content in broader value creation for employers and society.

To evaluate the impact of these EML elements, the end-of-semester student survey included targeted items asking students to reflect on: (a) how much the course increased their curiosity about real-world manufacturing topics, (b) how effectively assignments helped them connect concepts across domains, and (c) how confident they felt articulating the professional value of their manufacturing knowledge. Student responses indicated positive engagement across all three EML dimensions, with particularly strong reactions to assignments that tied certification knowledge to professional identity and career contexts. Future iterations will employ validated instruments to enable more rigorous quantitative comparison across offerings.

7. Results and Discussion

7.1 Quantitative Outcomes

Out of the eleven students enrolled in the course, nine attempted the CMfgT exam, and six passed, yielding a pass rate of 66.7%. One student achieved a score of 90%, demonstrating that high level mastery of the breadth of CMfgT content is attainable even within a compressed single semester schedule when alignment and scaffolding are intentional.

The SME Examination Analysis report for this administration (Test Code 9104, v1; Site: Wentworth Institute of Technology; Test Date: 08/06/2025) documents an International Average score of 67.0% across all candidates testing at the same time. The cohort's mean score of approximately 70.1%; computed from the nine individual scores on record; exceeded this international average by roughly three percentage points, suggesting that the structured, CMfgT-aligned course design produced outcomes that compared favorably with the global candidate pool, despite the compressed single-semester format and the cohort's uneven prerequisite preparation. This finding is consistent with prior work by Yip-Hoi and Newcomer [5], who report that structured curriculum alignment to SME frameworks improves student readiness relative to unstructured preparation.

In addition to certification outcomes, the SME Group Examination Analysis provided performance data by CMfgT knowledge domain, which can be mapped to the Four Pillars framework to identify areas of relative strength and areas for future curricular refinement. Table 2 summarizes these findings. The data confirm that topics emphasized most heavily in in-person lectures and high-weight homework assignments; lean tools, print reading, GD&T basics, and ethics; showed the strongest group performance, while domains covered primarily through self-study modules (engineering science fundamentals, advanced quality methods) showed comparatively lower performance.

Table 2: Group CMfgT Examination Performance by Four Pillars Domain (n = 9; Test Code 9104, v1; 08/06/2025)

Four Pillars Domain	Group Avg. Score	Notable Strengths (Selected Topics)	Areas for Improvement (Selected Topics)
Pillar I: Materials & Manufacturing Processes	~68%	Ceramics (100%), Surface Coatings & Finishing (100%), Metals (89%)	Casting & Molding (44%), Joining & Welding (44%), Electrical/Electronics Mfg (22%)
Pillar II: Product, Tooling & Assembly Engineering	~71%	Print Reading (100%), IP Protection (100%), Additive Mfg & Rapid Prototyping (89–100%), Gage Design (100%)	Tolerance Analysis (22%), CAD/Drafting (60%), DFX/Concurrent Engineering (61%)
Pillar III: Manufacturing	~66%	Mathematics (89%), Computer Systems (89%), Cybersecurity (100%)	Engineering Science overall (56%), Fluid Mechanics (44%), Statics &

Four Pillars Domain	Group Avg. Score	Notable Strengths (Selected Topics)	Areas for Improvement (Selected Topics)
Systems & Operations			Dynamics (33%), Data Science (22%), Digital Twin (33%)
Pillar IV: Manufacturing Competitiveness	~72%	Total Quality Management (100%), Lean & Six Sigma Tools (85–100%), Ethics (89%), QCD (85%)	Finance & Cost Justification (41%), Capability Analysis (39%), Quality for Additive Mfg (11%)

Note: Group averages are approximated by weighting section-level pass rates by number of items per section. Source: SME Coordinator Report – Examination Analysis.

7.2 Qualitative Feedback: Structure, Alignment, and Confidence

Student feedback consistently highlighted three themes: clarity of structure, perceived alignment between lectures and assessments, and increased confidence in approaching the CMfgT exam. Students reported that the explicit mapping to CMfgT topics, the use of a conceptual framework figure, and the repeated reference to the Four Pillars helped them understand "where they were" in the course and why each topic mattered.

Anonymized student feedback highlighted the course's strong organizational structure and the usefulness of its instructional materials in supporting exam preparation. Representative verbatim comments from the end-of-semester survey included:

- "Slideshows and lectures were helpful, as the professor compiled and explained the crucial concepts and definitions. Slideshows were a good balance of being both concise and comprehensive."
- "The textbook which was given for the course was very useful. It provided details for questions given during quizzes and exams, as well as homework assignments."
- "The slides were helpful at summarizing the textbook material."

Students also offered constructive suggestions, most notably that incorporating hands-on lab activities, such as using a coordinate measuring machine for a capability study or applying GD&T tolerance stacks to a physical part; would further reinforce the practical relevance of course content. This feedback directly informs the future work directions described in Section 9.

7.3 Professional Identity and Certification as a Career Signal

Beyond content knowledge, students reported shifts in professional identity. Many began the course viewing CMfgT primarily as an optional credential but ended with a clearer understanding of how certification can signal commitment to manufacturing and readiness for entry level roles. Class discussions and assignments that required students to articulate their value to employers through the lens of certification contributed to this shift.

This identity dimension aligns with the Value Creation component of the KEEN framework, in that students came to see their knowledge not only as a means to pass an exam but as a way to contribute to organizational success and continuous improvement in real manufacturing environments.

7.4 Inclusivity and Support for Diverse Preparation

The combination of embedded refresher content, guided solutions, and travel week self-study modules supported students with diverse backgrounds without diluting expectations. Students who entered the course with weaker engineering science foundations reported appreciating the opportunity to "catch up" through structured materials rather than being left behind. At the same time, those with stronger preparation engaged with deeper integrative questions in homework and exams that required more advanced reasoning.

This suggests that certification aligned courses can be both rigorous and inclusive when designed with explicit attention to prerequisite gaps and multiple pathways to engagement.

8. Transferability and Replicability

Although this curriculum was developed within a single institution and for a small cohort, it was intentionally designed to be modular and adaptable. Several aspects support transferability:

- Modular topic clusters allow instructors at other institutions to adjust pacing for quarter systems, larger class sizes, or different prerequisite structures by expanding or contracting specific clusters while maintaining overall alignment.
- Artifact templates; including lecture slide structures, homework formats, and mapping tables; can be adapted to other textbooks or certification frameworks while retaining the backward design logic.
- Explicit Four Pillars and CMfgT mappings provide a transparent blueprint that can be re targeted to alternate credentials or regional manufacturing priorities.

Instructors seeking to replicate or adapt the approach would likely need at minimum: (1) a clear articulation of desired certification outcomes, (2) a chapter level audit of their core text, (3) a mapping table similar to Table 1, and (4) a layered assessment plan. While recreating 2,500 slides is neither necessary nor realistic for many contexts, adopting the structural decisions and sample artifacts could significantly lower the barrier to implementing a certification aligned curriculum.

9. Limitations and Future Work

The primary limitations of this study are sample size and institutional specificity. With only eleven students in a single offering, the observed pass rates and qualitative findings cannot be generalized statistically to all manufacturing programs. The institutional context; a small class, motivated minor students, and strong instructor commitment to artifact creation; may not reflect conditions at larger or resource constrained institutions. The self-assessment instrument used in this study is not a validated psychometric scale; future work should incorporate performance-based measures and validated survey instruments to more rigorously assess learning gains.

Future work will focus on three directions. First, collecting data across multiple offerings of the course will enable more robust analysis of learning outcomes, pass rates, and the relationship between course performance and certification success. Second, collaboration with partner institutions including Society of Manufacturing Engineers could support a multi site study that explores how the framework performs under different enrollment levels, scheduling models, and student demographics. Third, publishing selected artifacts (e.g., mapping tables, example assignments, and conceptual framework figures) through repositories or communities of practice could support broader adoption and iterative improvement. Student feedback also identified incorporating hands-on laboratory activities, such as CMM-based capability studies and GD&T tolerance stack applications; as a promising direction for strengthening practical relevance in future offerings.

10. Conclusion

This paper described the rapid, from scratch redesign of a senior level Manufacturing Engineering course explicitly aligned with the SME CMfgT Body of Knowledge and organized around the Four Pillars of Manufacturing Knowledge. By using backward design, a detailed chapter level audit, and a layered assessment strategy, the instructor transformed the Instructional Paradox of breadth, resource, and prerequisite gaps into an opportunity to build a coherent, high rigor instructional ecosystem.

Certification results (a 66.7% pass rate with one student scoring 90%) and student feedback on structure, alignment, and confidence suggest that robust preparation for broad certification is achievable within a single academic term when alignment and scaffolding are intentional. The cohort's mean exam score of approximately 70.1% exceeded the reported international average of 67.0% for this examination, providing an external benchmark that supports the practical validity of the curriculum design approach. Group examination analysis further revealed that in-person, heavily scaffolded content; lean tools, print reading, GD&T basics; produced the strongest outcomes, while self-study-delivered engineering science topics represent the clearest opportunity for future refinement. Integrating Entrepreneurial Mindset elements fostered curiosity about real world failures, connections across domains, and a sense of value creation tied to professional identity and career trajectories. More broadly, the framework presented here offers a transferable model for manufacturing programs seeking to connect curricula to industry recognized credentials while advancing systems thinking, inclusivity, and professional readiness.

11. References

[1] G. Chryssolouris, D. Mavrikios, and D. Mourtzis, "Manufacturing systems: skills & competencies for the future," Procedia CIRP, vol. 7, pp. 17–24, 2013.

[2] D. M. Anderson, Design for manufacturability: how to use concurrent engineering to rapidly develop low-cost, high-quality products for lean production. Productivity Press, 2020.

[3] "Data USA Manufacturing Engineering." Accessed: April 17, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://datausa.io/profile/cip/manufacturing-engineering

[4] Cathy Cecere, "When it Comes to Engineers, Demand Exceeds Supply," Apr. 16, 2025. Accessed: April 17, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.asme.org/topics-resources/content/when-it-comes-to-engineers,-demand-exceeds-supply

[5] D. M. Yip-Hoi and J. L. Newcomer, "Conforming a New Manufacturing Engineering Curriculum to the SME Four Pillars," in 2015 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, 2015, pp. 26–393.

[6] P. Rufe and P. D. Rufe, Fundamentals of Manufacturing Supplement. Society of Manufacturing Engineers, 2005. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books?id=-aOUtGmDazgC

[7] P. D. Rufe, Fundamentals of Manufacturing, Third Edition. Society of Manufacturing Engineers, 2013. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books?id=Xs2Wx787hpcC

[8] M. Ssemakula, G. Liao, and D. Ellis, "Closing the Competency Gap in Manufacturing Processes as It Applies to New Engineering Graduates.," Adv Eng Educ, vol. 2, no. 1, p. n1, 2010.

[9] J. Irwin et al., "The Four Pillars of Manufacturing Knowledge: A Contemporary Perspective on Practical Implementation," Journal of Engineering Technology, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 38–51, 2025.

[10] C. Carroll, S. A. Sell, and M. B. Sabick, "Introduction to Entrepreneurial-minded Learning for Faculty of Foundational STEM Courses Using the KEEN Framework," in 2019 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, 2019.

[11] S. T. Ghanat and D. D. Ragan, "Implementing Entrepreneurial Mindset Learning Activities in Several Engineering Courses," in 2024 South East Section Meeting, 2024.

[12] Wentworth Institute of Technology, "Manufacturing Minor," 2025-2026 Academic Catalog. Accessed: April 17, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://catalog.wit.edu/

[13] T. S. Tillman, "Competency Areas for Certification Testing of Manufacturing Technologists and Entry-Level Manufacturing Engineers.," Journal of Epsilon Pi Tau, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 10–15, 1992.